Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 15th November, 1967

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

PETROLEUM (REGISTRATION FEES) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Bovell (Minister for Lands), and read a first time.

QUESTIONS

Postponement

THE SPEAKER: With the permission of the House, it is my intention to postpone questions until the first convenient opportunity after the tea suspension. I am informed that some of the answers are not available, and I think it would be better if the House agreed to take questions at a later stage.

PETROLEUM BILL

Second Reading

MR. BOVELL (Vasse—Minister for Lands) [2.18 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that recently two Bills relating to the exploration for, and exploitation of, petroleum resources within the offshore regions of the State were introduced into this Chamber and passed. Those two Bills are complementary to similar legislation that has been passed, or is still being considered, by the Parliaments of the Commonwealth and each State. It is the intention of each of those Bills to provide a common code for mining for petroleum in the offshore areas of the States and territories of the Commonwealth.

At the present time mining for petroleum in this State, whether on land or on submerged lands, is regulated by the Petroleum Act of 1936, as amended. For though the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Bill is passed, it is not yet proclaimed and operative. When it is, of course, the existing Petroleum Act will no longer apply to mining for petroleum offshore but only to mining for petroleum on the land areas of the State.

It is considered it would be undesirable to have two markedly different codes regulating the same activity—that is, petroleum exploration—merely because in one instance it is carried out on land and, in another, it is carried out on submerged land. This Bill accordingly proposes to repeal the Petroleum Act of 1936 and to provide, in respect of mining for petroleum onshore, in almost identical terms to those of the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Bill of 1967.

The Bill does, however, differ in some respects from the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Bill. The principal difference is that this Bill has no provisions dealing with the licensing of pipelines, for the reason that difficulties have been experienced elsewhere in the Commonwealth in dealing with the construction of pipelines over land, and further attention is being given to the problem by experts from the several States.

It has been thought that a better result will in the end be achieved by deferring the preparation of legislation to cover pipelines until the interstate consideration of the subject is more advanced. The Petroleum Act, 1936, also contains no provisions specifically dealing with pipelines but, by sections 12 and 20, has some provisions that might be resorted to if the need arose. Those provisions, in a slightly enlarged form, have been preserved in this present Bill under review.

The Bill differs further from the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Bill in respect of the provisions dealing with permits to authorise exploration for petroleum. The maximum size of a permit area under this Bill is 200 graticular blocks—roughly 5,000 square miles—and is thus one half of the maximum size of a permit under the offshore legislation. This difference has been created for the reason that most of the phases of petroleum exploration and, in particular, drilling, can be carried out more speedily and cheaply on land than offshore. For a similar reason, the initial term of a permit is five years under this Bill as against six in the offshore Bill.

The Bill provides in different terms from the offshore Bill when setting out the maximum portion of a permit that may be renewed at the various renewal stages. Under the Bill, on each occasion that permit is renewed, up to and including the third renewal, the permittee is obliged to relinquish an area equal to one-quarter of the area originally comprised in his permit. On the fourth and subsequent renewals, he may apply for no more than nine blocks—that is, not more than 350 square miles—which will ordinarily leave him with an area out of which a full-sized license area could be obtained if a discovery were made.

The offshore Bill provides that, on each renewal of a permit, the permittee is to relinquish not less than one-half of the area remaining in his permit at the time the renewal is applied for. The renewal formula in this Bill produces results that are, in effect, very similar to those produced by the offshore Bill.

The remaining difference of any consequence is with respect to rates of royalty. Under the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Bill, the rates are 10 per cent. of the value of petroleum recovered under a primary license—that is normally five blocks—and 11 to 12½ per cent. in the case of petroleum recovered both under a primary

license and a secondary license where a licensee has been granted a secondary license.

This Bill provides for a royalty of 5 to 10 per cent. under a primary license and 10 to 12½ per cent. for petroleum recovered under a secondary license and, except in certain cases under a primary license, where the two are held by the one licensee. A previous Government, in 1950, gave an undertaking to an exploratory company that the Government would not impose royalty in excess of 5 per cent.—the minimum in the Petroleum Act, 1936—in respect of petroleum recovered during certain periods from certain leases; and further, that it would not impose royalty in excess of 10 per cent. in respect of petroleum recovered from those leases at other periods.

Successive Governments have indicated that those undertakings would be honoured and it is necessary to make provision in this Bill for royalties in different terms from the offshore Bill to give effect to those undertakings. It is, however, intended that the rates declared by the offshore Bill will be applied in all cases not the subject of the undertakings, and the terms of this Bill will so permit.

As the Bill is designed to regulate the exploration for, and exploitation of petroleum on land within the State, it is necessary for the Bill to provide for the assessment and payment of compensation to owners and occupiers of land—including pastoral lessees—adversely affected by petroleum mining operations. In this regard, the Bill incorporates the existing provisions of the Petroleum Act, 1936, differing only in that actions for compensation will be determined before local courts rather than before wardens.

In conclusion, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that a Message was received from His Excellency the Governor for the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Bill. As you know, this Bill was introduced in another place and the difference between it and the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Bill is that the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Bill provided for an appropriation of funds from the State to the Commonwealth, and therefore it was considered the Bill would impose a charge upon the Treasury.

The Bill before us, of course, does not contain any such provision and therefore the advice passed to the Minister for Mines and myself is that this Bill did not require a Message and so was introduced in another place. A further Bill, which I hope will be agreed to, will be introduced immediately the second reading of this Bill has concluded, and it will deal with the matter of fees. I understand a Message from His Excellency the Governor is required for that measure and therefore it will be subject to the usual Message from His Excellency.

I thought it advisable to make that explanation. I have been informed that the original Petroleum Bill introduced in 1936 did not require a Message and no Message was received. The Bill we are now dealing with was introduced in another place and the President ruled that its introduction in that place was in order.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Kelly.

PETROLEUM (REGISTRATION FEES) BILL

Second Reading

MR. BOVELL (Vasse—Minister for Lands) [2.30 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is related to the previous Petroleum Bill, which I have just introduced. It is identical in terms to, and imposes the same rates of fees as, the Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Registration Fees Bill.

The fees imposed by the Bill before us are payable in respect of the registration of various transfers and other dealings in permits, licenses, and the like, to be issued under the Petroleum Bill, thus relating solely to onshore mining for petroleum.

In my previous remarks I referred to the Bill before the House and said that the reason for its being introduced in the Assembly in the first instance was that it might require a Message. I may have been in error to some degree, because I have since been informed that the Legislative Council is not able to introduce a Bill initially if fees are to be charged. So it would appear that the reason the Bill is being introduced here is that it charges fees, and not because it requires a Message from His Excellency the Governor.

I will have this matter checked to make sure of the position; but I repeat that the reason the Bill before us is introduced here is because it seeks to charge fees, and the other place has no authority to initiate such legislation.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Kelly.

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 8th November.

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [2.34 p.m.]: Usually when Bills to amend the Traffic Act are introduced, I make the observation that it is high time the Government gave effect to streamlining and condensing the existing Statute. I have urged that because, in my view, the Act is far too long and complicated, and ordinary members of the public are expected to have at least a working knowledge of its major provisions.

More than nine years ago—when it was my honour as Minister to administer the Traffic Act—I thought I would put in motion a process of examination of the Statute with that purpose in mind. But apparently nothing has happened. In any event, if there have been any deliberations productive of result, they have not made themselves evident in this Parliament up to date.

It is my intention to read portion of what the Minister told us; and I defy any member in either House to indicate that he has the foggiest notion of what is meant. This is no reflection on the Minister himself. The position has become complicated in the extreme, as members can see by referring to pages 4 and 5 of the Bill, where reference is made to the Metropolitan Traffic Trust Account, to the Consolidated Revenue Fund, to the Railway Crossing Protection Fund, to the Main Roads Trust Account, to the Central Road Trust Fund, as well as to the individual local authorities to which certain payments must be made.

Which of us is able to identify or state the purpose of each of the accounts I have listed? This is the portion of the Minister's speech to which I would ask members to give their attention; and if they are able to tell me what it is all about, I will be most grateful—

> As to the metropolitan area, the commissioner will pay into the Metropolitan Traffic Trust Account all fees received by him. Out of this account, he will pay to any incoming local authority an amount equal to three-quarters of the local authority's base year sum, and one-quarter of the base year sum to the Consolidated Revenue Fund.
>
> After allowing for this, he will set aside an amount equal to the aggregate of the base year sum of the metropolitan area and the base year sum of the Armadale-Kelmscott Shire—the latter was fixed before this shire came into the metropolitan area. I might explain that half of the shire had been in the metropolitan area for some considerable time, and it sought approval to transfer the remainder into the metropolitan area later. The commissioner will then charge that amount with the estimated cost of collection and administration.
>
> He will then divide the balance into two equal parts, pay one part to the constituent local authorities—excluding any incoming local authorities—and to the King's Park Board, in such amounts as the Minister decides, and an amount equal to one-half of the transfer fees collected, to the Railway Crossing Protection Fund. The other part shall be paid into the Main Roads Trust Account. After making these payments, the balance of moneys above the base-year sum shall be paid to the Central Road Trust Fund.

Surely it is possible to state, with regard to moneys that are received for traffic purposes, that certain proportions or percentages go to certain parties. Though I admire the Minister for his attempt to explain this involved formula, it does leave us completely in the dark. Surely it is not warranted that legislation in respect of a matter that ought to be transparently clear should be placed before us in these terms!

A great deal of this has arisen because of the process of adding and subtracting to the Act over so many years. So I would urge the Government—if it continues to be in that role for very much longer, which I doubt—to get on with the job of making the Act a worth-while document which members of Parliament, and perhaps also some members of the public, can comprehend. At the present moment the position is impossible.

I say that as one who has endeavoured for a number of years to display an intelligent interest in the legislation, because, as I indicated previously, for a period I was administering the Act. It is possible that during that time I added to the confusion by bringing in amendments that made the Act the tremendous document it is at the present time.

Another general observation I make is that it is proposed that a number of features in the Traffic Act are to be bodily removed and placed in the Main Roads Act. As the Minister pointed out, the next Bill on the notice paper is complementary to the one under discussion. It suggests to me—as I trust it suggests to you, Mr. Speaker—that as the work of the Main Roads Department and that of the traffic administration authorities are so interwoven, and becoming increasingly so with the passage of time, consideration should be given to main roads and traffic coming under one Minister.

We are aware that, in addition to the construction of roads, bridges, and the rest, the Main Roads Department has its own traffic engineering branch. Its advice is sought on—indeed it is the authority empowered under the law to write the prescription—traffic lights and signs and the responsibility for installing them. The work of the traffic engineering branch of the Main Roads Department is ever extending further afield, and certain of the duties and responsibilities of the Commissioner of Police or of the local authorities which administer traffic outside the metropolitan area are passing to the Main Roads Department.

I can see a great need for a different apportioning of the various portfolios so far as this matter is concerned. Perhaps

on a later occasion I will make some observations with regard to better grouping of other departmental activities, where there is much common activity between them.

Mr. Bovell: In the far-distant future you might have some opportunity to put that into effect.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have sufficient confidence in my leader to believe that it will be done by us shortly.

Mr. Bovell: I said you might have an opportunity in the far-distant future.

Mr. GRAHAM: The term used by the Minister will not bear out the likely turn of events shortly after the 24th February next, I guess.

Mr. Nalder: Could we ask you a question?

Mr. GRAHAM: If the Deputy Premier cares to ask a question I will do my best to oblige.

The SPEAKER: He will be very much out of order if he does.

Mr. GRAHAM: Another point I wish to make, because of the incoming local authority provision in the Bill, is this: I submit that the Government has done less than justice to itself and to the community, because of its chicken-hearted approach to traffic administration. The Government sought the easy way out by endeavouring to shed some of its responsibility in appointing a committee to go into the matter as to whether there should be a single traffic authority in the State.

Apart from the representatives of the Local Government Department—who I suppose felt that they had an obligation to be loyal to the shire councils and town councils in the country—the unanimous decision made to the Government by the other members of the committee was that traffic should be administered by a single authority, as is the case in the other States of the Commonwealth. Reasons were given for this recommendation, but the Government refuses to act on it. It is felt that this an another weakness of the Government in that the Liberal Party and the Country Party wings are unable to agree.

Mr. Nalder: What direct advantages do you claim?

Mr. GRAHAM: We have seen evidence of that in recent months when certain local authorities have enforced to the nth degree the traffic regulations in respect of speeding and the like. We had an example of that with the Wanneroo Shire Council. There are other instances; and I well recall several years ago a shire clerk saying he did not know anything about traffic. He said further, "I have no time to attend to traffic affairs. We do not have a traffic inspector, and so far as I am concerned that is that." We have this difference between an over assiduous local authority on one hand, and one which goes to the other extreme in that it cannot care less.

In these days when so many people motor and move about from place to place, and pass from one local authority district to another without being aware of the fact, it is the height of absurdity to have virtually one policy on one side of an imaginary line and a totally different one on the other. Surely it is not for me to advance argument in favour of a single authority, which I could do to oblige the Government on some other occasion. The committee, which laboured long, produced a report and a recommendation, and reasons were given for the recommendation. I thought it would have impressed the Government, just is it seems to have impressed everybody else.

Apropos of the point, I am reminded that a certain member of Parliament—I will not indicate on which side of the House, or in which Chamber he sits—approached me in the last 12 months and said, "What is the attitude of the Australian Labor Party to a single traffic authority?" I told him we were 100 per cent. in favour of it, because it was part of the policy and platform of the Labor Party. He then said, "I wondered if it was, because every person to whom I have spoken in my district, with the exception of the members of the local shire council, is in favour of the police taking over traffic control." The district he was referring to is a country district.

Mr. Lewis: The members of the local shire have been elected by the same people.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, but they were elected without standing on a platform of retaining traffic control in the country. It suggests to me that some members of local authorities feel extra important, because the other phases of this activity are administered by the bodies of which they happen to be members for the time being.

Mr. Lewis: Would you agree they come a bit closer to the problem and can see both sides of the question?

Mr. GRAHAM: No, I would suggest that a member of Parliament, who is answerable to every adult in his electorate, would be closer to the people and to their feelings than would a member of a local authority who, in the absence of adult suffrage, is only responsible to a portion of the people in the district.

So far as the Labor Party is concerned it has never been the intention that this change—which must and will come about one day—should result to the detriment of local authorities, because we on this side recognise that local authorities are an important instrument in the forms of government to which we have become accustomed in this country.

Mr. Burt: I think most shire councils would agree to central traffic control, but they would like to retain the power to license vehicles in their districts.

Mr. Bickerton: They would not make any money out of it if they used the revenue from licensing motor vehicles for the purposes for which it should be used.

Mr. GRAHAM: The fate of the principle of uniform traffic administration should not depend on the need to engage an extra typist or clerk. We would get nowhere if we used that line of thinking. It could be suggested that instead of using modern earth-moving equipment and machinery, we should use shovels; and if the use of shovels is too quick a method we could, perhaps, use teaspoons, to keep people employed on this type of work!

All the Government is doing in respect of this is delaying the day. Of course, that is the pattern of this Government in so many things, as I have stated before, and I have quoted many cases. Therefore, I suggest there is no occasion for me to do so again this afternoon.

I now turn to clause 7 of the Bill, which is to repeal section 14A of the Act; and very largely, in the complementary measure, all of the provisions of that section are to be inserted in the Main Roads Act. Section 14A sets out the purposes for which moneys shall be spent: the provision and maintenance in the metropolitan area of lights and signs for the direction of traffic; the provision, construction, reconstruction, improvement, maintenance, and supervision of any road or bridge; the construction, erection, and maintenance of lights for the lighting of any road or bridge, and so on. Nobody can have any complaints so far as I have gone, but at the end of the section it says, amongst other things that as to the balance of the moneys, it may be expended by the Commissioner of Main Roads in certain manner or—

> for any other purpose which the Minister may, on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Main Roads, from time to time determine.

As that provision is now to go into the Main Roads Act, I find myself almost discussing that Bill in the consideration of this measure; but even if that provision is in the Traffic Act at the present moment and moneys are to go into a certain fund for the purpose of roads, signs, traffic lights, lighting, and the rest of it, surely in the name of all that is reasonable, where there is the dragnet provision "for any other purpose" it should have some relationship to roads.

I am wondering on a point of law whether it could be sustained that money from traffic fees could be used to build a new concert hall for the City of Perth, or for extensions to Parliament House. The reason I ask that question is because this Government has decided that an amount of $38,850 shall be spent on the erection of an observation platform in King's Park so that visitors and the local people and their families can stand there to watch the traffic movement below—

Mr. Davies: And backyards.

Mr. GRAHAM: —in an area that was once part of the Swan River but is now the interchange in association with the northern end of the Narrows Bridge. As the member for Victoria Park interjected, because this building project approaches over the brow of the cliff of Mt. Eliza, one has an excellent view of the backyards of the residentials below, whereas an equally good view of everything that is down below can be obtained from the grass banks of King's Park, but without the interruption of the backyards of those residentials.

It is completely wrong—I say it is dishonest—for the money to be spent in this way. Unfortunately—perhaps fortunately so far as the Government is concerned—the public does not seem to realise that a proportion of the license fees they have paid to register their vehicles is, at this moment, being used to erect an observation tower in King's Park—money that should be used to construct and repair roads, and the rest of it.

The legislation under which it was decided this should be done is, of course, the Traffic Act; and the Minister has admitted that the provision which I read out is his authority for doing this. I say he has no right to do it, because it is completely removed from the concept of paying traffic fees for the purpose of those moneys being used on the roads, after administrative costs have been met.

Mr. Durack: What is the section?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (e), subsection (6) section 14A, on page 39 of the Traffic Act. I repeat—

> for any other purpose which the Minister may, on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Main Roads, from time to time determine.

If the Commissioner of Main Roads is a music lover and the Perth City Council is short of money and the main roads funds are in a rather healthy state, the Commissioner of Main Roads can recommend to the Minister, who can approve—and having regard to the precedent I have quoted, he would—of moneys being devoted to the construction of a concert hall in the City of Perth.

This is bad and wrong, and certainly contrary to the wish, will, and intention of Parliament. I had made up my mind to say something with regard to this; and it was only by chance I discovered, after wondering what was happening to section

14A of the Traffic Act—a section that contains so much of importance—that I learned, by and large, it was being placed in the Main Roads Act. So it will be possible hereafter for there to be a repetition of the state of affairs I have just outlined.

I say this is a misuse of road funds and it should not be tolerated; and if the Government did the right and proper thing, it would reimburse the main road funds and make other provisions to meet the cost of the erection of the building about which I have had something to say.

I pass to the consideration of clause 9, in respect of which I wish to thank the Minister. My attention was drawn some six months ago to the fact that there were people operating in difficulties in the metropolitan area; to wit, the people who repaired trucks and delivery vehicles which had sustained serious damage in accidents of one sort and another. After a period of some months that it may have taken to repair these vehicles, in order to return them or deliver them to the persons to whom they belonged, it was necessary to go to the Police Traffic Office to obtain a special permit to perform the journey from the repair shop to the owner of the vehicle.

The Act at present has relation only to motor traders, but now the Minister has been good enough to insert this provision which will allow him, the Minister, in his discretion to permit plates or tablets to be made available to other categories of people who show they have a need for them. So, these people instead of having, at frequent intervals, to run down to the Traffic Office, plates will be available for use in the factory or repair shop with a minimum of trouble both to the people concerned and to the traffic Office.

Clause 10 seeks to legalise or remove some doubt regarding those people who are not officers of the Police Department but who, at approaches to schools, wave flags to interrupt the flow of traffic to allow the children to cross the road. These people are apparently called inspectors and this amendment is to authorise them to control traffic within a limited part of the metropolitan area. One can see immediately that this is as broad as it could possibly be; in other words, these people could be given the job of controlling traffic anywhere in the metropolitan area, including large portions of it. They could be given a roving commission.

I do not think that is desirable, unless it be the intention of the Government to completely remodel our concept. We have become accustomed to the police having absolute authority in respect of traffic matters other than in a couple of special cases where we allow local authorities such as the City of Perth to have some authority in the matter of parking. However, the amendment in this Bill opens the floodgates and could possibly cause a great deal of concern to the Police Union and its members.

I appreciate the intention of the Government, but nevertheless the provision ought to be more restrictive in the terms in which it is proposed to be placed in the Act, in order to ensure these people undertake the comparatively simple duties which they do at present quite effectively, I consider. As they have not the skill and training, and usually they are over the age which would normally apply, I do not think we should leave the provision wide enough to enable them to undertake any or all of the activities of controlling traffic in the metropolitan area.

I now pass to a consideration of clause 11, about which the Minister did not say a great deal. This has to do with drivers' license fees and at the moment the Traffic Act provides that all such fees shall be paid into the Treasury to the credit of the Central Road Trust Fund established under this Act. But now the proposition is that the Commissioner of Police shall pay half of these fees to the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and the balance to the credit of the Central Road Trust Fund.

We had something to say with regard to the decision of the Government, which was later embodied in legislation, to require that the Lotteries Commission should pay a certain proportion of its money into Consolidated Revenue instead of using its funds for charitable purposes at its own discretion. Now we have this proposition of the Government under which the drivers' license fees, which at present all go into the Central Road Trust Fund, will be divided and 50 per cent. only will now go into that fund, the other 50 per cent. into Consolidated Revenue.

It is not my purpose to join in the chorus of the very many motoring organisations regarding imposition upon imposition upon motorists—an ever-increasing impost—as well as the new methods being devised for the purpose of raising money. My interpretation of the opinion of the Royal Automobile Club and kindred bodies is that to a large extent they are not so much opposed to these additional charges provided the special levies on motorists and vehicles are used for the building, improvement, and maintenance of roads. However, they do object to this ever-increasing rate of taxation if the money is to be used for general revenue to pay the ordinary expenditure of the Government.

So I am wondering where this had its origin and if the Minister can justify 50 per cent. of the drivers' license fees going into Consolidated Revenue, whereas at present 100 per cent. goes into the Central Road Trust Fund.

Those are my observations on the Bill, and I have no objection to its being given a second reading. I do wish, however, that the Government would be a little more bold and face up to the matters I mentioned earlier, because so far as I am concerned I have had enough of this hotchpotch arrangement of a document of over 100 pages constituting our Traffic Act, a great deal of which is in language not understandable by the ordinary people.

MR. CRAIG (Toodyay—Minister for Police) [3.6 p.m.]: This is one occasion when to a certain extent, I agree with quite a lot of what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has said.

Mr. Graham: I feel better already!

Mr. Brand: We are making some progress!

Mr. CRAIG: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition suggested that the Act could be streamlined a lot more than it is at present. We have been endeavouring to do this over the past few years and I think that he, of all people, will appreciate the difficulties we have encountered in endeavouring to do this. I think one of the main features contributing towards overcoming this difficulty would be the removal of the fiscal provisions of the Act which are rather complicated in anyone's language. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition drew attention to this.

I do not mind admitting that a considerable amount of confusion exists in the minds of members as to the source of revenue and the disbursement of the various funds. We have so many arrangements in regard to so many features of this that the time is coming—and I have discussed this with the Premier—when it may be possible at the expiration of the current agreement with the Commonwealth so far as matching money is concerned, to have one fund from which the disbursement is made to all authorities, whether they be within the metropolitan area or the country.

But a successful attempt has been made to streamline the regulations under the Act and, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows, these have now been segregated into their particular spheres of operation. We now have the Road Traffic Code covered by one set of regulations; we have regulations governing vehicle standards, and regulations for taxicars and so on and so forth, whereas at one time these were all incorporated in the one set of regulations.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to the possibility of a takeover of country traffic, and might I say here that most of the amendments contained in the Bill refer to the possibility of a country authority expressing its desire to be taken over; they would provide the financial basis of any such arrangement. This no doubt has led to the confusion in the minds of members; but most of the provisions of the Bill do provide for this.

The question of main roads and traffic authorities being amalgamated under the one heading is one to which the Government has given thought in the past and will, no doubt, do so in the future. We have a very efficient traffic engineering section in the Main Roads Department, which works very closely indeed with the traffic side of the Police Department. However, so far as any takeover of country traffic control is concerned, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to the departmental committee's report, the majority recommendation of which was for such a takeover. There was, of course, an accompanying minority report, and despite the thoughts of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition as to the Government's lack of action in regard to the majority report, I might say that this report has brought about certain satisfactory results, particularly with regard to the country local authorities.

The acceptance of responsibility for traffic control has been stepped up. Quite a number of country shires now have traffic inspectors, which was not the case in the past; some have increased the number of inspectors employed by them; and many authorities now obtain technical aid for traffic enforcement. In addition, a number of regional traffic councils have been formed and the function of these councils is to spread the responsibility of traffic enforcement over a number of authorities. This makes provision for some authorities which are not in a position to provide their own traffic inspectors.

I will admit that section 14A is dealt with under the Main Roads Act, as was pointed out by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I do not think it is pertinent for me to discuss this feature now except to say that the revenue available to the Main Roads Department, while primarily for the provision of roads, has also to be expended in other directions which could not be classified as roads, such as administrative buildings and the like. The Act I referred to clarifies the position regarding expenditure on administrative buildings.

The honourable member also referred to crosswalk attendants being classified as traffic inspectors, and he felt this might be the thin edge of the wedge if those inspectors were allowed unlimited authority anywhere in the metropolitan area. I can assure him this is not the intention. At the present time they are appointed as school crosswalk attendants and are issued with a certificate which specifies the particular crosswalk or intersection at which they can exercise this authority.

Mr. Graham: I think you will agree the wording of this Bill will allow anything to be done.

Mr. CRAIG: If the honourable member would like to amend the Bill in any way, I would be happy to consider the amendment. I have a minute which I received from the Senior Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman, part of which reads as follows:—

> An examination of the provisions relating to the appointment of traffic inspectors, to be found in section 22 of the Act, reveals that there is no power for you to appoint inspectors for the metropolitan area, as has, in fact, been done for school crossings. In view of the possibility of prosecutions on the complaint of persons so appointed, I thought it advisable to add the necessary power to section 22 and provision for this is to be found in clause 10 of the Bill.

That is the reason it has been provided for in this particular case.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition also referred to clause 11 which deals with drivers' license fees. This is more or less to clarify the position as it already exists. I have a note with me, and perhaps I had better quote it to clear the position. Here again, one has almost to be an accountant to understand these things. The note is as follows:—

> The disposal of drivers' license fees was previously dealt with under subsections (2) and (4) of section 25C. It is now to be dealt with under the proposed subsection (2) which is perhaps fortunate as in 1966 two subsections (4) were added to the section by way of two different Bills, both distinct in their purpose, and this amendment will delete the now redundant subsection (4) added by Act No. 57/66.

If the honourable member is any clearer in his mind, I am afraid he is clearer than I am.

Mr. Graham: Is it clear in anybody's mind?

Mr. CRAIG: It is only a machinery amendment and the present position still obtains. However, I do thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for his interest in this particular measure, and I commend it to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. Crommelin) in the Chair; Mr. Craig (Minister for Police) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 9 put and passed.

Clause 10: Section 22 amended—

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not prepared an amendment, but I would like to make a couple of suggestions.

Mr. Craig: You can leave the amendments until the Bill is discussed in the Upper House if you like.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is the reason I am making the suggestions now. This amendment states that an inspector may be appointed to control traffic. As the term "inspector" is one of rank in the Police Department, I feel some other title should be used. I would suggest "warden." Traffic wardens perform limited duties.

Mr. Brand: Can't you thing of a better name than warden?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is not "warder"; it is warden.

Mr. Brand: I know that.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am merely making a suggestion, but I repeat I am not bound by it. I think it desirable to get away from the official title of a senior member of the Police Force. An inspector in regard to traffic surely means a police inspector.

My second suggestion is that after the words "may appoint an inspector"—or a warden, if my suggestion is accepted—"to control traffic" insert the words "or pedestrians at crossings within that area, or a limited part of that area."

I think the intention is that there shall be a person who is not an officer of the Police Force who shall be authorised under the Act to perform certain limited duties in the metropolitan area. This legislation refers only to the metropolitan area. The work will be in relation to regulating traffic and pedestrians at certain points.

I realise the Minister will want some time to think this over and I will be quite satisfied if he is sympathetic to my thoughts and indicates he will see that appropriate action is taken in another place if he thinks it is necessary.

Mr. CRAIG: This seems to be quite all right. The honourable member objects to the definition of the word "inspector." Of course, there are country traffic inspectors, too.

Mr. Graham: But this only refers to the metropolitan area.

Mr. CRAIG: Yes, that is right. I do not like the term "warden." The person would be a school crosswalk attendant. That is all his duties would amount to and they would be confined to what has been suggested by the honourable member. I will look into this matter and, if something can be arranged along these lines it will be done in another place.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 11 to 13 put and passed.

Clause 14: Section 51 amended—

Mr. GRAHAM: Again, I do not intend to move anything, but I ask the Minister to have a look at this clause. It appears an error has been made in the drafting. As I see it, if the words "in lines 2 and 3" were inserted in line 25, it would be possible to delete paragraph (a) entirely. If members look at paragraph (a) they will see that its purpose is merely to delete

the words "or goods vehicle" in a certain section of the Act. Paragraph (b) is aimed at achieving the same objective. I should think it could all be incorporated by the insertion in paragraph (b) of the words I have mentioned, thus doing away with the necessity for paragraph (a). It appears to be clumsy drafting and something which has occurred inadvertently. I will be satisfied if the Minister looks at it now and has the matter attended to in another place.

Mr. CRAIG: I will have a look at this matter. The reason this has been included in the Bill is because the term "goods vehicle" is now redundant.

Mr. Graham: What I have suggested will still have exactly the same effect.

Mr. CRAIG: Possibly.

Mr. Graham: At the moment, words are being deleted and then they are being reinstated.

Mr. CRAIG: This has been drawn up by the parliamentary draftsman to make it quite clear that the term "goods vehicle" is removed from the original provisions of the Act. In deference to the honourable member's wishes, I will have another look at the matter to see whether any further clarification is necessary.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 15 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Craig (Minister for Police), and transmitted to the Council.

MAIN ROADS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 8th November.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [3.26 p.m.]: I did not think the Government would proceed with the Bill in the absence of the Minister. However, it appears it is going to do so, with the result that I suppose one might as well not say anything at all. Nevertheless, there are some comments I feel I should make whether or not any notice is taken of them.

The measure is really necessary because of the amendments being made to the Traffic Act. In the main the amendments are the result of the amendments made to the Traffic Act and the object is to streamline procedure. I think that is to be applauded. There is a lot of unnecessary duplication of work in the administration of funds derived under the Traffic Act as well as under the Main Roads Act. Where this duplication can be removed and administration simplified, it is very beneficial not only in the saving of Ministers' time but also in the question of efficiency. Most of the proposals are for that purpose.

I add my protests to those already expressed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in connection with the provision in the amendments which makes it possible for certain funds in a "trust" fund to be spent any way the Minister thinks fit. The proposal is that the Minister may approve of such expenditure from the trust fund upon the recommendation of the commissioner. Occasionally one might find a commissioner who would stand up against a Minister and say, "No, that is not a fair expenditure from such a fund." However, such men are pretty rare birds. When a Minister makes it clear that he wants to have certain expenditure incurred and he has the right to approve of such expenditure, it would take a pretty strong man indeed to say to the Minister, "I am not prepared to recommend it." There are such men and we meet them occasionally; but, I repeat, they are pretty rare birds.

Under this provision, one might conclude that if a Minister has made up his mind that he wants to spend some money from the trust fund for some purpose which is completely unrelated to roads and he suggests to the commissioner that he wants a recommendation that this should be done, he will get it. I do not think that is desirable in administration; namely, to leave it open to a Minister to spend money, ostensibly raised for a special purpose, on any pet theory entertained by the Minister. In particular, the Minister could think in terms of his own district. The way is open for that to be done. I very much doubt whether the Commonwealth authorities would be happy with such an arrangement, because into this Main Roads Trust Fund will be paid moneys which are received from the Commonwealth aid roads moneys, and there are certain specific requirements governing the use of this money.

It is all very well to say that so long as the total amount received is expended from the fund what happens to any other money in the same fund would be of no concern to the Commonwealth, but I think it is bad principle. If this is to be done, Commonwealth money should be paid into a separate fund and it should not be mixed with this money under a provision which states that some of the moneys from the fund can be spent in a way the Minister desires. That is what it means. The expenditure which has already been made on an observation tower in King's Park is not regarded by me as legitimate expenditure of traffic fees or main roads moneys, and I think we should have more regard to the stipulations which apply to moneys raised for roads.

In order to ascertain how the Commonwealth has laid down certain requirements as a guide, it is as well to look at them to find out if it is a reasonable proposition to allow the Minister the right to spend money any way he thinks fit. The Auditor-General, at page 90 of his report for the current year, makes reference to the money received under the Commonwealth aid roads moneys which form part of this trust fund, and I quote—

> Commonwealth Act No. 32 of 1964 provides for further assistance during the period of five years which commenced 1st July, 1964. This Act provides that—
>
> (ii) moneys paid to a State shall be expended—
>
> (a) on the construction of roads; or
>
> (b) in payments to local authorities for the construction of roads; or
>
> (c) on the construction of works that are not roads but are directly connected with transport by road or water. This expenditure is limited to the proportion set out in section 5 (3) of the Act;
>
> (d) on research directly connected with the planning or design of roads or with road construction.

Then, to make it perfectly clear, it continues—

> "Construction of roads" includes reconstruction, maintenance and repair of roads, and the purchase of road-making plant.

It is quite clear that in no circumstances could a State Government expend all that money in any way the Minister desired to spend it if it were not related to the construction of roads, and it is also clear that that money forms a major part of the Main Roads Traffic Trust Fund. To mix with that money other moneys received from traffic fees and the like, and then to say the Minister shall, from that fund, expend money without limit on anything so long as he obtains a recommendation from the Commissioner of Main Roads is, in my view, going beyond what was contemplated in the first place. I do not like the idea at all. I think it is very bad administration. It leads to looseness with administration and it is a temptation to use money other than for the purpose for which it was originally intended.

The Government should give consideration to this matter and at least put a limit on what might be expended in this direction in any one year. That would be some safeguard; but, as it stands, it is open to a Minister who has representation made to him from some member who wants to make a good fellow of himself in his own district to use some of this money, ostensibly raised for road purposes, for any purpose whatsoever. It could be used for creating an artificial lake in some district. That would not be an expenditure that could be justified, but it could be done under this provision which it is now intended shall be inserted in the Statute.

Apart from that I have no criticism to offer. The proposals are desirable for the reasons already given; namely, they will result in a streamlining of procedure and a saving of useful time which could be better employed by Ministers elsewhere.

MR. CRAIG (Toodyay — Minister for Police) [3.37 p.m.]: I am pleased to learn the Leader of the Opposition supports the Bill, although he has certain reservations, particularly on expenditure from the trust fund. I can appreciate his concern at any possible misuse of the authority of the Minister in this direction.

Mr. Tonkin: It would not be a misuse of authority; it would be illegal use.

Mr. CRAIG: Interpreting it another way, it would be an abuse of his authority, if I may use that term. However somebody has to have the authority in the first place. I would remind members that, in any case, the programme of expenditure for the year is submitted in the first instance by the Commissioner of Main Roads to the Minister for his approval. As the Leader of the Opposition knows full well, there is a certain amount of money which is not earmarked for any specific purpose but is available, more or less, for emergency use. It might be needed to provide excessive expenditure on a particular project or in other ways, but I feel sure it would not be used to meet the cost of a concert hall or the construction of an artificial lake. I think that is drawing the long bow a little too much.

However, the Minister in this case authorised a programme of expenditure drawn up by the Commissioner of Main Roads. I should imagine the amount available to the Minister for use in accordance with his desires would be limited indeed. It would probably be expended for a specific purpose; I do not know. I do know that the opportunity afforded the Minister of expending money on anything extensive would be extremely limited. I am here expressing the views of the Minister for Works.

Mr. Graham: Do you think the expenditure of $38,850 in King's Park is justified?

Mr. CRAIG: This could be a controversial subject. I think it is money well spent.

Mr. Graham: We might agree with you, but we do not agree on the source from which the money has been drawn.

Mr. CRAIG: It is really associated with road works.

Mr. Graham: How? It is an observation tower for tourists.

Mr. CRAIG: The public generally is interested in road works. People are interested in the work being done on the Mitchell Freeway, and on any other works undertaken by the Main Roads Department.

Mr. Graham: Due to the influence of the King's Park Board or the T.D.A.

Mr. CRAIG: What the Leader of the Opposition has said still lends emphasis to the need for the establishment of one particular fund to meet the expenditure on all road works.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Craig (Minister for Police), and transmitted to the Council.

Sitting suspended from 3.44 to 4.6 p.m.

QUESTIONS (17): ON NOTICE

1. *This question was postponed until Tuesday, the 21st November.*

WATER SUPPLIES

Extension to Muriel Street, Middle Swan

2. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

   (1) Have arrangements been made to extend water service mains into the new housing subdivisions at the western end of Muriel Street, Middle Swan?

   (2) If "Yes," when was the decision made?

   (3) Is the extended service to be charged to the subdividers of land? If not, who will be responsible for costs for the new services?

   Mr. CRAIG (for Mr. Ross Hutchinson) replied:

   (1) to (3) Arrangements were made to extend the board's water main in Muriel Street to the nearest boundary of the subdivision at the board's expense on the 12th November, 1964, and this would allow limited development in the subdivision.

   Extensions of reticulation within the subdivision would be provided by the board if the board's economic conditions were met.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Extension to Muriel Street, Middle Swan

3. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Electricity:

   (1) Has any arrangement been made to extend State Electricity Commission services to the new housing area, Muriel Street, Middle Swan?

   (2) Has the development company made any payment towards the new service lines, etc.?

   (3) When is the power expected to be made available to the new subdivisions?

   Mr. LEWIS (for Mr. Nalder) replied:

   (1) Yes.

   (2) No.

   (3) When the houses are wired and the commission has received applications for supply from the intending occupiers.

SEWERAGE

Extension to Muriel Street, Middle Swan

4. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

   (1) Has any arrangement been made to extend sewerage mains to connect with new housing subdivision at the western end of Muriel Street, Middle Swan?

   (2) If not, is the area considered satisfactory for septic tanks?

   (3) When was this area approved for subdivision by the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Board?

   Mr. CRAIG (for Mr. Ross Hutchinson) replied:

   (1) No.

   (2) Provided the land is drained and filled according to the requirements of the local authority, septic tanks are considered suitable.

   (3) The approval for the subdivision was given by the Town Planning Board in its letter dated the 23rd April, 1965.

COUNTRY WATER RATES

Assessment on Unimproved Capital Value

5. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

   (1) Does he agree that under the present method of rating country town water supplies, property owners are burdened with higher rating charges when improvements are carried out?

(2) If he does agree that there is a burden placed on such property owners, will he undertake to review the rating of properties from net annual value to unimproved capital value?

(3) If he does not agree that a burden is placed on such owners, will he give the reason for his findings?

Mr. CRAIG (for Mr. Ross Hutchinson) replied:

(1) and (3) When properties are improved they are revalued according to section 69 (1) of the Country Areas Water Supply Act.

(2) No.

NATIVES

Influx into Albany

6. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

Will he give earnest consideration to the appointment of a full-time officer to cope with the influx of natives into Albany?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

Yes. A male district officer and a female welfare officer will be posted to Albany as soon as they can be recruited and office and living accommodation found for them. They will be responsible for an area based in Albany.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Chandeliers: Replacement of Light Globes

7. Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister for Works:

(1) How many electric light globes have been purchased for the chandeliers since they were first installed at Parliament House?

(2) What has been the average replacement per week?

(3) What is the cost of each globe?

(4) Are globes available from more than one source?

(5) Who supplies the globes to Parliament House?

Mr. CRAIG (for Mr. Ross Hutchinson) replied:

(1) For the period the 1st March, 1964 to the 31st July, 1967—2,558 candle type lamps were purchased.

(2) For the period the 1st March, 1964 to the 31st July, 1967—the average weekly usage of lamps was 18.

(3) Current price per lamp—54 cents.

(4) When quotes were called from all suppliers for replacement lamps, only two quotes were received. One was not to specification and the quotation of G.E.C. was accepted.

(5) G.E.C. Australia.

CARNARVON HOSPITAL

Resignations of Senior Employees

8. Mr. NORTON asked the Ministe representing the Minister for Health Have any senior employees of th Medical Department at Carnarvo Hospital tendered their resigna tions; if so, who, and for wha reason?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

There is constant movement i senior staff at most hospitals.

The immediate situation at Car narvon is that the matron ha asked to be relieved early i January as she desires to trave overseas.

Dr. Fetwadjieff has indicated hi intention to resign early in th new year for personal reasons.

Dr. Peasley is being seconded t the Commonwealth Service.

Replacements are being arranged

MINES DEPARTMENT

Kalgoorlie Inspectorial Staff: Shortag

9. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister repre senting the Minister for Mines:

(1) What shortage exists in the Mine Department inspectorial staff a the Kalgoorlie office?

(2) What steps have been taken t overcome this shortage?

(3) When will the position be full remedied?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

(1) Currently one item for a distric inspector of mines is vacant an one other district inspector is o long service leave until Decembe 1967.

(2) and (3) Applications were calle without success. The matter ha been referred to the Public Ser vice Commissioner and it is pro posed to advertise again immedi ately.

GRAPES

Trial Planting at Mt. Barker

10. Mr. MITCHELL asked the Ministe for Agriculture:

(1) Is it a fact that the grapes plante in Mt. Barker for experiments purposes during 1966 were a fail ure?

(2) Is it proposed to repeat the trial again this year?

(3) In view of the reported unsuitabil ity of the land used, will a secon trial be made on more suitabl land?

(4) Will rooted vines be used this yea instead of cuttings, which wer used in 1966?

Mr. LEWIS (for Mr. Nalder) replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) The site is representative of what is regarded as a very suitable soil type. The cuttings failed last year due to waterlogging caused by unusually wet conditions. Prior to replanting this year the site was graded to improve drainage.

(4) The site was replanted with cuttings. A reserve of cuttings has been planted if replacements are required.

BUILDING BLOCKS

Prices: Report of Metropolitan Region Planning Authority

11. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:

(1) As it is six weeks since he advised that the report of the committee of officials appointed to investigate and make representations on the price of residential land was expected shortly, will he now state whether such report has yet been received by the Government?

(2) Will the report be available during the present session of Parliament?

(3) When was the committee set up and whom does it comprise?

(4) What is the reason for the delay in the presentation of the report?

Mr. BRAND replied:

(1) No.

(2) No.

(3) The committee was set up in January this year and comprises—

Mr. L. E. McCarrey (Assistant Under-Treasurer) (Chairman).

Mr. A. E. Heagney (Assistant Under-Secretary for Lands).

Mr. D. Cartwright (Senior Planning Officer, Town Planning Department).

Mr. A. L. Allsop (Chief Valuer, Taxation Department).

Mr. M. T. Healy (Assistant Deputy Commissioner, Taxation Department).

(4) The committee has completed its primary investigations, and preparation of the report rests with the chairman. The delay stems from the complex nature of the problem and the need to examine carefully the effect any proposals would have on the community generally.

I discussed this matter with the chairman this morning, and when the report comes forward there will be no recommendations for legislation this session.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FILE 1908/63

Refusal to Table

12. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Works:

For what reasons does he refuse to lay P.W.D. File 1908/63 on the Table of the House?

Mr. CRAIG (for Mr. Ross Hutchinson) replied:

The honourable member knows that a Minister does not have to give reasons for not tabling a file.

As stated on a previous occasion, I will endeavour to satisfy any requests for information relating to the plasterers' request for registration legislation.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Undergrounding of Mains: Government Decision

13. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Electricity:

(1) Has he yet arrived at any conclusions or has Cabinet made any decisions regarding the placing underground of power cables, particularly in cases where the developer of an area is prepared to pay the difference between underground and overhead cables?

(2) If not, what are the reasons for the delay and when can a decision be expected?

Mr. LEWIS (for Mr. Nalder) replied:

(1) No.

(2) A decision will be made when Cabinet can give consideration to a report received last week.

EDINBORO STREET INTERSECTIONS

Accident Statistics

14. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Traffic:

(1) Re intersection of Powell and Edinboro Streets, Joondanna, and prior to the installation of "Stop" signs—

(a) how many reported accidents had occurred at this intersection;

(b) what was the visibility rating;

(c) what was the traffic count;

(d) what was the safe approach speed?

(2) What are the comparable figures for the Roberts Street intersection and the McDonald Street junction with Edinboro Street?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

(1) (a) Accident statistics for the period the 1st January, 1964, to the 30th April, 1967, indicated eight reported accidents of a type susceptible to correction by "Stop" signs, four of which occurred in 1966.

(b) to (d) Visibility rating, traffic count, and safe approach speeds were not ascertained prior to installation of "Stop" signs as the intersection already was considered to meet the accident warrant for such signs.

(2) (a) Roberts Street intersection with Edinboro Street. Five similar reported accidents were recorded over the same period, one of which occurred in 1966.

(b) McDonald Street junction with Edinboro Street. No similar accidents reported over the same period.

(c) Visibility ratings, traffic counts, and safe approach speeds have not been ascertained for these locations.

DIRECTOR OF MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Resignation

15. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

(1) Did the State Director of Mental Health Services recently submit his resignation?

(2) If "Yes," what reasons did he give for his action?

(3) What decision was made on the resignation?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Inadequate revenue allocation.

(3) It was withdrawn after a more detailed examination of the allocations.

TELEPHONES

Delays in Installation

16. Mr. ELLIOTT asked the Premier:

(1) Is he aware that some people have waited up to five months to have private telephones connected to homes in some southern suburbs?

(2) Does he agree that this may suggest the P.M.G. Department is not geared to keep pace with the development of Perth and the State generally?

(3) If so, will he bring the position to the notice of the Postmaster-General, or take any other action which might help to remedy the situation?

Mr. BRAND replied:

(1) to (3) I am advised by the Director of Posts and Telegraphs that, generally speaking, applicants for telephone services anywhere in the metropolitan area of Perth do not have to wait for more than a few weeks for connection. In some new areas extensive cable reticulation is necessary and a longer waiting period is unavoidable. With the present growing demand for telephones, delays are also caused by shortages of exchange equipment but these are rectified as quickly as possible depending on the availability of trained staff. Seldom, however, is that delay more than three months from the date of application.

If there are any specific instances causing concern, the director would be pleased to receive the honourable member's representations.

HOSPITAL IN INGLEWOOD-DIANELLA AREA

Provision

17. Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

(1) Is it intended to erect a general hospital in the Inglewood-Dianella area to serve the expanding population?

(2) If "Yes," when will a start be made on the project?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

(1) and (2) For the immediate requirements of the area in question, the Government has already established hospital facilities at the Osborne Park Hospital to provide for areas referred to by the honourable member. These facilities will be expanded to meet the population requirements as and when this is necessary. The same situation applies with regard to the Swan Districts Hospital.

To meet the needs also, St. Anne's Hospital is extending its bed facilities by the addition of approximately 100 beds, construction to start early in the new year. This is being made possible by Government assistance in meeting interest payments on moneys borrowed by St. Anne's to finance the project.

Further population trends are being closely watched. These have to be considered in conjunction with planned access roads and major highways, availability of specialised and general practitioner staff and recruitment of nursing staff along with the considerable finance necessary for the

establishing of modern hospitals. Under all these circumstances it is impossible to determine in general when present planning could be extended.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

SUPERANNUATION ACT

Amending Legislation

Mr. TONKIN asked the Premier:

Is a Bill to amend the Superannuation Act included in the Bills yet to be introduced this session?

Mr. BRAND replied:

I owe an apology to the Leader of the Opposition as yesterday I did not mention the Superannuation and Family Benefits Act Amendment Bill. This is a major Bill and I hope to introduce it tomorrow.

ALUMINA REFINERY AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [4.20 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill now before the House is to ratify an agreement to amend the Alumina Refinery Agreement Act of 1961-1966.

When the original agreement was negotiated an alumina refinery with an output of 210,000 tons of alumina per annum was contemplated, and while there was a degree of flexibility built into the document, various provisions do not cover the situation we now have whereby at the end of 1969 there will be four units operating with a total capacity in excess of 800,000 tons of alumina per annum.

Incidentally, it is of interest to note that at this capacity the alumina refinery at Kwinana will be as large as any at present operated by Alcoa in America, where it has two refineries of this size. There is only one alumina refinery which is larger, and that is owned by Reynolds Corporation of America and is located at Corpus Christi, Texas. A refinery has been built at Gladstone in Queensland. It is quite a large one and is designed to have a greater capacity than the 800,000 tons we will have by 1969; but we do not expect our plant to stop at that level. I mention this in view of some statements which have been made about the relative sizes of plants.

This tremendous growth brings to light two major problems as far as the Government is concerned—

providing sufficient land for expansion of the plant;

an adequate railway rollingstock to handle the greatly increased tonnages of bauxite.

The first problem can only be overcome by realigning roads and closing roads no longer required, and ultimately, if expansion continues, providing a third rail on the existing standard gauge line between Kwinana and Cockburn Junction to permit closure of the 3 ft. 6 in. gauge line which at present skirts the works.

I will with your permission, Mr. Speaker, table two plans which are copies of plan marked "B" referred to in the agreement. This procedure is not statutory, but it will help members to study the areas referred to in the amending agreement covered by the ratifying Bill. I understand that one of these plans will go to the Legislative Council, and the other can remain here, if required. These plans clearly illustrate the land which will be made available to the company for expansion of the plant site, and I have a number of copies of this plan which I will now have tabled for the benefit of members. The area shown, shaded red, will be made available to the company on a freehold basis immediately. The area shown, shaded green, will be made available after the building of a diversion road which is shown delineated on the plan, and the work of adding a third rail to the standard gauge line between Kwinana and Cockburn Junction is complete.

It will be noted that the amendments provide that the company will be responsible for both the cost of any road realignment and the alterations to the railway system.

The problems associated with the additional tonnage of bauxite to be hauled are twofold. There is a need to build an extension to the Jarrahdale-Mundijong railway, and my colleague, the Minister for Railways, will be introducing this complementary measure in the near future, if not later in the sitting. The new line will connect up to a new crusher station which the company is building to handle the increased tonnages of raw material. Then there is the requirement of additional railway wagons for transporting the bauxite ore.

Because of the State's commitments in other directions, there are not sufficient loan funds available to finance these or the rail extension. The company is therefore providing all the funds required and it will, in fact, own both the railway line and rollingstock and will lease both of these assets to the Government with the State having the right to purchase at an appropriate time.

Mr. Jamieson: That is the extension part only, is it?

Mr. COURT: Yes, because the other is part of the normal system. It is for this reason that there is a reference to leasing in the agreement and why in the Bill the provisions of the Hire-Purchase Act have been negatived. This has been

done to make doubly sure. Personally, I do not think it is necessary, but legal people thought it should be included, or we could have the extraordinary position of the Government being caught up under the Hire-Purchase Act because it is a leasing document. My own personal opinion is that it is a hire arrangement and not a hire purchase. However, it is better to play safe. It would be quite impracticable for such leasing agreements involving the State to come within this hire-purchase legislation.

The foregoing explains the amendments in brief except—

the new subclause (8) of clause 7 of the principal agreement;

the amendment to clause 10 of the principal agreement.

New subclause (8) is designed to ensure that the State is not committed to deepen the approach channel to the company's wharf below 38 feet, which work is at present being carried out. There is a possible legal interpretation of the present agreement which commits the Government beyond the 38 feet, and this we were not prepared to accept.

The company needed minus 38 feet of water in order to successfully negotiate the contracts with Amax and Alcoa of America. This depth of water will enable 50,000-ton shipments to be made. This size shipment is needed to be competitive.

It was considered necessary to make sure that the State was in a position to refrain from joining in any further deepening if it so elected. In other words, it is entirely at the discretion of the State.

The amendment to clause 10 deals with rail freights. Members will notice that this is in two parts. Part I is mainly a conversion from the old pence rates in the old agreement to the decimal currency. Part II is the freight rate which will apply to future tonnages. These are telescoped to allow for greatly expanding tonnages. The original freight rates cut out, or at least did not cover big enough tonnages, and we have had to completely revise our ideas about the tonnages to be carried, and these rates for bigger tonnages have been projected into part II. They have been negotiated on a basis to allow a satisfactory profit to the Western Australian Government Railways and contain provision for escalation in the future to reflect rising costs.

I think it would be appropriate at this stage to let members have some facts and figures which will enable them to appreciate the impact a great enterprise like Western Aluminium N.L. has on our economy. Excluding contractors and railway personnel engaged on work arising out of the company's activities, a work force of 475 is employed. With four units operating, the direct work force will increase to approximately 670.

At the present time all the company's production of aluminium is exported, and at a two unit level of operation this contributes approximately $22,500,000 to the State's export income. If the present world price of alumina, which is equivalent to approximately $55 f.o.b., remains unaltered, the annual export earnings of this company will be approximately $45,000,000 per annum.

Another interesting fact, which is probably known to most members, is that starch is used in the refining process of alumina. The Gladstone refinery uses starch from grain sorghum as does, to a large extent, the Japanese refinery. However, ours is based on Western Australian wheat and flour. I made some quick calculations on the two unit basis, and the amount of starch used, when converted to flour, is the equivalent of 60,000 people eating bread; and by 1969 it will be the equivalent of 120,000 people eating bread. The fact that it goes into starch and then into alumina does not matter much to the farmer. The fact is that we have really created another community of 60,000 people as at this date, and it will be equal to 120,000 when the four units are operating and using our own Western Australian flour.

Mr. Gayfer: Do they get it at home consumption price?

Mr. COURT: I could not give an answer to that question, because frankly I do not know. I know it is a very nice starch plant at N. B. Love Ltd. and also that it has put us into the export gluten trade.

Mr. Fletcher: What about the use of the potato crop as a source of starch? Has that been investigated?

Mr. Brand: One thing at a time.

Mr. COURT: If it is to be economic, I do not think there can be two sources. It is a streamlined operation and it is sufficient that we at least use more wheat in the form of flour and then starch. We have the benefit of converting the wheat to flour as well as the benefit of using the flour on a home market as starch. There are numerous ancillary benefits as follows:—

railway revenue is boosted;

Fremantle Port Authority receives large sums annually in wharfage dues;

Mines Department derives revenue from bauxite mined;

many local firms have been engaged almost continually since the building of the plant commenced in 1961 in contracting work, and the fourth unit—due to commence shortly—will not be completed until the end of 1969.

In other words, there has been a continuous demand for engineering and other services since 1961. We can see this con-

tinuing until 1969, and there is no reason to say that will be the end of the expansion.

I refer to the comments I made on a previous occasion and to the letter from the company which I had recorded last year in *Hansard*, when the company declared its intention to establish a smelter. In this regard, members will know that the Japanese came into the market rather unexpectedly by buying aluminium ingots from the Geelong plant of Alcoa, which is based entirely on the alumina from Kwinana. This is indirectly of tremendous benefit. In fact, I would say it is directly of benefit to us, because the sooner the plant gets to the optimum intended economic capacity and output, the sooner will a decision be made to establish a smelter in Western Australia.

It has always been envisaged that when the smelter was established here it would be based on the export of aluminium ingots rather than the use of the aluminium locally within Australia. From our point of view, this does not matter. The important thing is to reach the stage of having a smelter and to go from bauxite to aluminium ingots.

In planning the company's area, we have endeavoured to provide an area for the smelter to be established in due course. Various estimates have been made as to when it will be established; my own estimate is that it will be established by 1976, if not before. In working the road pattern, the rail pattern, and the area available to the company both from this agreement, and the area the company has bought by independent negotiations, we have endeavoured to provide for this. I commend the Bill to the House and ask permission to table the plans.

The plans were tabled.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Moir.

Message: Appropriations

Message from the Administrator received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the Bill.

KWINANA-MUNDIJONG-JARRAHDALE RAILWAY EXTENSION BILL

Second Reading

MR. O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Railways) [4.35 p.m.]: I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

The Minister for Industrial Development has just introduced the Alumina Refinery Agreement Act Amendment Bill and, in doing so, explained some of the details in connection with the necessity for the extension of a rail line to accommodate the requirements of the Jarrahdale area. This Bill is complementary to the legislation that was introduced by the Minister for Industrial Development.

There is not much more I can cover in connection with it. Members have already been given details relating to the necessity for the line, the requirements, the freight rates that have been collected, and the various other details. It has been pointed out that the line has operated satisfactorily in the past. As far as the railways are concerned, the alumina line showed a reasonable profit over its year of operation. We believe this will be to the further benefit of the Railways Department. As far as the department is concerned, it will encourage and increase the freight rate in that area.

The Minister for Industrial Development pointed out that the company will provide the funds in connection with this, and they will be levied backwards over a period of time after which it can be purchased. The extension of the line will involve a distance of a little less than four miles. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Moir.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1967-68

In Committee of Supply

Resumed from the 14th November, the Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. Crommelin) in the Chair.

Vote: Legislative Council, $56,500—

MR. YOUNG (Roe) [4.38 p.m.]: As this is my maiden speech in this Chamber, I understand the privilege will be extended to allow me to make reference to some matters, provided they are not too controversial, which are not connected with the items of the Estimates. Firstly, I would like to thank the electors of Roe for the confidence they have shown in me and the honour they have bestowed upon me by electing me to be their representative in Parliament. As members are well aware, my predecessor, Mr. Tom Hart, retired from the Parliament because of continued ill-health. This ill-health was brought about by his constant endeavours for his electors. Since his retirement, the very good news is that his health has greatly improved.

At this stage, I would like to thank all members on both sides of the House for their congratulations and good wishes which were extended to me when I was first elected. I am very appreciative of the help and guidance given to me by all members during my settling-in period. I must say it has been quite a period. I would also like to thank all members of the House staff for their assistance and guidance.

This opportunity enables me to congratulate the Government on its continued effort to supply farming land at a controlled rate to the many people who apply

for it. As long as there is suitable land available, I believe we should make it open for selection to those young men, particularly young Western Australians, who are keen to go on the land. However, in making land available certain necessary precautions must be taken so that we do not fall into some of the errors which have occurred in the past. The problem of essential services, such as roads, schools, water supplies, and other matters, is one to be very carefully considered. To the extent of its resources, I believe the Government is doing this.

However, in a field which is associated with development we find the problems of erosion, and water conservation in the newer developing areas are falling somewhat behind. In the past, we have seen large areas of farming land opened up, but very little thought has been given to surveying and no consideration has been given to the natural contour of the country. It was a feature of Western Australia's early development that the heavy country was opened up first and, of course, this was in the valley areas. As a consequence, we find that the new country which is being opened up is in the higher areas and this is causing great problems in connection with wind and water erosion.

Large tracts of land are now coming into development and I consider some thought should be given to surveying them, where practicable, along the natural contour lines of the country. Roads and shelter belts of timber should be surveyed on the higher grades, which would eliminate the areas of flooding which are found when a natural valley is cleared. The roads run along the bottom of the valleys and this causes associated water problems.

The farmers find that if their boundary lines follow the natural contour of the land and if they work the land by following the natural contour, this is of assistance in overcoming the water erosion problem. The carrying out of contour banking, which is a good conservation practice, would follow simply because their fence lines would be almost parallel to the existing contour lines of the original survey. In March, 1965, an area of some 29,500,000 acres had been cleared in Western Australia. By 1970 the area will have increased to 37,000,000 acres, and by 1975 an estimated 43,000,000 acres will be cleared.

So it can be seen that, in the space of 10 years, approximately 14,000,000 acres will be added to land already developed, and we will need to watch carefully erosion by both wind and water. As cleared land increases the potential run-off, thus creating erosion and flooding, pasture and contour development tend to fall behind the rate of clearing, and the problem becomes accentuated.

At this stage I would like to quote from page 3 of the Annual Report of the Soil Conservation Service for the year ended the 30th June, 1966, as follows:—

> Problems have been caused by the sheer speed of development. More cleared land and more improved pastures have put feed ahead of stock numbers so there is not quite the same incentive for more pasture establishment. Also more clearing has accelerated run-off to the point of extensive shallow flooding in lower rainfall areas even without very big rains. This latter problem was already evident before the wet years of 1963 and 1964. It is in these lands that the main future extension of mixed pastures can be expected.
>
> Study of past land use statistics shows some continuing trends. Assumptions of current trends continuing have been made as a basis for projecting their effects at 5, 10, 17 and 25 years in the future. This is not altogether sheer guess work although what seems reasonable now may be quite outmoded in a few years. Sufficient prosperity and finance for rapid development is also assumed. At March 1955 there were 4.7 million acres of established pasture in 20.7 million cleared. Thus 16 million acres were not under pasture. Pasture was 23% and fallow 9% of cleared land. By 1965 there were 29.5 million cleared with 10.4 million under established pasture. At first sight the increase in pasture from 23 to 35 per cent. and the decrease of bare fallow from 9 to 6 per cent. should lead to less run-off, less flooding and less erosion. But cleared land not under pasture has increased from 16 to 19 million acres, a big increase of 3 million acres of higher run-off potential. It is assumed that clearing tends to increase run-off more than pasture establishment decreases run-off.

It can therefore be seen that unless steps are taken urgently to reduce this ever-widening gap with pasture development and contour banking, we will have the ever-increasing problem of erosion, and eventually it must get out of hand. In the south-eastern portion of the agricultural area, and in that part of the State between Southern Cross and the Southern Ocean, some 8,000,000 acres are waiting to be developed. Conceivably, this area could be thrown open within the next 10 years if the present policy of developing land at the rate of 800,500 to 1,000,000 acres a year is continued and, of course, if finance is still available and prosperity continues at the same rate as it has in recent years.

I would therefore urge the Government to ensure that sufficient funds are allocated to the Soil Conservation Service in

proportion to the gains expected from the opening up of this new land. The recruitment of trained staff and, indeed, personnel who can be trained in this work, is urgent. The service should be extended commensurate with the expected return from this land development. With the expansion of this department I would suggest, in relation to the conditional purchase agreements, a provision be written into the Act to exercise some form of control so that new settlers would be obliged to ensure their soil conservation work would be in direct proportion to their rate of clearing.

At the moment the position is that a farmer can, with modern equipment, log thousands of acres within a relatively short time, put a match to the clearing, and with the onset of the first winter rains have a water problem. A great deal of this trouble could be avoided if there were some form of control over the area cleared: if a condition were inserted in a farmer's conditional purchase agreement that he had to undertake a soil conservation programme commensurate with his rate of clearing.

The latest figures issued by the Soil Conservation Service show that there are 415 farmers awaiting the services of an officer of this department. The figures show that there have been 134 requests for an overall farm plan; 213 requests for contour surveying on part of the farm area; 36 requests for water conservation; and 80 requests for general assistance. Whilst I agree there will always be a waiting list of farmers for this type of work, it can be seen, by virtue of all the facts I have already mentioned, that the gap is increasing and it will not be many years before the present number of 415 farmers is doubled, with a consequent loss of control in their areas.

In regard to the extension work generally performed by this department, I will now quote from the minutes of the Soil Conservation Advisory Committee of Tuesday, the 15th August, 1967. The following appears on page 3 of the report:—

> With regard to extension work generally, there has been no great promotion of soil conservation by the Service staff. The additional work expected, associated with the present lack of staff leads to considerable embarrassment when requests for assistance cannot be handled. Within those catchments where the Soil Conservation Service is already involved however there must be active promotion of all aspects of soil conservation to ensure the application of a complete conservation programme.

These are the remarks of the commissioner and from them I would think we must ensure that this department is enlarged as rapidly as possible and more funds are made available to it to increase the activities of the department so that we have a positive control over these new areas which are being opened up, otherwise we could possibly have a situation similar to that which we discussed the other evening; namely, the problem of regeneration in the Ord River area.

I would now like to deal with the second section of my speech; that is, the problem of water conservation. With the ever-increasing demand for water in these areas, I can visualise the problem of a shortage of water for stock and domestic purposes arising, because in the large areas of this State which will, in the next few years, be opened up—that is in the Forestania and south-eastern areas—the land is very similar to the country now served by the comprehensive water scheme. This country does not lend itself to large key dams, because of the problem of salinity associated with catchment areas. When large areas are opened up and the comprehensive water scheme is taxed to its fullest extent, either by virtue of the fact that there is not sufficent water in the catchments, or the conduit supplying the water is too small, we will find there will be an ever-increasing demand for water in those areas.

Whilst in the past the department has made every effort to harness all the available water supplies in agricultural areas as they are developed, there are rocks of a suitable type available for catching water. Ten acres of suitable rock will catch 1,000,000 gallons of water. If these rock catchments were harnessed they would supply a permanent key point from which farmers could cart water. At this point I would like to refer to a statement that was published in *The Countryman* on the 2nd November, 1967, in which it was mentoned that water rationing may, in fact, be effected within the comprehensive water scheme before the present summer is over, and this will be after only one dry year.

Therefore, if we had a succession of dry years the position would be desperate. I would like to ask the Minister concerned if there is any substance in this Press report, because I have discussed it with a few farmers and, due to the shortage of water, they are faced with the prospect of selling their sheep on an already depressed market. In some areas feed is less than it has been in previous years and, as is known, wool prices are down to bedrock. Therefore if this Press report is correct and water is to be rationed resulting in farmers having further to deplete their flocks by putting more sheep on the market, the consequent fall in prices will be frightening. If the Press report is not correct I ask the Minister concerned to make some statement on the matter so that the fears of many farmers will be allayed.

Mr. Brand: I would think that was a rough guess on somebody's part.

Mr. YOUNG: I thank the Premier for that assurance. In areas not served by the comprehensive water scheme, and even in those areas where rock catchments do not occur, or suitable types of ground are not available to construct water catchments, we must push on with all speed to harness all the water possible where it falls and retain it for farming purposes.

The system of contour banking, which I mentioned when speaking on soil conservation, can also be used to catch water in dams or in rock catchments. In conjunction with adequate contouring of the land the water can be contained where it falls. There is, of course, a scheme already functioning to establish key dams to provide water for stock, but this is not the only problem. There is also the problem of providing sufficient and suitable domestic water, and for this purpose rock catchments could be brought into play.

Some rock catchments already harnessed are giving excellent service by supplying townsites, but there are other areas where rock catchments are not harnessed to provide a water supply, and although they would not be suitable for supplying water to a townsite, such catchments would constitute a permanent source of water from which farmers could cart supplies.

Another point that concerns settlers in my area is the fulfilment of the terms of their conditional purchase leases; that is, in relation to that provision that they must reside on their blocks within two years. Some revision of this provision is necessary; firstly, because in the event of a farm being allocated after harvest—and it does occur quite frequently—the first year after allocation is practically lost to the farmer. He could carry out his logging in the winter or spring months, but he must wait till the next summer before he could burn. He then has to fallow the ground, and crop it the following year. So, the first two years after allocation are practically gone before he obtains any return whatsoever from the farm.

With the need to reside on the block or the farm within a period of two years, we find that the settler can obtain only one return from the farm. He has to comply with all the other terms of the conditional purchase agreement in regard to clearing and fencing the land, and also in regard to making some provision for the establishment of a home within that two-year period. With the modern trend of light land development, it has been proved that a settler must burn, fallow, and then crop. That being the case, some extension of the two-year limit is necessary.

With an extension of this period the settler can be told, "We have extended the period in which you have to comply with the provisions of the Act, but with that extension we will enforce the terms of the conditional purchase agreement to ensure that you or your agent do, in fact, reside on the block within the new specified time." If we did that we would halt the position which was mentioned earlier in this debate in regard to absentee owners.

At the moment we find that the newer settled areas lie on the fringes of the older established areas. With the use of modern machinery mounted on rubber tyres, a settler could hook the machinery to a tractor, travel a distance of 50 miles, put in his crop, and return home after completion. We find that in some districts 50 per cent. of the farms are being worked by absentee owners. In the town of Hyden, which is in my electorate, one can walk along the street in the afternoons and see more vehicles with number plates of other local authorities than those with local number plates. This is proof of the number of farms which are worked by absentee owners.

If the period of two years can be extended before the provisions of the Act are enforced, then the problem of absentee ownership will be overcome. If the people concerned are not prepared to comply with the Act then their blocks will revert to the Crown. One thing which the enforcement of the provisions of the Act will bring about is the return of the family unit to farming in Western Australia. It is the family unit which has made the farming areas of this State, because we see the same surnames appearing in all farming districts from the time they have been opened up. The absentee owner set-up is destroying the family unit which has been the backbone of farming in this State ever since farming started; and the sooner we revert to the family unit instead of allowing big companies to control farming in Western Australia the better for the progress of the State.

I would like to make some brief reference to the practice of the Lands Department in adopting wide road surveys. In some districts the department is surveying roads up to 10 chains in width, with a view to protecting the wildflowers which grow on the sides. This is a very laudable intention, but it is creating problems. We find that in some cases a farmer, with a 5,000-acre conditional purchase block and with 240 chains of road frontage, has a 10-chain strip of reserve between his property and the road; that is, some 200 acres of reserve land between his property and the road.

He has to be responsible for the destruction of vermin that might gather within this reserve. As the area of 200 acres is, in some cases, bigger than the areas controlled by the Agriculture Protection Board for the purposes of destroying vermin, the provision which requires a farmer to be responsible for the destruction of vermin in the circumstances I have mentioned is rather severe; because his neighbour, a mile or two along the road, might have only a one-chain survey and

a 40-foot wide road to look after. In other words, the neighbour has a strip only 13 feet wide to look after.

In areas where wide road surveys have been undertaken, it has been the practice of the Main Roads Department and of the local authorities concerned to open up gravel pits right at the edge of the road. One can travel along a road and see where the Lands Department has been making an attempt to preserve the wildflowers but find that the Main Roads Department or the local authority has moved in and established a large gravel pit at the edge of the road. Some control over this is necessary.

Mr. Gayfer: They do not even fill it in.

Mr. YOUNG: As the honourable member mentioned, the Main Roads Department and the local authorities do not fill in the pit. With a 10-chain strip between the property of a farmer and the road, no difficulty should be experienced in establishing a gravel pit a couple of chains from the side of the road, thus leaving an unbroken edge of wildflowers on the roadside. If gravel pits are established out of sight they would not appear to destroy the wildflowers along the road edges. Of necessity, such gravel pits would have a track into them, but there would be an unbroken verge of wildflowers along the roadsides.

In conclusion I wish to say that now that I have made these points and got them off my chest, I hope I will be able to add a little to the debates of this Parliament.

MR. BRADY (Swan) [5.8 p.m.]: I wish to pass a few remarks in this debate, because we have the opportunity to bring to the notice of the Ministers and to members some of the difficulties which our electorates face. One of the problems I have is what I should mention, and what I should leave unsaid because of the time which various subjects take to present. Some subjects are much more important than others, but to individual people their particular problems could be of major importance.

My experience in politics is that very often if one wants some development in one's electorate one has to start 20 or 25 years before one can expect to achieve the objective. The member for Belmont has said it could take 30 years. He should know, because in my early days I was very closely associated with him. In those days we advocated the establishment of two particular institutions in the Midland area, and both took 20 to 25 years to reach fulfilment.

The first was the establishment of the Governor Stirling High School at West Midland. I first went into that district in 1929, and in 1930 a gentleman well known in the district (Mr. Balinski) was president of the parents and citizens' association. He was very closely associated with the member for Belmont and me, and we agitated actively for the provision of a high school. Twenty-five years after that we got the high school at West Midland, but by that time Mr. Balinski had passed away, so he did not see his wishes fulfilled.

The same happened in the case of the hospital at Middle Swan. This was advocated away back in 1930, and ultimately it was established during the time when Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver was Minister for Health. Since then it has been extended.

I now refer to another subject which is of great importance to my district, although it may take 20 to 25 years to reach culmination. However, I hope that it will reach culmination within the next 10 years.

Mr. Graham: That looks like an application to the State Housing Commission.

Mr. BRADY: It concerns a type of housing, but it does not concern the Housing Commission. What I am advocating is the establishment of a university in the eastern suburbs. In case any member gets me wrong and thinks I am advocating that one be established in Midland I can disabuse his mind, because I can assure him there is not sufficient land there to cater adequately for a university.

Mr. Nalder: You should start an argument with the member for Albany.

Mr. BRADY: I shall not do that, because as I proceed I shall show that I am sympathetic to Albany getting something in the nature of a university college or a university institution of some kind.

What I want to do is to draw the attention of the Minister for Education and of members generally to the great development that is taking place in the northern and eastern suburbs. It is envisaged by people with knowledge of these matters that the population could reach somewhere in the vicinity of 200,000 within a few years. When I see the figures in black and white they stagger me, particularly as some of them were compiled back in 1955 and were based on the Metropolitan Region Plan. At that time the great activity which is currently taking place in mining and in other types of development in the north-west was not envisaged, nor was it believed to be possible.

Mr. Lewis: You have not the figures in blue and white!

Mr. BRADY: No; but I have them in black and white. I see the Minister for Education is intensely interested in this matter, and as I proceed I hope he will become more interested. Firstly, let me assure him that I am asking for something which is brown and yellow. The figures I am about to quote relate to the

progress of certain districts in the last 21 years, as supplied by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics. The figures appear in a table attached to a calendar which is supplied to members of Parliament each year free of charge. The calendar is compiled by the Service Printing Company. The statistics relating to the population in various shire councils for the year ended the 30th June, 1966—not 1967—are shown.

For the year ended the 30th June, 1966, the population figures for the following districts are given:—

Midland	9,350
Bassendean	9,754
Bayswater	26,118
Belmont	26,978
Kalamunda	9,792
Mundaring	8,886
Swan-Guildford	9,771

That makes a total of approximately 100,000 people in the seven shire districts.

I imagine that the numbers have increased by many thousands since those figures were compiled. As the population of the whole of the metropolitan area is only 500,000, approximately, it can be seen that one-fifth of that population is now in the eastern suburbs. As the western suburbs are largely built up and their populations are now static, the eastern suburbs must grow at an immense rate. Even the town planners believe this, because, when compiling the figures for 1975, they estimated there will be a population of 80,000 people in the vicinity of Morley.

I feel I should highlight these facts today to indicate to electors that as far as I am concerned I am mindful of the fact that within the next decade some major educational institutions in the Midland district will have to be established. This is in addition to the three high schools and the technical school already established in the area. Because land in the western suburbs is bringing $4,000 to $8,000 a quarter acre—and the experts tell us that this figure will treble in the next 10 or 15 years—the only areas available in which the working man will be able to build will be north-east or south of Perth.

Mr. Lewis: North-west.

Mr. BRADY: I felt I should refer to this matter because it is important. As I said before, I am not trying to be parochial, although I generally am in my discussions in this Chamber.

Mr. Graham: Shame!

Mr. BRADY: A university or a university college should be established in the eastern suburbs during the next 10 years, by which time it would cater for 100,000 people plus the 20,000 or 30,000 who will build in the hills in the next 10 or 15 years, plus those who will build in country areas like Moora and Northam. If a university were established in the eastern suburbs it would obviate the necessity for thousands of cars to go backwards and forwards to Nedlands to the present University.

Mr. Lewis: Why not decentralise and establish it at Moora?

Mr. BRADY: If the Minister would like the university to be established at Moora, I would not mind, but it should be established along the lines of the New England University College in the Eastern States. If it were, it could do a tremendous amount of good.

The fact is that everything which is being planned for the metropolitan area is being planned for the western side of the city. I want to emphasise today that it is about time the powers that be—and particularly the Government members, whether they be Liberal or Country Party members—realised the great growth which will take place in the eastern suburbs in the next 10 or 15 years. The tempo has already been set. I have been reliably informed that a computer used recently to estimate the growth in the metropolitan area revealed that the greatest growth at the moment is taking place in the Morley district. Anyone who knows the way land values have increased in recent years could not dispute that statement. People know that the district is popular and are demanding for the land a price commensurate with the growth of the district.

When we can see the development taking place, we must look forward for the sake of the young people. I understand that in my electorate and those immediately surrounding it, it is estimated there are 10,000 teenagers and that in the next 20 years this figure could increase to 15,000. Now, especially with the growth expected in country towns like Moora and Northam, a university college should be established. I also anticipate that Toodyay will make great strides in the next 10 years. All these people will be looking for institutions like a university in the eastern suburbs. It is for this reason that, as I said when I commenced my address on the Estimates, I want to speak on the necessity for a university in the eastern suburbs.

I am going to remind members of some questions I asked and the answers I received a week ago. From the information given, members will be able to realise that I am not advocating one year too early the establishment of a university in the eastern suburbs. On Wednesday, the 8th November, I asked the Premier the following question:—

(1) What is the maximum number of students which can be catered for at the W.A. University?

The Premier replied—

(1) The recommendation contained in the tertiary education report was—

8,000 full-time.

2,000 part-time.

I then asked—

(2) What is the number of students enrolled at present?

The answer was—

(2) 3,797 full-time.

1,944 part-time.

In round figures, that makes a total of 5,700 approximately. My next question was—

(3) Has any decision been made where the next university will be located?

To which the answer was, "No." My final question to the Premier was—

(4) Who has the final say in determining the location of a new university?

To which he replied—

(4) It will be a decision of the Government.

I would be failing in my duty as the member for Swan if I did not suggest to the Government that when it is giving consideration to a site for a second university, it should decide on the eastern suburbs because of the great growth which is taking place in the metropolitan and rural areas immediately surrounding the city.

It is true that Albany, Bunbury, Kalgoorlie, and other country areas are looking forward to the day when they will have a university—

Mr. Rushton: What about those south of the river?

Mr. Guthrie: You don't count!

Mr. BRADY: —or a university college in their areas; and they are entitled to think that way. In regard to the question of the member for Dale concerning the establishment of a university south of the river, I will allow him to make his own speech on that subject.

Mr. O'Connor: Good on you!

Mr. BRADY: He may be able to compromise and agree that a university should be established in the Kalamunda area. If so, I would go along with him. I do not care whether it is established at Moora, Kalamunda, or Darlington; or whether it is established at Greenmount, where there could be an ideal site. However, I do not think it is desirable to establish a university in the extreme south-west corner.

Mr. Bovell: And why not, might I ask?

Mr. BRADY: Because I do not think the south-west corner will make the same rapid progress the north-west corner is making at the moment.

Mr. Bovell: It has carried the State on its back since the State was founded.

Mr. Graham: Sleepy hollow!

Mr. BRADY: The Minister had better not tempt me, because I go to Busselton, and I could remind him of things he desires to forget.

Mr. Bovell: You will not get a good reception the next time you go.

Mr. BRADY: I will take the risk in January next and have a look at some of the bowling enthusiasts.

Mr. Graham: What about the elections on the 24th February?

Mr. BRADY: According to the statistics of those attending the University in 1967, the figure is 6,000. I would estimate that a third of that number comes from the northern and the eastern suburbs and, to some extent, the southern suburbs and the hills districts. I do not think it is desirable that all these people should be travelling backwards and forwards, cluttering up the traffic lanes when, if the position is approached correctly and the Education Department and the Government examine the situation properly, this could be avoided in the next 10 or 12 years by the establishment of a university in the eastern suburbs.

There is approximately the same area available for subdivision in the near future—I will put it that way—as has already been developed in the metropolitan area. I have here the plan for the metropolitan region of Perth and Fremantle, complied in 1955. On page 43, diagram 7 indicates that half the existing residential area has been built on and the other half is ready to be developed. I would say, from looking at this diagram, that over two-thirds of that half remaining to be developed is in the eastern suburbs.

This is all proving my point which is that a university should be established in the eastern suburbs. If the estimated development is proved correct, it cannot be denied that 4,000 or 5,000 students will be available from the eastern suburbs to attend a university in the next 10 years.

I will not labour the point any further. I think members will have got the message that the time is coming, whether members believe it or not, when a university must be established in the eastern suburbs. As I have said before, I am not being parochial in the matter. The people from Midland, Bayswater, Bassendean, and Morley Park would, in my opinion, be quite happy to go to a university in Upper Swan, Darlington, Kalamunda, or somewhere else in that area. My aim is to get the message through to members of the House, and to the Ministers.

This can affect the Country Party and the Liberal Party members, and some thought must be given to this important

subject in the next year or two. It will not be long, with the present population trend, before our present University will reach saturation point. We know there are education problems on all sides, at the primary, secondary, tertiary, and University levels. We can avoid one of the difficulties which has arisen in the eastern suburbs if we look ahead to see what the position will be.

According to the figures I have with me, which I obtained from the Jackson tertiary education report, the University will pass saturation point in 1975. We are at the end of 1967 and so, in seven years' time, we will reach the maximum figure which can be taken into the University at Crawley. As I said before, I am not raising this matter one minute too early. Figures indicate that students are coming forward through the colleges and technical schools, and other institutions. In 1963 the total enrolments for tertiary education in Western Australia numbered 9,200. In 1975 they will number 17,400; an increase of not quite 100 per cent.

So I say that all those associated with education, particularly the Minister, will find it necessary to give some thought to this matter and if the Minister decides to build a University at Moora, I will not be disappointed. So much for the matter of giving thought to the establishment of a University in the eastern suburbs.

Another matter on which I wish to touch is probably not as important as the subject of universities, but it is important in another sense. I refer to the St. John Ambulance Association. For a long time I have been wondering whether the community generally and the Government appreciate what this organisation is doing. I do not think any assistance is being rendered to the association in its various activities. I deplored reading in *The West Australian* recently that great difficulty was experienced in manning St. John ambulances which went out onto the road. Apparently, it is desirable to have two men in an ambulance when it goes out. Believe it or not, I have actually seen the situation where a woman driver has had to take an ambulance out on an emergency call because no men were available. If no men were available to lift a patient into the ambulance, I do not know how a woman would get on. Not long ago at Pickering Brook I helped the local doctor lift a patient into an ambulance after a tragic accident.

I believe the time is overdue for some financial and physical assistance to be given to the St. John Ambulance Association. As I see the position, about 95 per cent. of the service rendered is on an honorary basis. Those people do a lot of study, and I have known of men who have carried on for 30 years giving two or three hours of their lives a week, and then giving it away because they got tired of their services just being accepted. When they required anything, they had to go cap-in-hand to ask for it.

I used to feel sick a few years ago to see the St. John Ambulance people at football matches holding out collection boxes to raise money to keep the organisation going. We as a community, and as parliamentarians—and as people with some responsibility—must recognise the work which those people are doing.

I could speak for well over an hour on this subject, but I do not intend to do that. I want to round off by saying that a fortnight or three weeks ago last Sunday, I was present when some people from an attendance of about 600, ranging in age from 12 to 70 were awarded medals for service—some of them for 30 years' service. I might mention that the temperature was 99 degrees. On that occasion I heard one of the leading doctors in the organisation make one of the best comments I have ever heard in regard to the St. John Ambulance work.

I have been directly and indirectly interested in this work for over 40 years. At one time I was with the St. John Ambulance team which took part in the competitions in Perth. I was pleased to hear the V.I.P. to whom I have referred say that he thought the time had come when consideration would have to be given to taking in other interests apart from the immediate work of the St. John Ambulance Association. He did not expand on the matter, but if I got the message, he meant it would not be easy to continue the organisation because of the lack of activities within it. This is probably because of the meagre financial assistance which it receives and because of the minimum amount of education which is imparted to the workers. If those people could have other activities in which to participate, they could do better.

For example, the young people working in the St. John Ambulance Association could be encouraged to take up nursing, chemistry, physiotherapy, or psychology. They could even be interested in becoming doctors. That is not beyond the realms of possibility, because I know a man who was an industrial chemist some years ago, and he has finished up as a leading doctor in St. George's Terrace. He now takes an active interest in Red Cross work. It is desirable to encourage St. John Ambulance workers to follow that line of thinking because the elementary training they receive in physical matters could be put to great advantage if they carried on into the various professions I have mentioned.

Another way to help the organisation would be to see that all industrial organisations have qualified St. John Ambulance men or women on the premises. Too often lives have been lost in industry because no qualified St. John Ambulance man or woman has been on the premises when

an accident has occurred. I do not think that is good enough in our age of development. We are supposed to be progressing at a rapid rate, and I believe that we are. However, let us get the right balance with regard to our moving forward. Let us look after the people who look after us. I advocate that the Government should encourage St. John Ambulance work by granting finance to encourage young girls and boys to follow up professions, as well as do the immediate work of providing an emergency ambulance service—which is only elementary in the scheme of things so far as saving lives is concerned.

I am advocating greater assistance for St. John Ambulance workers generally throughout the State while this controversy is still pretty fresh in the minds of members, as is borne out by *The West Australian*, of Friday, the 29th September, and the issues of the following days.

There are one or two other matters I would mention. Taking first things first, I want to discuss the question of housing for natives. I do not want the Minister to think that I am having a shot at him, as Minister for Native Welfare, because I think he has done a good job so far as the natives are concerned. However, somewhere along the line the department is falling down in regard to housing for natives.

A fortnight ago a lady who holds quite a responsible position in the community rang to tell me that the natives from Allawah Grove were being offered free fares to go to Mullewa so that Allawah Grove would be vacated. This would help to close up that area. I was alarmed and I asked a question of the Minister for Housing regarding this matter. As far as the natives from Allawah Grove are concerned, their position has improved 50 per cent. in the last 10 years. Their position could be improved 5 per cent. or 10 per cent. each five years for the next 20 or 30 years, and they could ultimately progress educationally, physically, and socially, to the same plane as we members of Parliament.

Mr. Graham: They could improve by about 200 per cent. by then.

Mr. BRADY: If given the right encouragement, those people could do that. I want to remind members that the Minister for Housing in the Labor Government made it possible for me, as Minister for Native Welfare, to set up the Allawah Grove settlement. That area was previously used for emergency housing during the term of office of the McLarty-Watts Government. Immediately the emergency had lifted sufficiently, and people were able to get into decent houses, the Minister for Housing at the time—Mr. Graham—was good enough to make a number of huts available for the natives.

I am alarmed to think that after the native welfare organisation in Perth has put in six years of solid work to improve the position of the natives at Allawah Grove, the centre is to be closed. Probably the first native kindergarten in Western Australia was opened at that centre. It may be desirable to close the settlement on the basis that the housing is not what one would desire, but I believe that would be the only condition on which it should be closed down. I would like to see the natives in better housing, but I also appreciate that some of them do not look after their houses the same as we do. As I have said, I do not want to see the area closed, and I think other areas could be developed with proper housing to give the natives an opportunity to settle down.

When I was Minister for Native Welfare a shire council bulldozed some mia-mias. I spoke to the Premier at the time, and he suggested I go out with the Commissioner of Native Welfare and have a look at the area. The Premier suggested I take over another area, which I did. As Minister for Native Welfare I took over approximately three or five acres at Eden Hill and I hoped to ultimately see a housing area there.

To date nothing has been done, although this Government has been in power for nine years. A lady told me a fortnight ago that she had been to the Native Welfare Department and the native who was with her had been given no encouragement by the officers of the department to stop in the metropolitan area. One officer kept asking this native person, "Why do you want to come down to the fleshpots of the city? Why do you want to stay here? You should go back to the country."

I do not appreciate a departmental officer telling people that; because only a fortnight before a native woman, who has five children—and they are the best dressed children one could see anywhere, and the lady herself was immaculately dressed—came to my home at West Midland to ask me to assist her to get a house. I understand she had an application with the Housing Commission for a house but she was told she would have to wait her turn.

I made inquiries and the officer to whom I spoke said, "Why did they come down from Yalgoo? They should have stayed there." As I see it, natives have just as much right as anybody else to come to the city. Sometimes these people come to the city to see their children; sometimes they come to see their mothers and fathers, which they are entitled to do; and others come to the city so that their children can get a better education.

There may be a line of thought that certain natives should not be encouraged to come to the city. By and large, that might, in certain circumstances, be the

correct approach. However, there are institutions in the metropolitan area that are capable of giving natives an education equal to that being provided at the University; and the Minister knows the names of the institutions to which I am referring. As a matter of fact, I have an invitation to see the Minister open some additions which have been made at the Pallottine Mission. I think the Minister would be the last one to say that institution is not doing a good job.

If places like that are doing a good job, and young native people are marrying among themselves, I want them to be given every encouragement to remain in the city as an example to other natives. I want to ensure that people like that, if need be, get housing equal to that provided for white people. I do not want to see departmental officers adopting a line of thought that the only place for a native is at Mullewa or some other country town. I thought I would emphasise that point while speaking on the question of natives.

Mr. Lewis: There are about 1,500 in the metropolitan area now. Did you know that?

Mr. BRADY: And it is to their credit that there is very little trouble from them. There may be a percentage, just as there is a percentage of white people, who cause no end of trouble; but they are the people who have no education, no morals, and no basic training in social matters. They have been living in mia-mias and camps in country areas. Less than five years ago I saw a woman with four children in one of these places. It was raining cats and dogs and this woman was living in a camp. She had four sheets of iron to cover herself and the four children; there was no bathroom, no stove—only a fire in the middle of this shelter—and the only roof over their heads was made up of the four sheets of iron. That woman had to rear a family under those circumstances. If people like that come to the city they are in no end of strife immediately.

I could tell members a story from my own personal experience of a house which I owned being let to a native. However, I do not intend to bring personal experiences into the debate because I am trying to put forward ideas about what I think should be done in my own electorate.

Mr. Lewis: They cannot expect to get houses off the hook. Other people in the community cannot do that, either.

Mr. BRADY: The Minister is quite right in that regard and, provided natives, every time they make inquiries, are not encouraged by the department to go back to the country, I will be quite happy. As a matter of fact, many people have said that it is time we closed down the Native Welfare Department and set up a department of social services.

Mr. Lewis: That won't give them any more houses.

Mr. BRADY: It may not, but it would provide for them a closer tie with the white community. It would make the native people feel that they were part of the community. I have heard many white people express that view, and it seems to be wrong that we should treat these people as though they were second-rate citizens. I want to see them treated as first-rate citizens, and as soon as possible. I am not criticising the Minister, but I think his Government should help him by making more money available so that he can make more houses available, not necessarily only in Perth but throughout the country districts as well.

I met a young chap in Gnowangerup a few years ago. He had a responsible position in the town but he had to live on the reserve. He had a family but he could not get a house in the town. I advised him to see his local member. These people are looking to the day when they will be able to get houses in the same way as white people can.

Mr. Lewis: If they had to line up with the rest of the community they would not get as many houses provided as they are getting now under the present arrangement.

Mr. BRADY: I hope the Minister will not allow his department to adopt the idea that these people should have to return to the country. As I said, a native woman came to my place about three weeks ago and both she and her family were immaculately dressed. I rang the Housing Commission to see whether she had an application with that department for a house and I was told by the officer concerned that this lady would have to wait her turn.

She was staying with her sister and I went out to see her on a Sunday. They did not have a minute's notice that I was coming to see her and when I knocked on the back door they asked me to come in. It was about five minutes to 12 and when I walked inside I found that home to be as tidy and as well kept as any in the metropolitan area. It would be the equal of any home in Nedlands, Peppermint Grove, South Perth, Guildford, or anywhere else. These women were attending to their domestic matters and the home was a credit to them.

One of the officers of the Housing Commission asked me why this lady had come down from Yalgoo. She had come to the city because she and her husband wanted the best education possible for their children. The husband had a job with a tile works at South Guildford.

Mr. Lewis: That is fair enough. We don't send them back to the country. How long have they had their application in?

Mr. BRADY: I cannot tell the Minister offhand, but the name of the family is Martin. The husband is working at a tile factory in South Guildford and they came to the city from Yalgoo. I said to the woman, "You will have quite a battle," and she said, "Yes, I know." Her whole approach to the matter was down to earth; she knew that as a coloured person she would have difficulties.

I now want to refer to traffic matters, although I will not be able to deal with them in detail because I have insufficient time. There appear to be two Government policies in regard to traffic. I have an extract from a newspaper which shows that 535 people signed a petition asking the Minister to have a crossing provided at Ashfield, which is quite close to Bassendean. The newspaper article in question reads as follows:—

> A spokesman for Mr. Craig said that though there was no specific plan for the crossing, negotiations between the W.A.G.R. and the Main Roads Department on reconstruction in the area, would possibly affect it.
>
> He said the situation would still be examined and some alternative to traffic lights would be considered.

I go past that area two or three times a day and 500 to 600 school children go backwards and forwards to the school in that district. Despite that, no adequate traffic lights have been provided and these school children, and the public generally, have no proper pedestrian crossing. Although nothing has been done for the people in that area, I notice that the Minister for Traffic (Mr. Craig) is seeking safety lights for the Terrace. I do not want to read the whole of the article which referred to this matter, but it dealt with a woman who was knocked down in St. George's Terrace. The Minister was most anxious to see that traffic lights were installed in St. George's Terrace.

As a member representing one of the suburban districts I want to see traffic lights installed in the suburbs. I want to see the Minister doing something for the eastern suburbs by the installation of traffic lights. I am not happy at the thought of pedestrian crossings, school crossings with zebra lines, and other similar types of crossings being provided because I think they are hazards—they are a trap, and in my view dangerous, and should be abolished.

For many years in this Chamber I have spoken on the advisability of having overhead bridges. An eminent town planner, in the person of Mr. Ritter, also advocates the building of overhead bridges and I think they are the only sane way to get pedestrians, whether they be school children or adults, across the road. I have an article from a local paper which indicates that the Commissioner of Police believes that pedestrian and school crossings may increase dangers.

Mr. Rushton: It would be hard on old people, would it not?

Mr. BRADY: I want to see the traffic department and the transport department concentrating on doing more for the suburbs. Not one traffic light can be found after one leaves Bayswater travelling east. What have the eastern suburbs done to the Government when it will not provide traffic lights east of Bayswater? There are traffic lights in the western suburbs and the southern suburbs, but when one travels north of Bayswater there are no lights at all; and I want to know why.

Why are some parts of the metropolitan area picked out for special consideration and other parts neglected? I have a list showing the traffic lights which have been installed over the past five years. A total of 28 have been installed but none have been erected east of Bayswater. Why is the Government mindful only of the interests of the taxpayers in the western suburbs and the southern suburbs? There are half a dozen places where traffic lights should be installed.

Let me quote a classic example. For years people in the Guildford area have advocated the provision of a safety zone to cater for children from the slow learning institution. This would enable them to get backwards and forwards over the road at Guildford. The last reply I had from the Minister was to the effect that three officers had viewed the area in question and were satisfied that a safety zone was not required. Yet only three days ago I had to pull up sharply to allow a nurse to take 15 to 20 children over the road—all slow learners; children who are mentally retarded. Despite that, the departmental officers recommend that traffic lights are not required in that locality.

I was first approached on this question about seven years ago, and that approach came from the mothers' union of the Anglican Church. Within the last six months a school teacher approached me and asked me to do something. As a matter of fact, my heart comes up into my mouth every time I pass that area. Yet the departmental officers say that traffic lights are not required. I ask the Minister—unfortunately he is not in his seat at the moment—what the Government is doing to protect these children and the lady who is looking after them? The ladies in charge change from week to week and they do not know whether Mary Brown is too slow or too quick; they do not know whether Josie Smith is a slow or fast walker. Therefore I believe something should be done to protect these children; we should not wait until there is a tragic accident through slow learners dashing in front of a motorcar.

At the moment there is talk of closing the crossing at Market Street. For years I have advocated the installation of traf-

fic lights at that point, but nothing has been done because the crossing committee —which probably could not care less— feels that no lights are required. The Railways Department has let a tender for a railway bridge to be built at Guildford to connect up with Bassendean on the other side of the river. I will bet a thousand to one—and those are pretty good odds—that neither the Minister for Railways nor the Minister for Health nor any other Minister has considered the possibility of installing a crossing for the children of the district.

I felt that if I highlighted these matters in this vein I might be successful in getting one of the Ministers of the Government to see what can be done to enable the children who attend the Nathaniel Harper Home for slow learners to cross this area in safety. My own view is that an ordinary pedestrian crossing is not sufficient; a bridge should be provided for this locality to cater for the school children concerned. I hope that somebody will look at this matter in order that we might provide for the safety of the children on the one hand and the employees of the institution on the other.

I want to make a brief reference to the advocacy of the chamber of commerce in Midland, which has sought to obtain improved police protection, and improved lighting. I have written to the Minister for Police in connection with this matter, and he replied that there are a certain number of officers of the department who are examining the position. I hope they continue to examine the position until the extra police protection sought is provided.

I understand that there is a limited number of policemen to look after law enforcement in the district. I am concerned, however, at the unfavourable reports that have been received in the area over the last five or six years. I vividly remember the last incident when two fellows pulled up the local milkman and robbed him. They were later found at Guildford. The people of the district are clamouring for more police protection, and they look to the Police Department to do more than just examine the matter.

The Chamber of Commerce in Midland also wants improved lighting facilities to be provided in the area. I am very mindful of the value of improved lighting, because it would contribute to greater protection being afforded the residents because the police would be able to see anybody moving around the area in a suspicious manner. It would be far easier for the police to keep an eye on such people if the lights were not switched off at 1.15 a.m. I would like to see the lights left on until the early hours of the morning because they would help to provide better protection, and would assist the police in carrying out their duties.

Quite apart from this, if the lights were left on it would prove a great encouragement to tourists who visit our State and arrive at all hours of the morning. What would be more welcome to people who arrive at Midland from the Eastern States than to find the place illuminated; and to know they could proceed from Midland to Guildford and Bassendean, and on to the city during the early hours of the morning while the area was still lighted.

Apart from tourists, there are businessmen and others who travel to country areas in the small hours of the morning, and it would be a great help to them if the areas concerned were illuminated.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mitchell): The honourable member has another five minutes.

Mr. BRADY: I had hoped to deal with the matter of continued flooding at the West Midland section of the standard gauge railway. I do not seem to be able to get anywhere with the Railways Department and the Public Works Department in my endeavours to obtain some redress for the people in that area. I would like the Ministers concerned to give some thought to this matter and see whether anything can be done for the residents of West Midland who are suffering this disability of flooding.

There are quite a number of matters with which I wish to deal, but I fear I will not be able to cover them all in the time I have left. I do, however, wish to refer to the question of State aid, though I will not be able to do it full justice. I saw a circular a fortnight ago in which it was estimated that State education cost the Government $165 per child. We now find the Government is offering the private schools $10 a child.

Mr. O'Connor: An additional $10.

Mr. BRADY: I think the view held by the schools is that the amount is totally inadequate, and I am inclined to agree. The institutions concerned are saving the State Government a great deal of money by their activities in making a worthwhile contribution to education, and I think they should be encouraged in the work they are doing.

That is my contribution to the debate on the Estimates. I will have to leave the other matters with which I wish to deal till a more opportune moment. I hope that ultimately—perhaps before I die—a university college will be established in the eastern suburbs.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again at a later stage of the sitting, on motion by Mr. Rushton.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Council with an amendment.

BILLS (2): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Married Persons and Children (Summary Relief) Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development), read a first time.

2. Chiropodists Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr. Brand (Premier), read a first time.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Consideration of Report

Report of the Standing Orders Committee now considered.

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman) [6.11 p.m.]: With the permission of the House I would like to make one or two observations on the work of the Standing Orders Committee which led up to the presentation of the report before us. I would also like to make some suggestions as to the manner in which this debate on the report of the Standing Orders Committee should be conducted.

I have noticed in the past that a reference to debates of this nature has indicated that in this House, at least, there has been some confusion. I have put to the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition submissions with which I think they are in accord and which, I hope, will lead to a more useful and satisfactory debate on the subject.

First of all, I would like to thank the members of the Standing Orders Committee for the very diligent manner in which they applied themselves to this problem. I think in all they met to consider this matter for something like 100 hours—to be precise it was 97 hours—to which must be added quite a lot of work which was done by individual members of the committee over and above that time.

The member for Subiaco and the member for Pilbara were particularly assiduous in their application to the task; neither of them missed a single sitting, or even a single minute of each sitting. They both made very valuable contributions to the framing of the report. Originally the late member for Mt. Marshall was a member of the committee, but unfortunately he was not able to see the conclusion of the work he put in. Latterly, when the House met this year, the member for Avon has been a member of the committee, and he has sat in on a number of meetings. I must say, however, that by the time the House met most of the hard work had been completed.

I would remind members that last year the House expressed a desire in various ways to see whether we could speed up our procedures with a view to streamlining the business before us. The Committee made a very close examination of the whole question, and I think the conclusions it reached were very well reasoned.

It might be as well if in general terms I stated those conclusions to the House. It was generally felt that the procedures which took up time were not so much created by Standing Orders as by the practices of the House that have developed over the years, which are time consuming.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The SPEAKER: The committee did give some thought to the scope and proper function of Standing Orders; and I think, briefly, one might say that Standing Orders generally exist in order to facilitate Government business, but the more stringent the Standing Orders, the more are the curbs imposed on private members. There is a certain conflict in the idea that the presiding officer—the Speaker—should protect the interest of private members, back-bench members, and minorities; and he should also rigorously apply Standing Orders.

It is of interest to note that the House of Commons, which is a House of something over 12 times the size of this one—it certainly sits very much longer than this House and has much more complex problems to discuss—manages to conduct its public business with a total of 117 Standing Orders. I have had a quick look through our own Standing Orders, and as far as I can gather there are something like 364 Standing Orders governing our conduct of public business. This rather indicates to me that more Standing Orders do not facilitate the passage of business through the House. I think the secret of the success of the House of Commons is the manner in which those responsible organise the business of the House. It is the voluntary restraint of members—if one could call it that—which enables a reasonably quick passage of business.

The Whips in that House play a much more prominent part, as they arrange how many speeches on a Bill will be made from each side of the House, and they determine who the speakers will be; and they have a very big number from which to choose. Perhaps they may want only three or four, or half a dozen, speakers and they have literally hundreds of members from whom to choose. Any member who does not really prepare his work is rarely given a second chance by the Whip; and that is one of the things that impressed me while I was in England.

A fortnight or so ago we had a visit from members of the House of Commons, including Mr. Armstrong, Assistant Whip in the present Government. He made it clear to me that if a member delivered a

bad speech, he did not get another chance —at least not in that session. This might seem a bit arbitrary, but it enables them to get through their business and ensures a good standard of debate; and good debate generally results in good legislation. So one cannot say the public necessarily suffers.

It may well be that we do not need these aribtrary restraints in a small House such as this, but I think there is a lesson for us to learn, and we should be careful to see we do learn.

I notice also in the House of Commons Standing Orders that considerably more responsibility, shall I say, is placed on presiding officers; and they use their discretion to, perhaps, a far greater degree than they do in this Chamber. For instance, Standing Order 28 dealing with dilatory motions enables a presiding officer to decide whether or not he will put a motion such as, "That we do now report progress." If the presiding officer thinks the motion is moved capriciously, he does not put it. This means that any irresponsible use of dilatory motions is curbed to a great extent.

The committee felt that probably the occasion when the House loses a great deal of time is during the Address-in-Reply, which can go on for some three or four weeks; and I think it was the opinion of the committee that it might be of advantage if we could restore the status of the Address-in-Reply debate to the original intention.

It might be of interest to some members to realise that the original intention of the Address-in-Reply was that it should be a debate—this was the position in the House of Commons until, I think, 1893—confined to the subject matter of the Queen's Speech. In other words, the Queen's Speech was an outline of the Government's proposed legislative programme and its general programme in relation to affairs of State and debate was confined to these matters. For this reason, if there is an amendment to the Address-in-Reply motion, or if the Address-in-Reply motion is not carried, it is regarded as a Government defeat, and it is felt that the Government should resign.

It is considered the Address-in-Reply debate is one in which the House concerned endorses the general legislative programme of the Government, and the debate was originally confined to that particular subject. In 1893 other matters were allowed to be introduced because it was felt the original arrangement was too restrictive, and prevented an Opposition from stating what it thought should have been in the Queen's Speech. For that reason the scope of the debate was widened. Unfortunately, in a great many Houses of Parliament today, this debate has degenerated into something in the nature of a recitation of members' individual grievances. I have never felt, in view of the fact that it is a debate on a motion thanking His Excellency for the Speech which he was pleased to deliver to Parliament, this is a particularly edifying form of debate. I have always felt that it should be of a high standard and that it should not simply be turned into a grievance debate, which does nothing to enhance the standard of Parliament.

The committee suggests that this House give consideration to restoring the Address-in-Reply to something in the nature of its original status. I think it was with this in mind that the committee made the recommendation that there should be opportunities for members to air grievances. It was felt that if the opportunity to air grievances was taken away from the Address-in-Reply, some alternative avenue should be provided; and for this reason the committee has made certain recommendations which have been incorporated in the suggestions.

I think it might be of interest to members to know that Australia is now reaching the stage where it is being looked at by the newer countries as a country that should provide some sort of example in parliamentary procedure. It has been suggested that a course for presiding officers, similar to the one I attended in the Palace of Westminster in 1964, should be held in Australia.

Next week we are to have somebody from the Parliament in Ceylon attached to this Chamber for observation. I think we have a responsibility to see we do maintain the best traditions of the British parliamentary institution and that our general conduct is such that it will be of considerable assistance, particularly to those countries in the general geographic sphere in which we live, in order to, perhaps, assist them to run their own affairs.

The actual procedure to be adopted—and I have discussed this with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition—is that the member for Subiaco (Mr. Guthrie) will move that the House do now consider the report of the Standing Orders Committee, using Committee procedure. This will give him an opportunity to deal in detail with some of the suggestions. The member for Pilbara (Mr. Bickerton) will second the motion and this will also give him an opportunity to say what he wishes. If any member wishes to talk on that motion, he can do so.

If the motion is carried, my suggestion is that the Standing Orders Committee should occupy the three chairs at the Table in order to be reasonably close together for convenience. We should go through the Standing Orders from 1 to 419, consecutively. This means that if any honourable member wants to discuss a Standing Order the committee has not

recommended for amendment, that member will be given the opportunity to do so.

It is my hope the House will bear with me in this matter and that it will be possible to put blocks of Standing Orders such as, say, 2 to 37 inclusive, or something like that. If there are no amendments and nobody wants to discuss any of the Standing Orders, I will put them in a block. As a matter of fact, this has been suggested in the new Standing Orders.

It is not the wish of the committee or myself that we should in any way restrict debate on this particular matter; and I hope that whatever the result of the debate, the House will feel it has been a satisfactory one. For that reason, I have mentioned the procedure. It will also be necessary for members to work not from the present printed copy of Standing Orders, but from the report, because they will find some of the numbering does not correspond. In cases where Standing Orders have been cut out or transposed, it is not possible to work from the book.

I suggest that the member for Subiaco should now move the motion which has been suggested.

MR. GUTHRIE (Subiaco) [7.46 p.m.]: I move—

> That the House do now consider the report of the Standing Orders Committee, using Committee procedure.

For the benefit of the House, I would mention in speaking to this motion—as you, Mr. Speaker, have already indicated —that the Standing Orders Committee has considered every single Standing Order at present in our book. When I say that we have considered them, I think it is fair to mention that we went through the Standing Orders from 1 to 419 on at least three or four occasions. It is also fair to say that we changed our mind on some of them as we went through on a second, a third, and, finally, a fourth occasion.

Although amendments are proposed to a very small percentage of the Standing Orders, members will appreciate that this is because we decided, after very careful consideration, that we could not improve on some of the existing Standing Orders. In fact, there were occasions when we decided to chop out some procedure which was considered to be archaic but, after reading the authorities which were available and after studying Standing Orders in other place, we came to the conclusion that there were sound reasons for their inclusion. We consider it would be unwise to take them out, even though they are seldom, if ever, used. I would emphasise that point; namely, they are seldom used and consequently they are not cluttering up the procedures of the House. However, they exist for a very good reason.

I do not propose to go into those Standing Orders in detail at this stage, because Mr. Speaker, you have already informed the House that each Standing Order will be called on in turn and members will have the opportunity of asking questions on any Standing Order where archaic procedures appear to be retained. They are retained for quite sound reasons.

I think it is fair to say that the starting point in our review of these Standing Orders was the desire which has been expressed by many members of the House and many people outside Parliament that there should be two sessions of Parliament. This is a phrase which is very loosely used. Our research disclosed that there was no place we could find which has two sessions of Parliament in one year. Two sessions of Parliament means that Parliament is actually prorogued for a new session. There are many places where there is one session of Parliament with a number of sittings.

In addition, in the Federal sphere and also in the House of Commons a session of Parliament can go over a year or two. In one instance in the Federal House the session ran for the full three-year term. It rests with the Government of the day to bring the session to a close. If there are two sittings during the course of the year, this does not mean there are two Address-in-Reply debates or two openings of Parliament. Parliament could be opened in May of one year and, perhaps, there may not be another opening until the September of the following year.

Mr. Brand: In view of your comments on the session could I ask what the daily performance is called? Is it known as a sitting?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is a sitting day. These terms, unfortunately, are somewhat confusing. We gave some thought to the question of introducing the word "term," following the English courts, to refer to a term of Parliament as opposed to a sitting, because of the confusion with sitting day. Finally, we came down on the side of leaving it as a parliamentary session with "sitting" to mean a sitting over a period of months, and the daily sitting to be known as a sitting day.

Another virtue of two sittings of Parliament is that Bills which are introduced in the first sitting are not destroyed by reason of the fact that the sitting comes to an end. They still remain on the notice paper. This is a very desirable practice and it is used very greatly in the Federal sphere. I am not referring to controversial legislation; but it is possible for a Minister to introduce a Bill which may be revolutionary on the law and require a great deal of research. In the Federal sphere the Matrimonial Causes Act is a prime example of a measure which was introduced and allowed to lie on the Table; it was dealt with many months later.

It is possible also to allow debate to proceed to a certain stage and then let it rest while further investigation is made. The mere fact that the particular sitting comes to an end leaves that Bill extant. Members will recollect that we had this situation somewhat in reverse when the companies legislation was introduced in 1959 or 1960 and the whole measure had to be reprinted, because it was not dealt with until the following session. These are problems which are overcome by not having only one sitting.

Another reason why we rejected the idea of making the Standing Orders provide for a certain number of sessions of Parliament was because we appreciated they might not even be in the same year. There might be an election in June with one period before Christmas and Parliament could continue after Christmas. Sometimes there could be two sittings of a session in a calendar year and the next time there could be two sittings of a session in a financial year. The task of drafting Standing Orders to cover it was extremely difficult and we discovered nobody else had attempted it for the obvious problems which we had encountered. I make the observation that the number of sessions of Parliament rests entirely with the Government of the day. It could open a Parliament immediately after an election and not close it until the day before the next election.

Mr. Bickerton: There must be a minimum of one.

Mr. GUTHRIE: As the member for Pilbara says, there must be a minimum of one; there does not have to be three. I would like to deal with some of the major points in the proposed amendments which are before the House. Members will notice a fairly extensive definition clause at the beginning of the Standing Orders. This has been introduced, in the main, for two major purposes. The first is to avoid needless repetition throughout the Standing Orders and, by putting a phrase definition, it is not necessary to repeat the contents each time. Exactly what is meant is conveyed through the phrase. The other alternative is to give definitions to phrases which we use, but we have never quite known what they do mean.

To give two examples I would draw the attention of the House, firstly, to the definition of the phrase "Leave of the House" and, secondly, to the phrase "*sub judice*". Dealing with the question of leave of the House, previously we have repeated right throughout the Standing Orders "Leave of the House without a dissentient voice." Now this will simply be "Leave of the House" and the definition clause will define its meaning. This saves verbiage.

In the case of *sub judice*, no definition has existed in our Standing Orders. We could not find a particularly satisfactory definition anywhere, but we have introduced a definition of *sub judice* which is taken from May's *Parliamentary Practice*. I think we have managed to work out a fairly reasonable definition. Of course, it is open for discussion by members of the House but, at least, when the phrase is used in the future any member will be able to turn to our own Standing Orders to see what it means. We believe the definition is what the phrase has meant in parliamentary phraseology throughout the British Commonwealth right down the years. It has been necessary to look at the text-books of a number of places to obtain the information. We have consolidated it into a definition in our own Standing Orders. There are other instances of that type of thing in the definitions. As I said before, they fall into two major categories.

I also draw the attention of members to a departure which is proposed to Standing Order 36. Up to this point of time it has not been possible to introduce any Bills at all into this Chamber whilst the Address-in-Reply debate is proceeding. In the new Standing Order 36 it is proposed it will be possible for a Bill to be introduced and for the Minister, or the member who has introduced the Bill, to give his second reading speech. At that stage the debate must be adjourned. The reason is that we feel this will facilitate proceeding with Government business, or the business of the House, the moment the Address-in-Reply debate is completed. It will enable measures to be introduced and explained and, whilst the Address-in-Reply debate is proceeding, it will enable members to indulge in research on a particular measure. It is not mandatory, but it will enable the Government of the day to place a number of Bills before the House while the Address-in-Reply debate is proceeding, and it will also enable members to proceed with any research on those Bills.

To our amazement, we found that one State—Queensland, I think—deals with the Address-in-Reply debate something like the way in which we deal with the Estimates. It might finish the Address-in-Reply debate on the last day of the session. We could not see the purpose of this. After all, the object of the Address-in-Reply debate is for the Government to obtain a mandate for the Governor's Speech before proceeding with the legislation. The farcical position is reached of having passed all the legislation referred to in the Governor's Speech and then finding that the House did not approve of what was in the Governor's Speech. This kind of thing reduces the procedures of Parliament to a farce.

In our opinion, if this procedure were adopted, one might as well cut it out completely because it would have lost its purpose. It does have a purpose and, that is, the Government of the day presents to the House its legislative programme and the House gives its general approval. That is why, up to this point of time, it has not been possible under our Standing Orders to introduce any legislation.

Mr. W. Hegney: But the Government does not present its legislative programme. It mentions only a few items.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is something which should be argued with the Government. I am speaking only on behalf of the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr. Brand: We are only following worthy precedence.

Mr. W. Hegney: I was not speaking of any Government in particular.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The reason why we say legislation can proceed only to a stage when an explanatory speech is given is because no vote should be taken until the Address-in-Reply debate, and subsequent vote of confidence of the House, has been obtained in the programme submitted by the Government of the day.

Members will also observe that Standing Order 167 sets out in tabulatory form the time that applies in regard to speeches. This has been a great annoyance to members and a great deal of disagreement has existed as to what are the appropriate times to speak on certain matters.

We now have them in schedule form and nobody should experience any difficulty in future in knowing just what is the appropriate time which applies to a member when he is debating a particular subject. We have made some reductions and we hope that the House will accept them. I do not propose to go into these in detail at this stage. They can be debated by the House when we reach Standing Order 167.

We have made some provision for a grievance debate and, Mr. Speaker, you have dealt with this at some length. It will also come up for further debate so I do not propose to say any more on the matter at this stage. The reasons for introducing this have been explained and there is no need for me to repeat them here.

Members will know that we have made a revolutionary change in the method used to deal with financial measures. By that I mean the Budget itself. We have done away with the Committee of Ways and Means and the like. We have done away with the Committee of Supply. In this we have followed the Commonwealth precedent; namely, that the Budget will be introduced as a Bill and will pass through the normal second reading, Committee, and third reading stages. When it is in Committee, as in the Commonwealth sphere, schedules will be dealt with in a similar way to the schedule in an appropriation Bill, but there will be a more detailed schedule which will take the form of our present Budget. That will be open for debate as it is now, but the detailed schedule will not go to the Legislative Council, so we will not be departing from precedent in regard to that and permitting the Legislative Council to debate the individual items contained in the Budget. Once again, this is the same procedure followed in the House of Representatives.

We feel it tidies up the debate during the second reading stage. We consider it permissible to speak only on general matters during the second reading debate, and members will be allowed to speak on each part as it is dealt with in general, and then finally will be allowed to speak on each individual item to a limited extent, as they can at present. We are of the opinion that this will bring speeches into the proper compartments and will encourage members to speak only as they do during the second reading debate on general financial matters of the State, and that when they wish to speak on a particular subject they will wait until that part is called upon.

This will obviate a problem that arose during the last session in regard to what the situation was with the estimates of those departments that were administered by the Premier. At the time the ruling given was, as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that those departments were covered by the debate on the vote for the Legislative Council. Some members doubted the correctness of the ruling, but in any event it is now made perfectly clear that the Premier's Estimates will be treated in the same way as those of a department that is, Parliament will be one department, and the Premier's Estimates will come under a different department. If a member wishes to speak on tourism he can wait until that part of the Premier's Estimates is brought before the Committee.

We have endeavoured to clarify the position regarding messages to and from this House and another place on amendments proposed by another place, or disagreed with by another place. On examining the present Standing Orders we found there was a lot to be desired. We have covered up all the loopholes and we hope the suggested procedure makes clear how we shall deal with each problem when it arises.

There is a final observation I wish to make on the Standing Orders. In the past there has been doubt about something that does not exist in the Standing Orders; that is, how we deal with the report by the Standing Orders Committee. For the future guidance of members of this House when dealing with a report by the Standing Orders Committee, we have set out how such reports shall be dealt with. To our amazement we found there

is no procedure laid down, and looking back through *Hansard* various speakers have dealt with reports from Standing Orders Committees in different ways. There is a particular set-up in the Commonwealth Parliament. The Speaker automatically retires from the Chair, and the Chairman of Committees takes over, but in doing so he acts as Deputy Speaker when controlling the debate.

For this evening we have continued the practice that has been followed in this House in the past; that is, of the Speaker sitting in the Chair and dealing with a Committee debate, and, as members will observe, there is a section in the report setting out the procedure to be followed when discussing reports of future Standing Orders Committees.

I do not wish to say any more. Members of the Standing Orders Committee will be only too pleased to answer any queries posed by any members as they come forward.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [8.5 p.m.]: I do not intend to traverse the ground covered either by yourself or by the member for Subiaco, Mr. Speaker. The member for Subiaco pointed out most of the major changes recommended by the Standing Orders Committee for adoption by the House, and I will not deal with them again.

I would remind members that this report of the Standing Orders Committee has been before members of the House for some weeks, and I feel adequate opportunity has been given to them to study the proposed amendments. I have no doubt that by this time they have made notations on the copies of the report they have received so that they may speak on any particular Standing Order as it comes forward.

I am pleased the member for Subiaco pointed out, in regard to sittings of Parliament, that this, of course, is not a decision for the Standing Orders Committee, but is purely a matter for Governments and if, from time to time, we have members speaking on this matter and saying there should be more than one sitting of Parliament each year, the Standing Orders will not control this; it will be up to the Government of the day to make its own decision on the matter.

As you have already pointed out, Mr. Speaker, a considerable amount of time was spent on this proposed revision of the Standing Orders, but the Standing Orders Committee certainly does not consider, and never did at any time, that it was presenting to the House a perfect document. As a Standing Orders Committee we felt we had to do the best job we could, but the members of the House have the final say. After this question has been finally decided, should the outcome be that we finish up with a copy of the Standing Orders exactly the same as that which we now have, that will be the desire of the House, and there is nothing the Standing Orders Committee can do about it. The recommendations of the Standing Orders Committee are before the House purely for consideration by members and I suggest that they be given favourable consideration.

Question put and passed.

Note: In the following debate—

A Standing Order not proposed for amendment by the Standing Orders Committee is set out thus: Standing Order 53.

A new Standing Order proposed by the Standing Orders Committee or a Standing Order proposed for amendment by the Standing Orders Committee is set out thus: Standing Order 55, as proposed.

The SPEAKER: Will the member for Subiaco and the member for Pilbara take their places at the table of the House? I hope the Premier does not mind the two members sitting at the table with their backs to him.

Mr. Brand: I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Have all members their copies of the reports?

Standing Order 1, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 2, as proposed—

Mr. JAMIESON: I take it that Standing Order 2 is dealing with the whole of the chapter?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, as it turns out, it is the whole of the chapter.

Mr. JAMIESON: I would like to have some explanation for the necessity of paragraph (c) under "Matters 'sub judice'" appearing on page 2 of the report. When amending Standing Orders I hold we should lay down orders which are clear to the House. Members will note that paragraph (c) contains the following words:—

> . . . if it appears to the Chair that there is a substantial danger of prejudice to the trial of the case;

If those words are included there could be confusion in future as a result of various interpretations by different presiding officers, and I do not think that is desirable. If we left the Standing Order containing only paragraphs (a) and (b) we would have something definite before us. You, Mr. Speaker, might rule that a matter is deemed to be *sub judice*, but the next Speaker who occupies the Chair might give a ruling on a similar situation which is directly opposite.

I would therefore like to hear the comments of members of the committee on the possibility of deleting paragraph (c) so that the Standing Order would be simplified to a clear explanation in paragraphs (a) and (b), and without the appendage which would allow the Chair to

make a determination, because Speakers are only human and they will make a determination in accordance with how they view the situation before them and not necessarily in a way that will give guidance in the future on a similar situation that may occur. I would like to hear the members of the committee comment on what I have put forward, but I want to speak on another matter later.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This paragraph was taken from May's *Parliamentary Practice* in regard to what the situation is at the moment. For the benefit of the House I point out that paragraph (a) covers criminal matters and paragraph (b) covers civil matters before the time the case has been set down for trial, but it does not cover the case which has been created merely because a writ has been issued. In the authorities it has been pointed out that there could be a prejudice to the trial immediately after the writ is issued. However, it is also realised that writs can be issued merely to make a matter *sub judice* and to prevent a parliamentary debate. So there must be some discretion exercised.

Following what has been the practice in the United Kingdom, the members of the committee felt there should be an occasion for a discretionary ruling from the Chair that in special circumstances there could be a prejudice to a trial; but if members wish to limit the Standing Order to paragraphs (a) and (b) it is quite open for them to do so. However, we could find ourselves in the situation if we did, that, at some future time, we could prejudice some person's trial by debating it in this House.

Mr. BICKERTON: I hold the same opinion as that expressed by the member for Subiaco. The last point made by the member for Subiaco is the principal one; namely, that we could have someone issuing a writ purely for the purpose of preventing a debate in Parliament that should be held. However, if members wish to have only two paragraphs, I have no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is the interpretations clause, and there are quite a number of definitions. My feeling is that there should be a definition of *Hansard*, of which there is none. The only reference I can find to *Hansard* is in Standing Order 202, and unless there is some definition of it, *Hansard* has no official recognition, and I think expression should be made as to what it is and what form it takes.

In any event, *Hansard* should be given some official recognition. I have studied our existing Standing Orders and the closest I can get to a definition of *Hansard* is contained in Standing Order 413 which refers to the Printing Committee, but that does not adequately cover the situation. I have not prepared anything in advance, but I think that if, later on, we use the term quoted in Standing Order 202 there should be something to indicate what *Hansard* is and what its functions are.

Whilst I am on my feet and apropos this point, if there be some validity to my suggestion, but no member has as yet the requisite words prepared, is it possible —if it be the will of the House—to retrace our steps to draw up something appropriate to define *Hansard*?

The SPEAKER: That is purely a matter for decision by the House.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We did not give this matter any thought at all. The reason why the term *Hansard* has not appeared in the Standing Orders is that the term orginated in England, and it referred to the unofficial report of the proceedings by one named Hansard. I can see no objection to a definition being inserted, but it is a matter to which we should give some thought. I would not care to try to draw up a definition now. It could be done before the consideration of the Standing Orders is concluded.

The SPEAKER: The best way would be for someone to move that further consideration of this Standing Order be postponed.

Mr. JAMIESON: The other point I wish to raise is in relation to the interpretation of "Pecuniary Interest." This appears to be a clumsy definition, although it appears in May's *Parliamentary Practice*. In the case of a family company where a man, his wife, and his children have a joint interest, does it amount to a general interest as referred to in the definition?

Mr. BICKERTON: We also had difficulty with this definition. It is pretty difficult to determine that a person does not have an interest in the case of appointment of members to Select Committees and the like. The member for a district could have an interest in a business similar to that which is being inquired into by a Select Committee; yet his services could be vital to the committee because of his knowledge of the district and of the circumstances surrounding the matter to be investigated. The best we could do was to accept this definition. Not only does the definition in that form appear in May's *Parliamentary Practice* but also in the Standing Orders of the other States and of the Commonwealth.

We realise that the House will elect the members to Select Committees and the like, and it is up to the House to satisfy itself that those members are not financially concerned with the matter to be investigated, even though they may be engaged in small businesses.

The SPEAKER: Members could get themselves into a ridiculous position in raising this point, because it could be interpreted that no member of Parliament

should vote on a members of Parliament salaries Bill.

Mr. JAMIESON: That being the case I had better leave it alone.

The SPEAKER: We have to realise that these are matters which the presiding officer has to interpret in the light of the circumstances. Clearly in the instance I have just outlined the people will expect the presiding officer to give a fairly generous interpretation.

Mr. GRAHAM: I move—

> That further consideration of Standing Order No. 2 be postponed.

Mr. O'NEIL: I oppose the motion. Firstly, the member for Balcatta has indicated that the term *Hansard* appears only in Standing Order 202. The definitions have been included to reduce the verbiage in the Standing Orders, as the member for Subiaco has stated. It would be preferable to agree to the Standing Order as it stands, and to change the wording of Standing Order 202 when we come to it to include a reference that *Hansard* means the official record of the speeches.

If we are to modernise the operations of Parliament we may, at some time in the future, not have *Hansard*, and we may decide to use tape recording. We would make progress by agreeing to the Standing Order and then by considering Standing Order 202 when we get to it.

Motion put and passed; further consideration of Standing Order 2 postponed.

Standing Orders 3 to 35—

The SPEAKER: As no amendments have been put forward, with the permission of the House I propose to put Standing Orders 3 to 35 inclusive.

Question put and passed; Standing Orders 3 to 35 agreed to.

Standing Order 36, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Orders 37 to 51 agreed to.

Standing Order 52—

Mr. GRAHAM: The term "Chamber of Offices" appears. I have not heard that term used previously. Could an explanation be given of this term?

The SPEAKER: It has been in the Standing Orders for a number of years. It means the Chamber and the offices associated with the Chamber, such as the offices of the Clerk and the Assistant Clerk.

Mr. JAMIESON: I imagine that originally there was a misprint and the word "or" instead of "of" should have been used. So as to clear up any doubt I move an amendment—

> Line 6—Delete the word "of" and substitute the words "or the."

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 52, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Order 53—

The SPEAKER: There is no alteration to Standing Order 53 except that the words "and places" in the heading have been deleted. The question is that it stands as printed.

Standing Order 53 agreed to.

Standing Order 54, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 55, as proposed—

Mr. JAMIESON: Why was this Standing Order not joined with Standing Order 56? One seems to contradict the other. Standing Order 55, as recommended, states—

> If a member fails to attend the Assembly for two consecutive months in any Session without the permission of the Assembly (such permission being entered in the Minutes) his seat thereupon becomes vacant.

Standing Order 56, as recommended, states—

> No Member during the Session shall absent himself for more than fourteen days at a time without an express leave of absence from the House; and
>
> . . .

Mr. GUTHRIE: It does not matter whether we have one or two Standing Orders. The recommendation relating to Standing Order 55 merely repeats what is in the Constitution Act, and we cannot alter that Act. The Act provides that if a member is absent for two consecutive months his seat shall become vacant.

Standing Order 56 is a parliamentary restriction introduced by the members themselves, and the Constitution Act makes no provision for that. It states that if a member is away for more than 14 days without express leave of absence he is guilty of contempt. This Standing Order induces members to attend sittings of the House, and without it they might absent themselves for periods of up to two months. Two separate subjects are dealt with in these Standing Orders, but if it is the desire of the House they could be joined.

The SPEAKER: My attention has been drawn to an error in Standing Order 55. The word "Minutes" has been used. The term should be "Votes and Proceedings."

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I move an amendment—

> Line 5—Delete the word "Minutes" and substitute the words "Votes and Proceedings."

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 55, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Order 56, as proposed—

Mr. GRAHAM: In regard to this Standing Order, the period of 14 days is confusing. Does it mean a fortnight, or 14 sitting days? If it is intended to mean days of sitting then the Standing Order should so stipulate.

The SPEAKER: My interpretation is that its means 14 consecutive days.

Mr. GAYFER: I think when the committee was discussing this, it was understood that a day referred to a sitting day, and therefore 14 days would be 14 sitting days.

The SPEAKER: In the Constitution, "sitting days" is used and means the days on which the House actually sits. The Standing Order as printed does not use the term "sitting days," so I think it means 14 consecutive days.

Mr. GRAHAM: It could be that in a period of 14 days—that is a fortnight—the House might sit on only one day. On the other hand, it could sit on several days. I think, therefore, it would be far better for us to state a certain number of sitting days; say, six sitting days. If a member is absent for six sitting days without receiving the leave of the House, then he is guilty of contempt. Members of the Standing Orders Committee no doubt discussed the ins and outs of this and I would like to be guided by that committee. I think 14 sitting days could be far too long, because this could cover a month. I would like to hear from a member of the committee, but I suggest that it should be six sitting days.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would support the suggestion of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. This particular Standing Order, members will observe, is purely a repetition of what was previously in Standing Orders, but the 14 days could be ridiculous. For instance, we all know that these days we normally rise for Show Week. Six sitting days, on the other hand, would, in the normal course of events, cover two weeks.

Mr. Dunn: Speak up. We cannot hear you.

Mr. GUTHRIE: For the benefit of the member for Darling Range, who is a little deaf—

Mr. Graham: A little dumb.

Mr. GUTHRIE: —I will repeat what I said. Six sitting days would normally cover two weeks, and I support the suggestion of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BOVELL: It is always acknowledged by the Whips—and I was a Whip for many years, both when we were the Government and when we were the Opposition—that the 14 days means 14 calendar days. I always adopted the procedure of arranging for a motion for leave of absence if it was known that a member was not likely to be present within 14 days. This is the Whip's responsibility and it is the Whip's understanding that it is 14 calendar days.

Mr. GAYFER: Standing Order 55 refers to two consecutive months. Could we tidy this one up by making it two consecutive weeks?

Mr. HAWKE: I did not hear the member for Subiaco, even when he did speak up, so it was not only the member for Darling Range who had difficulty in that regard. I cannot quite work out why we must stipulate sitting days. How can they be other than sitting days? If a member is here on a non-sitting day, who knows, and who cares?

Mr. I. W. Manning: The solution is to make it two weeks.

Mr. HAWKE: That sounds a rather weak solution to me. I think we must decide on how many consecutive sitting days a member is allowed to be absent without leave of the House. That is the problem, as I understand it.

The SPEAKER: Would the member for Northam like to move a motion in this regard, because I have not got one at the moment?

Mr. HAWKE: I move an amendment—

> Lines 2 and 3—Delete the words "fourteen days at a time" and substitute the words "nine consecutive sitting days."

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 56, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Orders 57 to 59, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 60—

Mr. GRAHAM: This Standing Order reads—

> 60. The Clerk of the House shall keep a daily record of Members attending in their places at any time during the day's sitting.

That may be desirable as a principle, but we all know what occurs in the House. Members are in and out conferring with other members and Ministers and they also change sides for divisions. It seems extraordinary that although the records might show that I have voted in half a dozen divisions, because I have not sat in my own place, I am not recorded as being present. I think this is rather ludicrous. I believe that if a member has been in the Chamber at any time during the day's sitting—whether he has been in his place or not—he should be recorded as having been in attendance. I would therefore like to move an amendment to delete the words "in their places."

The SPEAKER: Do you mean he would not have to attend in the Chamber?

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely the whole Standing Order refers to the Chamber because this is where we sit.

Mr. Bickerton: Once you delete the word "places" you remove the reference to the Chamber.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do you think it is necessary to refer to the Chamber?

The SPEAKER: Yes, it tidies it up.

Mr. GRAHAM: Very well then. I move an amendment—

Line 3—Delete the words "in their places".

Mr. Court: It would be most extraordinary if a man did not sit in his seat at least once. Would it happen?

Mr. Lewis: Surely at some time a member would sit in his seat.

Mr. GRAHAM: We never know, because on occasions sittings can be exceedingly short.

Mr. Nalder: It has never happened in your experience.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Sergeant-at-Arms is very obliging and courteous, and does not follow every member to his exact seat. He perhaps would not know for certain whether a member was sitting in his own seat or in the one adjoining it. However, it is known that the member has been in the House at some time during the day's sitting. If my amendment is passed it would avoid the absurd situation to which I have referred.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I oppose this amendment. I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is just splitting straws. Every member in this Chamber is allocated a seat and he cannot speak in this House unless he is in his seat. I do not think it is too much to expect that every member be in his seat for at least a minute or so in order that his attendance might be recorded.

I do not think that a member has ever taken part in divisions and not occupied his seat for at least one moment. The Standing Order has stood the test of time and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Amendment put and negatived.

Standing Order 60 agreed to.

Standing Orders 61 to 63 agreed to.

Standing Order 64, as proposed—

Mr. JAMIESON: With due respect to the committee, it seems to me that it has tried to tidy up this Standing Order, but has made a bit of a mess of it. Without a definition, one would have imagined this to be a good Standing Order last week when it was rather hot, because the Standing Order states that every male member shall be uncovered when he enters or leaves the House. I think this is unfairly treating the male compared with the female.

Mr. J. Hegney: Are you not splitting straws?

Mr. JAMIESON: No. This amendment should refer to the head being uncovered; but even then we could be in difficulties if an Afghan were elected to Parliament. We would have to amend the Standing Order again.

I would like to suggest that this Standing Order should be referred back to the committee before final adoption. I move—

That further consideration of Standing Order 64 be postponed.

Mr. BICKERTON: The committee does not mind having another look at the Standing Order, but we came to the same conclusion as that arrived at by the member for Beeloo. We found that "hatless" did not apply, and we got back to what is generally recognised as having no head dress—to be uncovered. We realised that a hat is part and parcel of a female and we do not think that a female should go uncovered. Uncovered, as far as parliamentary usage is concerned, means not to wear a head dress.

Mr. MITCHELL: As far as I can see, all members are equal and I do not see that it is necessary to discriminate between males and females. In a lot of instances, the word "male" includes female.

Mr. HAWKE: As far as heads are concerned, I suppose the member for Murray and myself would be the most uncovered. Possibly the member for Subiaco could be included with us. However, speaking seriously, I wonder whether this Standing Order is required at all. Surely custom would lay down that members must come into the House without hats, and I feel this should apply to women members too. I do not see any reason or sense in making any differentiation except, perhaps, on Opening Day.

As far as showing obeisance to the Chair is concerned, I do not like the word "obeisance." However, custom lays it down that every member must show respect to Mr. Speaker when entering or leaving the Chamber or when moving from seat to seat. That is well established. In fact, we had a row many years ago relating to the question as to whether the Chairman of Committees was entitled to receive obeisance from members. I think the late Mr. Marshall was Chairman of Committees at the time and he insisted, and ever since then all members have shown some respect to the Chairman and Deputy Chairmen of Committees.

If the Standing Order is to remain, then I agree with the member for Stirling that there should be no differentiation whatsoever. There is only one woman member of Parliament at present, and she is most determined that she shall not be known as a female member, but as a member. I feel the committe might have another look at this Standing Order.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The member for Beeloo said that the term "uncovered" meant "hatless." I am inclined to think the term is a hangover from 300 or 400 years ago and actually refers to wigs. It occurs

to me that this could be solved simply, and I would move that Standing Order 64 should read as follows:—

> Every member shall recognise the Chair when passing to or from his seat.

The SPEAKER: There is a motion already before the Chair moved by the member for Beeloo. The motion is that the matter be deferred for further consideration.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I will second that. If the Standing Order is carried it will cut across section 26 of the Interpretation Act which provides that in every Act the masculine shall include the feminine.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have no objection to the motion, but I think the matter raised by the member for Stirling is important. I do not know how we can test the feeling of the members, but I think it was the late Mr. Alex Panton who, when Speaker, referred to Mrs. Cardell-Oliver—later Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver—by saying that there were no ladies in this Chamber; all those present were members.

Therefore, I think it is wrong in principle that we should, in our domestic rules, draw a distinction between male and female members. I would like the committee to give further consideration to that point.

Mr. NALDER: There is a point to which I think no consideration has been given, and I do not know whether it could be incorporated in Standing Order 64. There have been times when this House has been in session and it has been extremely hot. On such occasions I think it would be convenient for members to be allowed to remove their coats. As a matter of fact, I think that one Speaker did agree that this should be allowed. I think it would be quite reasonable to include such a provision and allow the Speaker, on occasions, to permit members to remove their coats.

Mr. EVANS: I like the word "reasonable." It will be recalled that I have often pressed for the use of that word, and I very much like the suggestion made by the Deputy Premier. I understand the motion before the Chamber is that this Standing Order be referred back to the committee. I endorse that with a view to the committee giving consideration to the suggestion made by the Deputy Premier.

Mr. BOVELL: I do not like disagreeing with my colleague, the Deputy Premier, but I object. I do not think it is becoming that members should be lounging around the House in shirt sleeves.

Mr. BICKERTON: The Standing Orders Committee is not adamant on this point. Could the member for Beeloo withdraw his amendment so that an amendment could be moved for Standing Order 64 to be deleted? We would then be back to where we started, and everyone would be happy.

The SPEAKER: I must put the motion which is before the Chamber. The motion moved by the member for Beeloo is that Standing Order 64 be referred back to the committee.

Mr. JAMIESON: I am prepared to withdraw my motion but I am afraid it might prolong matters rather than help.

The SPEAKER: Has the member for Beeloo the permission of the House to withdraw his motion? As there is no dissentient voice, the motion is withdrawn.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: The question now is that Standing Order 64 stand as printed.

Mr. MITCHELL: I move an amendment—

> Line 1—Delete the word "male".
>
> Lines 4 and 5—Delete the words "every member."
>
> Line 6—Delete the words "or her".

Mr. LEWIS: I support that suggestion, which is that the words in heavy type be deleted.

Mr. TONKIN: I think we need to have another look at this because as the Stand-Order exists. I can walk into the Chamber with my hat in my hand and put it on my head when I sit down. The only time I have to make sure I have not got it on is when I move about.

The SPEAKER: That is House of Commons practice. The member for Stirling has moved that the word "male" in the first line, the words "every member" in lines 4 and 5, and the words "or her" in the last line be deleted.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not opposed to the amendments, but I am impressed by the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. Surely this Standing Order will apply only when a member enters or leaves the Chamber, or when he is moving about the Chamber. In addition to the words intended to be deleted, surely we could also delete the words "he enters or leaves" and insert in their place the word "in". Then of course we could delete the words "or moves to any other part of the House during the debate." In other words, the Standing Order would read as follows:—

> Every member shall be uncovered when in the House, and shall make obeisance to the Chair in passing to or from his seat.

The SPEAKER: The only way to deal with this is to put the amendments proposed by the member for Stirling, and then the question that the Standing Order stand as amended.

Amendments put and passed.

Mr. GRAHAM: I move an amendment—

Line 2—Delete the words "he enters or leaves" and substitute the word "in".

Lines 3 and 4—Delete the words "or moves to any other part of the House during the debate".

If the amendment is agreed to Standing Order 64 will then read—

Every member shall be uncovered when in the House, and shall make obeisance to the Chair in passing to or from his seat.

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 64, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Order 65 agreed to.

Standing Order 66, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 67—

Mr. GRAHAM: I hope I am not being pedantic, but it seems to me that the word "previously" in the seventh line should be "prior."

I move an amendment—

Line 7—Delete the word "previously" and substitute the word "prior".

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 67, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Orders 69 and 70 agreed to.

Standing Orders 72 and 73, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 74, as proposed—

Mr. JAMIESON: I do not like mandatory sentences being applied as severely as they are in this Standing Order. During the 15 sessions that I have been in this Parliament there has not been one suspension, although possibly on occasions the Government would have liked to see a member of the Opposition suspended; and alternatively, the Opposition, on occasions would have liked to see some members of the Government suspended.

However, in the Federal Parliament even Ministers are suspended, and under this Standing Order, for a second offence during the same year, a Minister could be suspended for seven consecutive days and the Government would be without his services for that period. Seven consecutive days, with our normal times of sitting, would be approximately three weeks, and I think that is unreasonable. I think probably 24 hours for the first occasion would be reasonable and I intend to move that we replace the seven consecutive days, for a second offence with "such time as may be determined by the House provided that this be not less than two consecutive days." In the case of the 28 consecutive days' suspension I shall move to provide that be not less than six consecutive days.

In other Parliaments it is not unheard of for the Leader of the Opposition to be suspended, and I think Parliament should have some say in regard to the period of suspension. There should be more latitude, because I do not think anybody would be thrown out unless there were strong reasons for doing so. I move an amendment—

Line 5—Delete the words "seven consecutive days" and substitute the words "such time as may be determined by the House provided that this be not less than two consecutive days".

Lines 8 and 9—Delete the words "twenty-eight consecutive days" and substitute the words "such time as the House may determine provided that this be not less than six consecutive days".

It is then in the hands of Parliament to make a determination.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I must point out to the member for Beeloo that he is providing for no upper limit, and that was one of the major purposes of laying down the period in the Standing Orders. His amendment will leave it to the majority vote of the House to impose any maximum penalty desired; and the House would be taking upon itself the right to deprive an elected representative of the people the right to sit in the House. The Government could, if it wished, suspend a member of the Opposition for the whole session, and I do not think we should agree to the proposal. There should be an upper limit.

Mr. HAWKE: I do not like this amendment at all; it would give all the advantages to the Government of the day and all the disadvantages to the Opposition. We cannot judge the future. We do not know how severe or bitter party politics may become in the future, and if we leave the decisions covering periods of suspension to the vote of the House then we are giving a great advantage to a Government which might be prepared to use its power to put members of the Opposition at a very great disadvantage.

In addition, I think members should know in advance what the penalties are. If the penalties are laid down clearly in the Standing Orders, as is proposed in this Standing Order, then every member knows where he is; he knows what the penalty will be if he offends and is suspended on the first occasion. If he offends, and is suspended a second time under the same Standing Order, then he knows what the penalty will be, and so on. I think that is fair and advisable and would have a good effect from the point of view of discipline. I much prefer the Standing Order proposed as compared with the amendment moved by the member for Beeloo.

The SPEAKER: I would point out to the House that the atmosphere that could be expected to exist during a debate of the nature envisaged by the amendment

moved by the member for Beeloo is scarcely one in which reasonable justice might be done. If there was trouble in the House and a member had to be suspended immediately it would be difficult to decide how great the punishment should be. I would not agree to this.

Mr. JAMIESON: I am prepared to withdraw the amendment but I think it would be better if we had a minimum and a maximum. However, I have not had time to draw up an amendment along those lines and, therefore, I ask leave to withdraw the amendment I have moved.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. GRAHAM: We now have exactly the same state of affairs as we had earlier where we stated a certain number of days without making up our minds whether or not they were sitting days. In this instance I think the first occasion should provide for one sitting day; the second occasion, which now provides for seven consecutive days, should be three sitting days—because that is equivalent to a week—and for the third occasion it should be 12 sitting days instead of 28 consecutive sitting days.

I say that because at show time we cease on Thursday evening and we do not resume until the following Tuesday week, which is a period of 12 days. Therefore, if I was suspended on the Thursday afternoon before Show week, for a period of seven consecutive days, I would not miss one day's sitting of Parliament. I move an amendment—

Lines 3 and 4—Delete the words "twenty-four hours" and substitute the words "one sitting day".

Line 5—Delete the words "seven consecutive" and substitute the words "three consecutive sitting."

Lines 8 and 9—Delete the words "twenty-eight consecutive" and substitute the words, "twelve consecutive sitting".

The SPEAKER: There is just one point. If the honourable member were suspended at eight o'clock this evening for one sitting day, does he consider he would be suspended for the whole of tomorrow's sitting?

Mr. GRAHAM: That would be so. I would be suspended forthwith and for the whole of the next sitting day. If that were not so, I could be suspended five minutes before the end of the sitting, for one sitting day, and I could take my place in the House the next day and it would in effect not carry any penalty.

The SPEAKER: That is the point I am getting at.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know whether I have properly worded my amendment. My intention is that his suspension on the first occasion shall be forthwith and for the whole of the next sitting day.

The SPEAKER: For the remainder of that day, and for one complete day?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is so. Perhaps we could leave it to the Standing Orders Committee to clothe it in the appropriate words. If members agree, the matter can be recommitted for further consideration if it is not as watertight as it should be. This could relate to periods of time when the House is not sitting, and the penalty would have no application at all.

Mr. BICKERTON: The Committee discussed this at length and felt it should leave the words as they originally appeared in the Standing Orders. It is true the suspension of a member from the House meant he would have nothing to do with the House; it originally mentioned the precincts, and so on. The member could not use any of the facilities of the House, and no doubt it was felt this was sufficient punishment for the member at the time. Members now have offices, and so on, in the building, and we felt it might be unreasonable to prevent a man using his office, because this would not punish him but his constituents who are the interested parties. We should consider whether we truly want punishment to be on sitting days or on consecutive days. I do not see that the punishment of suspension is any greater if it is a sitting day, or a non-sitting day.

Mr. Graham: It says suspension from the sitting of the House, which means the Assembly. It would only apply to this Chamber.

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 74, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Order 75—

Mr. GRAHAM: The overhaul of our Standing Orders is made every 15 years, and we should see it is made properly. On page 14, line 5, we find the words, "the Sergeant-at-Arms shall act on such orders as he receives from the Chair in pursuance of this standing order." There is no provision for any order to be given to the Sergeant-at-Arms. I think the words, "in pursuance of this standing order" are redundant, and I move an amendment—

Lines 10 and 11—Delete the words "in pursuance of this standing order".

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 75, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Order 75a, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 75b—

Mr. JAMIESON: This passes too much responsibility to the presiding officer. The Government could lose its majority and there could be a vote of no confidence before the Chair, and there would be a real rhubarb if the Speaker decided to adjourn the House or suspend the sitting for a time to be named by him. The

Government could decide half-way through a session to drop its legislation and adjourn because the Speaker agreed to do so. I am sure the committee did not intend this. Perhaps it should read, "suspend any sitting for a time to be named by him, but no longer than two sitting days."

The SPEAKER: This would give the Speaker more power than he has at the moment. In the event of grave disorder the Speaker can leave the Chair and the Chamber until he feels order can be restored. The Speaker is still bound by the sessional order of the House, and he is bound to be present for business on certain days.

Mr. JAMIESON: I will withdraw my objection in view of your explanation, Mr. Speaker. If this is subject to a sessional order it will be all right.

Standing Order 75b, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 75c, as proposed—

Mr. HAWKE: If a member wilfully disobeys the order by the House to attend, the House would then direct the Sergeant-at-Arms to take that member into custody. In what practical form would the order operate?

The SPEAKER: A writ could be issued under the hand of the Speaker, if necessary, for the arrest of the member, and the Sergeant-at-Arms would formally take him into custody.

Mr. Hawke: Would the Sergeant-at-Arms be on his own?

The SPEAKER: The Speaker would decide what additional assistance might be necessary, but I think the Sergeant-at-Arms would be able to cope with some of the members in the Chamber.

Standing Order 75c agreed to.

Standing Orders 76 to 80 agreed to.

Standing Order 81, as proposed—

Mr. GRAHAM: There has been some uncertainty in the minds of members that there is no specific provision for questions to be asked without notice, even though Speakers generally have been most indulgent. Private members use the device of questions without notice in a matter of urgency, or perhaps when they have received an unsatisfactory answer, or there has been some misunderstanding as a result of information previously given by the Minister. As you know, Sir, I could have 500 written questions on the notice paper tomorrow, but instead of doing that I might choose to ask a question verbally, and at the moment you can at any time say you will not accept any further questions without notice. This right should belong to members, and Ministers could quite easily ask for further questions to be placed on the notice paper if they thought members were overdoing it. I would like to see a new subsection (4) inserted after subsection (3) entitled, "Questions Without Notice." It should not depend on the liver or the generosity of the presiding officer. I move an amendment—

> Line 6—Insert after subsection (3) the following new subsection to stand as subsection (4):—
>
> (4) Questions without Notice.

Mr. BOVELL: I move—

> That the amendment be amended by adding the words "at the discretion of the Speaker."

I do this because otherwise questions without notice could go on *ad infinitum* as there would be no Standing Orders to stop them.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have no objection to the additional words.

The SPEAKER: I think the additional words moved by the Minister for Lands will put the matter on the same basis as it is at the moment. One of the problems with regard to questions without notice is that it is difficult for the presiding officer to determine whether they are in order or not. He hears them for the first time when they are asked in the House. Members could take the opportunity to ask all sorts of irregular questions because they are without notice and because the Speaker may not have time to examine them. I would draw members' attention to the fact that in this Parliament members have, in my opinion, generally been given an exceptionally good run on questions. Roughly speaking we get through about 30 questions in half an hour. I believe this is purely because I have exercised a fairly tight control.

In many Parliaments, questions without notice can only be supplementary questions and must relate to questions asked on notice. Only the week before last members from the House of Commons were here and were surprised that we allowed questions without notice in this way. They thought it was of considerable advantage to members and one which they had never enjoyed. I think it is wise that the Speaker retain some control.

Mr. BICKERTON: I assure the member for Balcatta that this matter has occupied quite a bit of the time of the Standing Orders Committee. With the exception of the period during which the late Mr. Rodoreda was in office, questions without notice have always been allowed and we doubted the wisdom of including this matter in the Standing Orders lest we would have to create other Standing Orders to govern that particular one. It was suggested that the words "questions without notice at the discretion of the Speaker" be included, but we said it would represent precisely what we are doing now in that the Speaker has the discretion. In addition, we felt that some member might successfully move to have the words "at the discretion of the Speaker" deleted.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: If questions without notice are done away with we will lose the core of the Parliament. They play an important part at the early stage of a sitting. When I first became Speaker I was approached by the then Leader of the Opposition to see whether I was going to allow questions without notice in the House, as my predecessor had disallowed them. I said I would allow them because in my opinion they are the life of this Assembly. I have been here for 30 years and with the exception of the period that Mr. Rodoreda was Speaker, questions without notice have been the practice over that period. We know that questions without notice are asked in the Commonwealth Parliament. They are the spice of the Parliament.

Amendment on amendment put and passed.

Amendment, as amended, put and passed.

Standing Order 81, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Orders 82 and 83 agreed to.

Standing Order 84, as proposed—

Mr. DAVIES: I wonder if we could be told why a petition should contain a prayer at the end thereof; and why in paragraph (d) we should retain the words "skin or." At some time or other every member has gone to the Clerk of the House regarding the procedure to be adopted in the gathering of signatures for a petition; and I think some of the procedures are clumsy, and this might be an opportunity to bring them up to date.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have no objection to the words "skin or" being deleted. However, if we take out the word "prayer" the petition becomes meaningless, because a petition has two objectives: The form in which one sets out the facts; and then at the end is the prayer setting out the relief being sought. This has been the form of petitions from time immemorial. It is not a prayer as in the Bible. It is only a formality; and the main purpose of the prayer is the relief being sought.

Mr. DAVIES: I move—

Line 12—Delete the words "skin or" in paragraph (d).

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 84, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Orders 89 to 97, agreed to.

Standing Order 98, as proposed—

The SPEAKER: After the word "with" in line 3, the word "the" should be inserted. This matter will be attended to by the Clerks.

Standing Order 98, as corrected, agreed to.

Standing Orders 99 and 100 agreed to.

Standing Orders 101 and 101a, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 102 agreed to.

Standing Order 103, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 104 agreed to.

Standing Order 106, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Orders 107 and 108 agreed to.

Standing Orders 108a and 109, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 109a, as proposed—

Mr. GRAHAM: I move an amendment—

Line 3—Delete the word "will" and substitute the word "shall".

The word "shall" is our usual form of expression.

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Orders 110 to 112 agreed to.

Standing Order 113, as proposed—

Mr. GRAHAM: I move an amendment—

Line 4—Insert after the word "or" the word "shall".

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 113, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Orders 114 and 115, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 117, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 118 agreed to.

Standing Order 119, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 120 agreed to.

Standing Order 121, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 122—

Mr. GRAHAM: Correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Speaker, but should not the word "made" in the second line be "moved"? If we look at the top of page 21 the wording is, "but not to any Member who has moved an Amendment . . ." In addition Standing Order 123 refers to the mover of the original question. I think the correct word in Standing Order 122 should be "moved." I move an amendment—

Line 2—Delete the word "made" and substitute the word "moved".

Mr. O'NEIL: I do not want to be pedantic, but this Standing Order refers to a member who has made a substantive motion to the House. I think it is correct as it is.

Mr. Graham: No, it is the mover.

Amendment put and negatived.

Standing Order 122 agreed to.

Standing Orders 123 to 126 agreed to.

Standing Order 127, as proposed—

Mr. JAMIESON: I think it is high time we did away with this Standing Order which says that no member shall allude to any debate during the current session in the other House of Parliament. When

I first came to this House, members were not allowed to allude to their own debates, and we had to go to all sorts of devious means to do this. I am sure you will know what I mean, Mr. Speaker, if you think back on your old days as a private member. We went to all kinds of capers such as pinning extracts, and the rest of it.

When amendments were made some years ago, this restriction was obviated and, for convenience, we are able to refer to *Hansard*. We are able to quote what the Minister said or what somebody else said in debate and this expedites matters considerably. There is ample room in the provisions of the other Standing Orders to prevent us from reflecting on the other House of Parliament. However, I do not think we should be prohibited from alluding to any debate, because a number of measures come here from the Legislative Council.

There may be some matter which the Minister for Health has dealt with and a member in this Chamber might wish to refer to his remarks for some reason or other. If a member wishes to refer to debates in this way, I think it is humbug to restrict him. I should like to see this Standing Order taken out, because I do not think it is necessary as we cannot reflect on the other Chamber.

If it is necessary for the Premier to refer to something which one of his Ministers in another place has said and he wishes to quote it, I do not think there is any harm. There is no reflection on the other House; and surely the main reason why this Standing Order was introduced initially was to ensure that no reflection was made on the Legislative Council, which is the other Chamber of the Parliament. I would like to see it deleted, as I have said. I know I will have to vote against it and, doubtless, in this way it would be deleted.

That is what I intend to do unless the Committee can give any specific reason why we should not be able to refer to debates from another place in the same way as we refer to our own debates, without having to go to all the various dodges and means to make references to matters which have been discussed in the other Chamber.

The SPEAKER: There is a very good reason for this Standing Order, although the member for Beeloo and other members may not appreciate it. It is an accepted rule, shall we say—and any reference to May's *Parliamentary Practice* will bear this out—that members of the House should *bona fide* deliver their own speeches to the House. This is why reading long quotations from newspapers is not encouraged. It is also why this Standing Order does not allow people merely to repeat a speech which has been made in the other Chamber.

Furthermore it is felt that the House should come to its own decisions on its own arguments and should not be influenced by decisions made in another place. For those reasons, it has always been the practice not to permit references to debates which have taken place in the other House.

Mr. JAMIESON: With due respect, Mr. Speaker, I have read the notes of a Minister who has introduced a Bill in another place and subsequently I have followed those notes when the Minister has introduced a measure into this House, and they have been identical. This proves that your point is not being carried out, whether at ministerial level or at any other level because it could be a private member's Bill. I would assume that technically a person has to make his own speech and is not allowed to make the same speech as that made by the member who introduced the measure in another place.

I think we should overcome this position, because there should not be any reason for it. We have not abused the privilege, as it were, of using *Hansard* to refer back to what took place. The debate could have taken place some time ago and we need to refresh our memories. I do not think there is really any fear of members not making their own speeches if they are reading from *Hansard*. There is still ample scope in the rules to cover the position.

The SPEAKER: There is a point which the member for Beeloo has missed. Members are responsible for the truth and substance of facts they place before the House. If an identical speech to that delivered by a Minister in another place is delivered by a member in this place, whether that speech was written by him or by somebody else, he is still responsible for the information he gives to the House. If we allowed members to quote a speech which was made in another House, a member could say, "I was only quoting what the other person said. If it was not correct, I did not mislead the House; he did." In point of fact, this is not so. The member who quotes must accept responsibility for what he says.

Mr. BICKERTON: The member for Beeloo will find that the Committee went as far in Standing Order 127 as it felt it could go at this stage in connection with this matter in view of what the Speaker has said. Standing Order 127 has no connection with the reflection upon members. As the member for Beeloo has pointed out, that is covered by Standing Order 129. However, it is designed to prevent the same speech being read direct from *Hansard* to the House.

In connection with the question of refreshing one's memory on matters and the necessity to refer to *Hansard* to see what occurred in the other House, this condi-

tion only applies during the current session. The Committee left it as it was, because it was felt this was as far as it could go; that is, to apply the restriction to the current session and not go back too far. If the House feels otherwise, it is up to members to do something about it.

The SPEAKER: I assume the position is that the member for Beeloo wants to move that this Standing Order be struck out.

Mr. JAMIESON: If I oppose it and the decision is carried it will still have the same effect.

Standing Order 127 agreed to.

Standing Order 128—

Mr. JAMIESON: I think there is a technical error in this Standing Order. We are amending Standing Orders in this year, and I think it would be advisable to have the year of Her Majesty instead of His Majesty.

The SPEAKER: The member for Beeloo wishes to move that the word "His" be deleted and the word "Her" substituted in this Standing Order. I think the position is covered by the Interpretation Act.

Mr. JAMIESON: I appreciate the Interpretation Act, but we will look back and see that Standing Orders were amended and re-established in 1967 which is the year of "Her Majesty." If we make the word "Her" I consider it will be more correct. I move an amendment—

Line 2—Delete the word "His" and substitute the word "Her".

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 128, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Order 129 agreed to.

Standing Order 130, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 131—

Mr. HAWKE: I seek information and guidance on this Standing Order. Standing Order 129 says that no member shall use offensive words against either House of Parliament, and Standing Order 131 provides that no member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House.

Would I be right in saying that the sense of the two Standing Orders would be that a member in this House could not use offensive words against the other House of Parliament, but he could use offensive words against members of the other House? If so, it seems as though it should be tidied up.

The SPEAKER: I think probably the Speaker concerned would act in this connection. As Speaker I would pull a member up on this matter. Probably the literal interpretation which the member for Northam places on these Standing Orders is correct. I consider it is a matter for the discretion of the Speaker as to what he considers is unbecoming.

Standing Order 131 agreed to.

Standing Orders 132 and 132a, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Orders 133 and 134 agreed to.

Standing Order 135—

Mr. GRAHAM: I move an amendment—

Lines 6 and 7—Delete the words "nor pass between him and the Chair".

I am not in disagreement with the sentiment, but if members will refer to Standing Order 65 they will see that no member shall pass between the Chair and any member who is speaking. This is already provided for, and it is merely repetition.

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 135, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Order 136—

Mr. JAMIESON: Item (1) says that no member shall interrupt another member while speaking, unless to request that his words be taken down. This appears in several places. I would like an explanation from the Committee why this is necessary, because *Hansard* takes down everything anyway. It looks as if this has been left over from an old Standing Order which existed before *Hansard* came into operation. I do not see why we should specifically allow a person to interrupt a speech to ask for something to be taken down when it is already being taken down. The other two portions of Standing Order 136 appear to be correct, but Item (1) is quite unnecessary.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The reason for this is that when words are taken down they are written into the Votes and Proceedings, which is the only official record of Parliament. That is the purpose. It is to allow it to be written into the Minutes of Parliament if a member wishes something to be clearly recorded in the Votes and Proceedings.

Standing Order 136 agreed to.

Standing Orders 137 and 138 agreed to.

Standing Order 139, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 140—

Mr. GRAHAM: I would like you, Mr. Speaker, to tell me what is meant by the words, "but it shall be competent for any Member to take the sense of the House after the Speaker has given his opinion, . . .". This seems to be a peculiar expression and I was wondering what is encompassed by it.

The SPEAKER: It means that any member shall be competent to call for a division. It is the verbiage that has been used for many years in this House and apparently has been understood.

Mr. GRAHAM: If everybody is happy with the wording, I am quite satisfied.

Standing Order 140 agreed to.

Standing Orders 141 and 142 agreed to.

Standing Order 143, as proposed—

Mr. JAMIESON: I take it that this is a matter of usage, and that a member who objects to the ruling of the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees must surely be able to submit his reasons. However, if a member has to state his reasons in writing, he should be granted ample time to write them out. I would like the committee to indicate whether, when it gave consideration to the Standing Order as it stands at present, it was realised that it does not mean, in effect, he has to submit reasons to the House. He must submit his case in writing and at that stage there are no reasons. The Speaker would have to make a determination when he comes into the House without having the reasons before him. Also, the Chairman of Committees would not have had a chance to look at them.

The SPEAKER: I think this Standing Order is quite clear. In fact, I think I was very generous to a member a few nights ago when I accepted his reasons. It is quite clear that if objection is taken to the decision made by the Chairman of Committees the Speaker must resolve the question and he must know quite definitely the grounds for the objection. There must be no opportunity to change the grounds for the objection, and for that reason the objection should be stated in writing and without debate, because if there is to be a subsequent debate it shall be on the Speaker's ruling. The Speaker knows what the objections are and he gives his ruling accordingly.

Mr. JAMIESON: I take it that if there is no notice taken of the objection raised by a member he could sit here all night writing out his reasons.

The SPEAKER: That would be a vicious act on the part of the member and I do not think it would be tolerated.

Standing Order 143 agreed to.

Standing Orders 144 to 149 agreed to.

Standing Order 150—

Mr. GRAHAM: Could someone inform me what is meant by the words——

> No Member shall converse aloud or interrupt or make any noise or disturbance whilst any Member is orderly debating or whilst any Bill, Order, or other matter is being read or opened:

If the words have no meaning I cannot see why we should retain them.

Mr. GUTHRIE: A Bill is read. This is a Standing Order that has been in operation for some time. Obviously a motion or an order is not read. It would be the other matter that is being opened.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will not press it.

Standing Order 150 agreed to.

Standing Orders 151 to 156 agreed to.

Standing Order 158, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Orders 159 to 163 agreed to.

Standing Order 164, as proposed—

Mr. GRAHAM: Could I ask a member of the committee why, during a division, it is necessary for a member to be seated if he wants to raise a point of order? It seems a little foolish to me, but there may be some explanation.

Mr. BICKERTON: This is because there is another Standing Order which states that a member may speak only when standing in his place. To do away with the silly idea of a member having to cover his head whilst speaking during a division, we decided a member may not necessarily be in his own seat, but could be on the other side of the Chamber and therefore should be allowed to speak while seated.

Mr. GRAHAM: If he is in someone else's seat on the other side of the House, he has to flop on the floor, does he?

Mr. GUTHRIE: He may speak whilst still seated. He can only stand in his own seat.

The SPEAKER: There could also be the situation where the Speaker was on his feet putting the question and if a member came to his feet at that time he would be out of order.

Standing Order 164 agreed to.

Standing Order 165, as proposed—

Mr. JAMIESON: I would like to ask a member of the Committee what would be the position under this Standing Order if one of the motions were negatived. The Standing Order has been amended to read, "Such motion shall not again be entertained within the next 15 minutes." During that time the Committee could decide that the Chairman should report progress. If one was debating the last item before the Chair and took only five minutes, and progress had to be reported, what would be the position? Surely it would be competent to move a motion on this item again.

The SPEAKER: The motion would not be the same. The motion to report progress would be entirely different to the question. If the debate is concluded it is then a question of reporting to the House and the Committee finishes automatically.

Mr. LEWIS: What would be the position where a motion is moved for the House to divide or for the Committee to divide? The Standing Order states that if a motion is negatived the motion moved for the Committee to divide shall not again be entertained within the next 15 minutes. The Committee could have moved on to another clause, or the House could have moved on to another Bill, and yet the motion to divide the Committee or the House cannot be moved within 15 minutes of the previous motion.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The situation is that this is purely a motion moved in an endeavour to kill a Bill; or it is a motion to kill a Bill moved by an Opposition that wants to be difficult.

Mr. Lewis: It does not say that.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is one of the standard motions laid down for the business of Parliament. It has nothing to do with calling for a division.

Standing Order 165 agreed to.

Standing Order 166, as proposed—

Mr. HAWKE: The reason for the amendment to this Standing Order is the understatement of the century.

The SPEAKER: I am glad the member for Northam is on the side of the Standing Orders Committee.

Standing Order 166 agreed to.

Standing Order 167, as proposed—

Mr. BRAND: In this Standing Order reference is made to only one matter to which I wish to refer. That is the question of the proposed grievance debate provision. I thought I would like to point out that as this is a very new and, I think, quite a major change, I am not opposed to the idea, because it introduces a provision to our Standing Orders that we have experienced in this House previously. However, as far as I am concerned, I would agree to its acceptance provided the 10 minutes was limited to 10 minutes and there was no right of extension; that the grievance provision was suspended when other Standing Orders were suspended; and that the Minister, or the member deputed by him, should have the right of reply.

Finally I am prepared to agree to the amendment provided we try this proposed change every second Wednesday rather than every Wednesday. I put this forward because it is proposed that in the event of this provision being accepted, you, Sir, as Speaker, would call for grievances every Wednesday. To me, this in itself will permit a great deal of unnecessary debate on grievances. There is some doubt as to what grievance means, anyhow; because I hope the Committee had in mind that we provided in these Standing Orders for members to let off steam, or air their grievances.

I must say I was not very impressed with the argument you, Mr. Speaker, advanced a little earlier about the debate on the Address-in-Reply, and your idea that it should be lifted to a higher standard. That is all very well, but there is very little we can do about it, and I think the debate on the Address-in-Reply during all the years we have known it will continue along the lines that permit of a general open go for everyone.

I am inclined to think that this is not a bad idea, because every subject and every grievance will be aired by every member who thinks they should be aired. I think it would be wise for this Committee to make a start by allowing the grievance day to be held on every second Wednesday.

If grievance day becomes popular and there is a demand for more time then maybe another Parliament could consider making more time available. I rise to speak on Standing Order 167, because of the new provision for a grievance debate, and the time to be allowed is set down at 10 minutes for each member. It is further provided that with the consent of a majority of the House a member may be allowed to continue his speech for a further period not exceeding 15 minutes. I do not think this was intended by the Standing Orders committee.

I would like it to be laid down clearly that there is to be no extension of the time limit of 10 minutes for each member. I therefore move an amendment—

> Page 28, line 13—Insert after the words "Each Member" the words—"including the Leader of the Government or Member deputed by him to reply."
>
> Page 28, line 19—Insert at the end of the proviso the words "This proviso does not apply to a Grievance Debate."

The SPEAKER: The Standing Orders Committee is well aware of the fact that a mistake has been made in this instance.

Mr. BICKERTON: On the question of the extension of time of speakers, it was not intended by the committee that the time limit of 10 minutes to be allotted to each member in the grievance debate should be extended. The other matters which have been mentioned could be more appropriately discussed when we reach the Standing Order which supplies the machinery for putting the grievance debate into operation.

The motion just moved by the Premier alters the position somewhat. Before a copy of the motion was handed to me I thought there should be no extension of the limit of 10 minutes, but what the Premier wishes is that out of the four speeches one must be made by the Leader of the Government.

Mr. Court: No. There will still be four speakers, but the Premier could nominate a member to reply to each of those speakers. There is still a limit of 10 minutes.

Mr. BICKERTON: It means there could be a maximum of eight speeches.

Mr. Court: That is right.

Mr. BICKERTON: I cannot see a great deal of wrong in the motion of the Premier. The Standing Orders Committee was trying to keep the period down to a minimum, particularly as the grievance debate would eat into the time allotted to private members' business. That was the reason the committee suggested a Wednesday for the holding of grievance debates, so that the time on the days when Government business has precedence will

not be used up. The committee thought that Ministers did have ample opportunity to reply to any matters raised in the debate by making ministerial statements, or something of that nature. It was felt by the committee that the 40 minutes to be devoted to the grievance debate would be 40 minutes of the time set aside for private members, business. There is nothing in the recommendation to say that a Minister cannot use one of these 10 minute periods, but by doing so he will rob members on this or the Government side of the House of the opportunity to put forward grievances.

As Ministers have the right of reply in other debates one can hardly object to their having the right of reply in this instance, especially as when a member raises a grievance I imagine he wants it to be dealt with. As I have argued in favour of members being allowed to express grievances, I do not see how I can vote against a proposal to enable answers to be given. The only objection I have is that less time will be available on Wednesdays for private members' business.

Mr. BRAND: The reason I moved the motion is that there appears to be no right of reply by the Government. If members are to be encouraged to rise and speak in the grievance debate, then someone from either side of the House could make a sweeping attack on the Government, but there would be no right of reply immediately. I do not imagine there will be four speakers rising every Wednesday, or once every fortnight, to speak in the grievance debate; nor do I imagine a Minister will rise on every occasion to reply to grievances.

If grievances are genuine the Government or the Ministers concerned might like to examine the position, and let it go at that. We will not always be on this side of the House, and maybe some day members opposite will be sitting on the benches on this side. This is not a case of looking at our position as the Government of today; it is a matter of setting down Standing Orders. In this particular Standing Order a change is to be made and a new provision is to be introduced. That is why I believe that as far as possible we should provide for circumstances which could embarrass us or delay the House in such a way as not to achieve what the committee has set out to achieve.

Mr. DAVIES: Does this mean the debate on this Standing Order will be closed if the motion is put?

The SPEAKER: Yes, it would. If the honourable member wishes to raise any matter he should do so now.

Mr. DAVIES: I remained silent, because earlier this evening there were several speakers on different parts of a Standing Order, and you, Mr. Speaker, took the amendments in their order.

The SPEAKER: I do not think the Premier will object to your raising the matter you have in mind.

Mr. DAVIES: Why did the Standing Orders Committee decide on the time limits set out in the Standing Order—from unspecified time down to 10 minutes?

The SPEAKER: The committee felt it had a direction from the House to endeavour to speed up the proceedings. It considered that one obvious way to achieve that was to reduce the time limit of speakers. The committee felt that the time limits suggested will not make it unreasonable for members to present their points of view, but in some cases it will mean that the repetition of speeches—which we have today—will be avoided.

Mr. DAVIES: I thought the committee might have adopted the Standing Orders which apply in other Parliaments. I am aware that part of the charter given to the committee was for it to endeavour to hasten the proceedings of Parliament, but I do not think this Standing Order will accomplish very much.

Regarding the debate on the Address-in-Reply the only change is that an ordinary member will have his time reduced from 65 to 45 minutes. It was not very many years ago when the speaking time in this debate was unlimited. Within the memory of some members in this House, the speaking time was reduced to 60 minutes and that was considered to be reasonable. Now it is suggested that it be further reduced to 45 minutes.

Has the committee taken out any statistics to indicate how many members, particularly those on the Government side, have spoken for the full 60 minutes? If all the 50 members of this House—that is, the 51 members after the next election less the Speaker—were to speak for the full 60 minutes as against 45, the extra time required would be 12½ hours. This includes members who are Ministers of the Government. By reducing the time limit to 45 minutes, the most that can be saved is 12½ hours a session. I doubt whether much will be accomplished by this reduction, because it will only amount to two sitting days at the most.

Recently we have had a lot to say when we have been able to criticise the Government; and irrespective of which Government is in office, in view of the growing power of the executive, of the methods by which laws are made, and of the restrictions which are placed on Parliament, the time limit should not be reduced It is smallmindedness to reduce the time limit on one of the major occasions when members have the right to criticise the Government.

These remarks also apply to the debate on the Estimates. Very few members speak for the full hour, and if they all did the

maximum additional time that would be taken would be 12½ hours a session. This is an unnecessary restriction.

There are occasions when members speak for the full time allotted, and last evening we had one such occasion. The most that could be saved last evening was 15 minutes under the Standing Order we are discussing. There is a suggestion that when Bills are dealt with in Committee the time limit is to be 15 minutes on the first occasion when a member speaks, and 10 minutes on a subsequent occasion. Members will not have the right to speak on more than one subsequent occasion. This might cut out unnecessary repetition.

On the two major occasions when members are given the right to be critical and to put forward general complaints no attempt should be made to hasten the proceedings. The most that could be saved would be 12½ hours during the Address-in-Reply, and 12½ hours during the Estimates in any one session.

This matter was mentioned to me by the member for Mt. Hawthorn who expressed concern. He has been called away, unfortunately, and he asked me to express his thoughts to the House, although he is retiring from Parliament this session.

The SPEAKER: Are you moving an amendment?

Mr. DAVIES: Yes. For the reasons I have given, I move an amendment—

Page 27, line 33—Delete the figure "45" and substitute the figure "60".

Page 27, line 39—Delete the figure "45" and substitute the figure "60".

Page 28, line 8—Delete the figure "45" and substitute the figure "60".

Page 28, line 9—Delete the figure "45" and substitute the figure "60".

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. MITCHELL: I was going to make a suggestion. It is quite evident that the committee did not expect the Ministers to have the right of reply, becaue Ministers would not have a grievance. I suggest that we leave the position as it is, and then when we come to the last provision, we could stipulate that one of the members of the Government side shall be the Premier or the Minister if he so desires, giving the Government one member and the Minister.

Mr. Brand: Why shouldn't two private members on the Government side have an opportunity to speak?

Mr. MITCHELL: The Government members are in a better position to air their grievances to their Ministers and to Cabinet, and would not desire to do so in the House, and therefore it should be all right for the Minister to be one of the Government members to speak.

Mr. HAWKE: I am seeking information in regard to this grievance debate. I want to know whether "members" includes Ministers. If so, it seems to me that the amendment of the Premier is not really necessary.

The SPEAKER: I think I can explain the position. The member for Northam is probably correct, and it might be more accurate to say "each member other than a Minister." However, I think the committee's idea was that this provision was primarily to assist the back-benchers from both sides to submit any matter they feel should be submitted under this heading.

It was not the intention of the committee to provide either side of the House with any particular advantages and that is the reason the provision is confined to two speeches from each side of the House. If the suggestion of the member for Stirling is adopted, and the Minister can take the place of a Government back-bencher, you are obviously reducing the opportunity for Government back-benchers to speak.

Furthermore, I doubt very much whether the suggestion of the member for Stirling would meet the requirements of the Premier, because the Premier wants to be able to reply to each specific grievance.

Mr. Bickerton: If necessary.

The SPEAKER: I do not know whether I have answered the question of the member for Northam to his satisfaction. I think he is strictly correct, but it is assumed by the committee that Ministers would not want to air a grievance. The Premier's amendment is—

Page 28, line 13—Insert after the words "Each Member" the words "including the Leader of the Government or Member deputed by him to reply."

Amendment put and passed.

The SPEAKER: The Premier's next amendment is—

Page 28, line 19—Insert at the end of the proviso the words "This proviso does not apply to a Grievance Debate."

Amendment put and passed.

The SPEAKER: I believe the member for Victoria Park wishes to move a further amendment.

Mr. DAVIES: I am disappointed with the result of the previous amendment I moved. I explained my reasons at the time for moving it. The reception of the amendment merely substantiates the fears of the member for Mt. Hawthorn. He said there is a growing desire to take away from Parliament the right to bring matters before it. It looks as if we have now returned to the Government-Opposition situation whereas previously the matter was being discussed on a fairly non-party basis. However, in view of the reception of my first amendment, it would be a waste of time for me to move anything further.

Standing Order 167, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Order 167a, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 168 agreed to.

Standing Order 169—

Mr. GRAHAM: I would like to know what Standing Order 169 means, particularly clauses (2) and (3). I have not the foggiest idea what they mean.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We indulged in a lot of study on this. With due respect to the House, we had not heard of clause (3) either. We deleted it and then we reinstated it after we had carried out a lot of research and found that it served a useful purpose. I will deal with the clauses in their order in replying to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The first provision reads—

> 169. A Question may be superseded—
>
> (1) By the Adjournment of the House, either on the Motion of a Member "That the House do now adjourn," or on notice being taken, and it appearing that a quorum of Members are not present.

This is an obvious method of bringing a debate to an end. Clause (2) reads—

> (2) By a Motion "That the Orders of the Day be now read."

If there is a motion before the Chair, and the motion "That the Orders of the Day be now read" is moved, this enables the Chamber to dispose of the previous motion without defeating it. It simply disappears off the notice paper and the Chamber proceeds to the next business. Clause (3) reads—

> (3) By the Previous Question.

This is a method used in the House of Commons quite often when they want to censure a member without actually recording a vote against him. The debate is held and then the motion is moved, "That the previous question be put." It is a device to bring a debate to an end without taking a vote on it. Upon reference to *May*, we found it does serve a useful purpose. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition can accept my assurance on that.

Mr. Graham: I will accept it.

Standing Order 169 agreed to.

Standing Order 170 agreed to.

Standing Orders 170a and 170b, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Orders 171 and 172 agreed to.

Standing Order 173—

Mr. JAMIESON: I would like the comments of the committee on this. It seems to me to be merely a statement of fact. The Standing Order reads—

> 173. A Question for reading the Orders of the Day is superseded by the Adjournment of the House.

I'll say it is! As I have said, this is not a Standing Order. It surely is a statement of fact, because this actually happens. I would like some comments on it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If the honourable member refers back to clause (2) of Standing Order 169, he will see the words—

> By a Motion "That the Orders of the Day be now read."

The question is that the Orders of the Day be now read and this, in itself, is superseded by the adjournment of the House. It is merely procedural as to how to dispose of that motion.

Standing Order 173 agreed to.

Standing Orders 174 to 176 agreed to.

Standing Order 177, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Orders 178 to 183 agreed to.

Standing Order 184, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Orders 185 to 192 agreed to.

Standing Orders 193 to 195, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 196—

Mr. GRAHAM: I regret I will now be interrupting in several places the progress which we have been making. Without any explanation, because I think it is obvious, I move—

> Line 1—Delete the word "Previously" and substitute the word "Prior".

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 196, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Order 197 agreed to.

Standing Order 198—

Mr. GRAHAM: In order to conform with the processes I think the words "and locked" are superfluous. The doors are closed and attendants stand at each of them. Members do not force their way in or out of the Chamber. I think it is appropriate that the doors should be closed after a lapse of two minutes and no member shall enter or leave the House until after the division. I move an amendment—

> Lines 1 and 2—Delete the words "and locked".

The SPEAKER: I do not think there is any great significance in this. There is only one comment I wish to make and that is, I will not promise the member for Balcatta that I will alter my terminology of saying "lock the doors."

Mr. BICKERTON: The reason why the doors are locked is so that nobody can come into the House after a period of two minutes. If the doors are just closed, there is nothing to stop anyone from coming in.

Mr. JAMIESON: It is not advisable to delete these words. With a limited number of attendants, problems could arise. We do not have a great number of attendants and on occasions some of them could be away ill. If the doors are locked one attendant at each end can look after the situation. I do not think anyone

would complain that he had been locked out. I do not see anything wrong with the Standing Order as it is.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Standing Order 198 agreed to.

Standing Order 199—

Mr. GRAHAM: I move an amendment—

Line 4—Delete the words "take seats" and substitute the word "pass".

Everyone cannot take seats.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. GRAHAM: I move an amendment—

Line 7—Delete the word "party" and substitute the word "side".

Standing Order 202 refers to this as sides. I think there is one teller for each side.

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 199, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Order 200 agreed to.

Standing Order 201—

Mr. GRAHAM: I move an amendment—

Line 3—Delete the word "will" and substitute the word "shall".

This will conform with the verbiage which is used all the way through.

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 201, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Order 202, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Orders 203 to 208 agreed to.

Standing Orders 209 and 210, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 211 agreed to.

Standing Order 212—

Mr. GRAHAM: Members will note that precedence will ordinarily be given by courtesy to a motion for a vote of thanks to the House, but there are other motions which should be given precedence. I move an amendment—

Line 3—Insert after the word "House" the words "or for Valedictory or Condolence motions".

Members will appreciate that in the event of a bereavement it is customary to move such a motion.

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 212, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Orders 213 to 216 agreed to.

Standing Orders 217 to 219, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 220 agreed to.

Standing Order 221, as proposed—

The SPEAKER: I understand the Premier wanted the debate to finish at 11 p.m. I am wondering whether it is the wish of the House that we should continue.

Mr. BRAND: We can go through to the end of chapter 20.

Standing Order 221 agreed to.

Standing Order 221a, as proposed—

Mr. BRAND: In furtherance of what I said previously, I would like to insert the word "second" before the word "Wednesday" in line 2 of this proposed Standing Order, so that it will read, "each second Wednesday". I move an amendment—

Line 2—Insert after the word "each" the word "second".

Mr. Graham: Could I suggest that it should be amended to read, "at least every second Wednesday"?

Mr. BRAND: Why not just leave it at "second Wednesday" for the time being?

Mr. Graham: I was just thinking that if the new Government wanted to make it read, "at least every second Wednesday" the Standing Order would have to be altered.

Mr. BRAND: I think we will leave it in accordance with my suggestion.

Mr. BICKERTON: There is one point I would like the Premier to consider. I wonder whether he realised when he had this amendment in mind that if the House meets for about 4½ months, the session works out to about 18 weeks on a basis of four weeks to every month. If we altered the Standing Order so that grievance day would be held every second week it would mean that there would be roughly nine Wednesdays on which grievances could be heard. If the Standing Orders are suspended for a month before the House rises another two days must be deducted from that figure of nine, leaving a total of about seven grievance days if everything went well.

Standing Orders could be suspended five weeks before the end of the session, which would mean every fortnight from then. I wonder whether the Premier would try it out every Wednesday, and if not satisfactory we could make it every second Wednesday rather than do it the other way.

Mr. BRAND: I have lived long enough to feel it would be better to leave it as every second Wednesday. If this is not enough we can change it. One is very loth to remove something that has been already inserted. I am anxious to see the provision work. If it is not overdone, members will have sufficient opportunity to express their genuine grievances, and for my part I will undertake to have the matter considered later on if necessary.

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 221a, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Order 221b, as proposed—

Mr. BRAND: I move an amendment—

Line 1—Delete the word "each" and substitute the words "every second".

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Order 221b, as amended, agreed to.

Standing Order 221c, as proposed, agreed to.

Standing Order 221d, as proposed—

The SPEAKER: If the grievance proposition is to work satisfactorily it will require a fair degree of control from the Chair. It will again place some responsibility on the Whips because they will have to give some indication to the Speaker as to who will be speaking on each side that week. To give some indication as to what a grievance would constitute, I would point out that a grievance could relate to—

(1) A matter of some urgency, or about which satisfaction has not been obtained through the normal administrative channels.

(2) A matter that is too comprehensive to be encompassed in a question.

(3) A matter about which a decision of the House is not necessarily desired.

When there is no wish to move a motion—

(4) A matter to which the member does not wish to attach the importance of notice of motion.

(5) A matter which has not been the subject of debate in the House during the current session.

I do not suggest that these are the only grievances, but the committee agreed we should just give some indication as to what we had in mind.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I would like to delete the word "two" and insert in lieu the word "three." I move an amendment—

> Line 1—Delete the word "two" with a view to substituting the word "three".

Mr. DURACK: I wonder whether thought has been given to the problems associated with dividing the House into two sides, bearing in mind that there are three parties in the House at the moment.

The SPEAKER: The committee approached this matter with some degree of responsibility. The member for Perth himself suggested we should endeavour to curtail and streamline our procedures, and the committee felt that two members from either side of the House would be appropriate. We did not want to distinguish between the back-benchers from either side of the House. If we are to provide for all parties we could raise all sorts of inequalities, and the position could get out of hand. The Standing Orders Committee felt it had to decide on a number, and it decided on two.

Mr. DURACK: I am not concerned with the number but the division of the House into two sides. This would include an Independent member.

Mr. GUTHRIE: An Independent member sits on one side of the House or the other. That was why we got away from parties. At one time, when the member for South Perth was an Independent, he occupied a seat on the Opposition side. He was therefore deemed to be on the other side of the House.

Mr. BRAND: I oppose the amendment moved by the member for South Perth. Because we want this Standing Order to work we should not start off by enabling a large number of members to rise and speak, and thus develop a farcical situation. If this Standing Order proves to be of value, I will be the first to give it further consideration.

Mr. DAVIES: A farcical situation will not develop. The Standing Order providing for the grievance debate has been amended, and is now farcical. Assuming there are 24 or 25 members in the Opposition, and two members are allowed to speak on each occasion, under our present system there will not be sufficient opportunity for each member to speak even once during each session. Even with the holding of a grievance day on every Wednesday I doubt whether every member will have the opportunity to speak once each session.

It is quite clear that the Standing Orders Committee was aware that sufficient opportunity would not be available. Considering what we have given away in reducing the time for speaking on the Estimates and on the Address-in-Reply, what the Premier has proposed will in no way compensate for the loss. The whole procedure relating to grievance day is farcical, because of the limitation that is to be placed on members.

The least we can do is to agree to the added concession proposed by the member for South Perth in seeking to increase the number of speeches by one-third. If we are to do the best we can for the people whom we represent then it is not too much to ask for that. It is regrettable that the Premier has moved to have the grievance debate held once a fortnight; but, having agreed to his proposal, there should be three speakers from each side on any one day.

Amendment put and negatived.

Standing Order 221d, as proposed, agreed to.

New Standing Order—

Mr. BRAND: I move—

> That after Standing Order 221d, the following be inserted to stand as Standing Order 221e:—
>
> 221e. The Leader of the Government or Member deputed by him shall have the right to reply to each of the Members who has spoken under Standing Order 221b.

Motion put and passed; the new Standing Order agreed to.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Brand (Premier).

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 16th November, 1967

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (6): ON NOTICE

MARVEL LOCH SCHOOL

Closure

1. The Hon. J. J. GARRIGAN asked the Minister for Mines:
   (1) Is it the intention of the Government to close the Marvel Loch State School?
   (2) If the reply to (1) is "Yes," what alternative arrangements will be made for the education of children in the area?
   (3) Does the Minister agree that the closure of this school will adversely affect this small town?

   The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:
   (1) The matter will come under review during 1968, in response to local requests.
   No action will be taken until all parents concerned have been contacted and their opinions sought.
   (2) and (3) See answer to (1).

KALAMUNDA HIGH SCHOOL

Draining of Oval

2. The Hon. F. R. WHITE asked the Minister for Mines:
   (1) What action is proposed in regard to the draining of the new oval at the Kalamunda High School?
   (2) When will this drainage be completed?

   The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:
   (1) The proposal includes the provision of new channels and deepening of existing channels to divert the stormwater which at the present time flows on to the oval from surrounding higher land.
   (2) Funds are available and the work will be carried out in the near future.

WOOL EXPORTERS LIMITED

Availability of Report

3. The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON asked the Minister for Mines:
   (1) Is the Minister aware that farmers involved in the Wool Exporters case are having some problems regarding taxation liability?
   (2) As the result of this inquiry could have some influence on the position, could the Minister give any indication as to when the report of the Wool Exporters case is likely to be available?

   The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:
   (1) I have no knowledge of the matter but I imagine that this could well be so.
   (2) It is expected that the report will be received about the first week in December.

KALAMUNDA HIGH SCHOOL

Upgrading

4. The Hon. F. R. WHITE asked the Minister for Mines:
   (1) Is there any proposal to upgrade the Kalamunda High School from a three year to a senior high school?
   (2) If the reply to (1) is "Yes"—
      (a) when is it anticipated that construction will commence; and
      (b) when will fourth year students be admitted?

   The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:
   (1) and (2) Not at present. The upgrading of the Kalamunda High School has been given full consideration. The number of post-junior students is not sufficient to permit the introduction of the full range of upper school courses. Unless these courses are available the students will be at a disadvantage compared with the opportunities they now enjoy at the Governor Stirling Senior High School.

HOUSING

Albany: Suspension of Building Programme

5. The Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Mines:
   (1) Has the attention of the Minister for Housing been drawn to a statement appearing in an issue of *The Albany Advertiser* dated Monday, the 13th November, 1967, wherein a builder states that—
      (a) the State Housing Commission has halted its Albany building programme because it claims construction tenders are too high; and