

piece of legislation has been good, I think we should reintroduce it at the first opportunity in any manner that we can, whether by private legislation or by Government legislation. If, subsequently, the Attorneys-General from the other States think it is good legislation, then it can be added to their Statute books too. If it is on our Statute book for two or three months before the other States, surely no harm is done; only benefits can accrue.

I am not one who is at all happy to see finance being taken from the public by company directors with flamboyant advertising, and the companies going out of business within a few days, leaving the poor unfortunate investors who have put their money into the enterprises lamenting. Surely, if it is good enough to put some stability into big business; if it is good enough for a creditor to say, "I am prepared to give this company credit," then it is good enough to say that the parent company should have enough confidence in the subsidiary to let it stand on its own feet, or alternatively not to take any advantage in regard to giving credit to it. I think it is reasonable to assume that a person who extends credit to a company is almost a provider of capital and should never be disadvantaged. A person who advances credit puts forward a certain amount of new capital in the first instance.

If we carry on as we have been doing in Australia during the last two years—and there have been some very glaring instances—we will destroy the principle of credit. We will want a complete guarantee before anything is done on a basis of 30, 60, or 90 days, and I think that any arresting action that can be taken to stabilise public confidence in company administration is well worthy of support.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. R. C. Mattiske.

House adjourned at 5.42 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 10th September, 1963

CONTENTS

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY—

Acknowledgment of Presentation to Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator	865
---	-----

BILLS—

Beekeepers Bill—

2r.	872
Com.	875
Report	876

Firearms and Guns Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	892
Com. ; Report	893
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act Amendment Bill—2r.	877
Occupational Therapists Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	876
Com. ; Report	877
Offenders Probation and Parole Bill—	
2r.	893
Com.	911
Report	912

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—

Agricultural Fellowship—Appointment of Fellow	865
Beef Cattle—Population, Slaughtering, and Breeding Potential	867
Betting—Unclaimed Dividends : Amount Absorbed by T.A.B.	867
Building Heights—Restriction in Vicinity of Parliament House	868
Child Welfare—Delinquency : Availability of Committee's Report	868
Desalination of Bore Water—Installation of Plant at Yunderup	866
Education—Five-year High Schools : Enrolment Figures and Gymnasium Facilities	870
Electricity Supplies—Charges in Country and Metropolitan Areas	871
Eye Accidents—Incidence in Industry	867
Fluoridation of Water—	
Adoption and Discontinuance of Practice	870
Cost of Fluoride Tablets as an alternative	870
Use of Chris.Phos. as an alternative	870
Housing—	
"Southlea," "Westlea," and "Graham" Flats : Weekly Rental	865
Pensioner Flats : Allocation of Units at Swanbourne	868
Legislative Assembly Seats—Enrolments	871
Mining—Fitzgerald River : Mines Department Exploratory Work	867
Noxious Weeds—Checkpoints on Entry into Western Australia	865
Pastoral Stations—Registration Details	869
Police—	
Policeman at Darkan : Date of Appointment	867
Station at Kalgoorlie : Commencement of New Building	866
Railways : Standard Gauge Railway—	
Cost of Materials and Labour	871
Number of Employees	871
Television—Senate Select Committee's Inquiry	863
Tidal Power—Agreement with French Firm for Harnessing	866
Town Planning—	
Second City for Western Australia : Town or Site Suitable	871
Swan Location 2039 : Tabling of Papers re Lot 222	868
Workers' Compensation Rights—	
Knowledge of Laws Elsewhere	866
Orders-in-Council	866

CONTENTS—continued	Page
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—	
Firearms—Single Licenses	871
Fremantle Harbour Trust—Utilisation of Borrowing Powers	872
Totalisator Agency Board—Prosecution of Former Agent W. G. Donohoe	872
Weed Control Scheme—Conclusions from Geraldton Trial Group	872

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Acknowledgment of Presentation to Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator

THE SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I desire to announce that I waited upon His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator and presented the Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech at the opening of Parliament. His Excellency has been pleased to reply in the following terms:—

Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly: I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen and for your Address-in-Reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament.

I might add that I also conveyed to His Excellency the many appreciative references, made during the course of the Address-in-Reply, to his very courageous action and keen sense of duty which made it possible for him to open Parliament on this occasion. He told me that he is getting better and expects to be out of hospital in a week or so; and I think he was appreciative of members' regard for him.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

"SOUTHLEA", "WESTLEA", AND "GRAHAM" FLATS

Weekly Rental

1. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What weekly rental is being charged by the McNess Housing Trust for the flats at *Southlea* and *Westlea*?
- (2) What is the maximum weekly rental chargeable under the McNess Housing Trust Act?
- (3) Under what authority is the law being breached?
- (4) What steps are contemplated in order that the rentals of the *Southlea* and *Westlea* flats conform with the law?

- (5) What weekly rental would be payable by a widow occupying a flat at *Graham* if such widow came within the eligibility formula applying at *Southlea* and *Westlea*?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Dual flats—*Southlea*—25s. per week.
Single flats—*Southlea*—30s. per week.
Single flats—*Westlea*—30s. per week.
- (2) 12s. 6d. per week.
- (3) It was decided that the McNess Housing Trust be requested to assume administrative control of these projects. The honourable member has already been advised verbally by the Minister for Housing that it is intended to introduce legislation in this session of Parliament to deal with the question of rents.
- (4) Answered by No. (3).
- (5) "Graham" flats do not cater for widows as such. These flats were erected with Commonwealth-State finance in 1958 and it has been the policy to permit the surviving spouse occupying a flat in *Graham* to remain in occupancy at a rebated rent, which amounts to a figure in some cases as low as 13s. 6d. per week.

It must be remembered that the rent of the top floor of *Graham*, which is about one-third of the total project, is based on a figure higher than the economic rent, which assists the rebate cases.

AGRICULTURAL FELLOWSHIP

Appointment of Fellow

2. Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Agriculture:
 - (1) Has a fellow been appointed to the position of the Queen Elizabeth II Fellowship in Agriculture?
 - (2) If so, when will he take up his duties?

Mr. NALDER replied:

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

NOXIOUS WEEDS

Checkpoints on Entry into Western Australia

3. Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Agriculture:
 - (1) How many checkpoints for noxious weeds are there between the Eastern States and W.A.?
 - (2) Where are they situated?

- (3) Does he consider the number to be adequate?
- (4) Does he consider that there is any danger of noxious weeds being introduced into Western Australia through secondhand agricultural machinery?
- (5) If so, can any action be taken to eliminate this danger?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Two.
- (2) Fremantle and Kalgoorlie.
- (3) No. Consideration is being given to the establishment of a check-point on the Eyre Highway and the extent to which it is practicable for the Commonwealth, South Australia, and Western Australia to co-operate in this regard is being explored.
- (4) and (5) There must always be some risk with used machinery imported from other States. Much of such equipment has gone to the Esperance district where inspections have been possible.

The risk of introducing noxious weeds along with farm produce and machinery has been widely publicised, and systematic visits have been made to farms in the Esperance area, with a view to inspecting such items and also locating major weeds before they have had the opportunity to become widely established.

DESALINATION OF BORE WATER

Installation of Plant at Yunderup

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

- (1) Has he seen a report from the United States to the Water Research Foundation of Australia concerning the desalting of bore water, which states experiments have proved that it is possible to de-salt brackish bore water for a cost of 4s. per 1,000 gallons?
- (2) Will he have this report investigated with a view to consideration of a similar plant to be used at Yunderup?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes. All available information suggests a much greater cost than 4s. per 1,000 gallons. However, as requested, the matter will be looked into.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION RIGHTS

Orders-in-Council

5. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Have any Orders-in-Council been made pursuant to the powers contained in section 6 (5) of the

Workers' Compensation Act, 1912; if so, in respect of what countries have such orders been made?

Knowledge of Laws Elsewhere

- (2) What steps are taken to acquire an up-to-date knowledge of laws of other countries affording workers' compensation rights to dependants of deceased workers, so that, where appropriate, His Excellency the Governor may be advised so as to enable him to determine the question "If the Governor is satisfied" in accord with the terms of the subsection?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) One in respect of New Zealand; three others are pending.
- (2) Information as to the relevant laws of all countries desirous of operating reciprocally is obtained through the consuls or other diplomatic representatives.

POLICE STATION AT KALGOORLIE

Commencement of New Building

6. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) When is it likely that work will commence on the building of a new police station in Kalgoorlie?
- (2) If the date has not yet been finally determined, would he outline the details as to the allocation of funds for this purpose?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) and (2) It will be listed for consideration in the 1964-65 loan works programme.

TIDAL POWER

Agreement with French Firm for Harnessing

7. Mr. TONKIN asked the Premier:

- (1) Has the Government entered into an agreement with the French firm Sogreah or any other firm in connection with further investigations or assistance concerning the harnessing of tidal power north of Derby?
- (2) If "Yes," what are the terms and conditions?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) See answer to No. (1). I might add that discussions are taking place in regard to this project.

FITZGERALD RIVER*Mines Department Exploratory Work*

8. Mr. HALL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has any exploratory work been carried out by the Mines Department, or other persons, at Fitzgerald River?
- (2) If so, what were the findings relative to coal and iron ore deposits, and oil potential?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) The department and a number of private concerns have explored the Fitzgerald River area for minerals on various occasions over the last 60 years.
- (2) There is no petroleum potential and little iron ore potential in this area. A thin seam of poor-grade coal has been tested and found to be uneconomic.

EYE ACCIDENTS*Incidence in Industry*

9. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Is he aware the statistics for the year 1961-62 reveal that there were 387 males and five females with injuries to the eyes, classified as "industrial accidents"?
- (2) If he is aware of the statistics, relevant to eye injury in industry, will he undertake to have research made with a view to eliminating or reducing the incidence of same?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) The comprehensive statistics gathered for the first time in Western Australia reveal these figures.
- (2) The statistics are being examined very carefully by the factory inspectorate and safety officer with a view to further research into the incidence and causation of eye accidents.

BEEF CATTLE*Population, Slaughtering, and Breeding Potential*

10. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What is the beef cattle population in the agricultural area of this State—
 - (a) males; and
 - (b) females?
- (2) How many—
 - (a) female; and
 - (b) male

cattle were slaughtered, from the agricultural area, for the years 1961-62 and 1962-63?

- (3) Are records kept as to breeding potential of slaughtered cattle from the agricultural area?
- (4) If so, what was the number of potential breeders slaughtered for the years 1961-62 and 1962-63—
 - (a) male; and
 - (b) female?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) As at the 31st March, 1963, beef cattle in the agricultural areas of this State comprised:
 - (a) 140,928 males; and
 - (b) 258,101 females.
- (2) It is estimated that—
 - (a) 120,856 male; and
 - (b) 43,913 female
 beef cattle from the agricultural areas were slaughtered for the year 1961-62. Later figures are not available.
- (3) No.
- (4) Answered by No. (3).

BETTING: UNCLAIMED DIVIDENDS*Amount Absorbed by T.A.B.*

11. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) What is the total amount of unclaimed dividends which have been taken into the funds of the T.A.B. since its establishment?
- (2) Of this amount, how much is in connection with the operations of the board for the twelve months ended the 31st July, 1963?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) £58,818.
- (2) £43,649.

POLICEMAN AT DARKAN*Date of Appointment*

12. Mr. H. MAY asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) Having regard to my previous representation in connection with having a policeman stationed at Darkan, will he say if the date of this appointment can be expected soon?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) and (2) Owing to many other urgent calls on the manpower available to the department, it is not proposed to station a constable at Darkan permanently in the foreseeable future.

Arrangements have been made for more extensive patrols of this area from Williams.

SWAN LOCATION 2039

Tabling of Papers re Lot 222

13. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Will he lay upon the Table of the House all papers dealing with application for, objections to, and granting of the subdivision of Lot 222 of Swan Location 2039, corner of Mt. Prospect Crescent and Falkirk Avenue, Maylands?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes—for one week.

The file was tabled for one week.

BUILDING HEIGHTS

Restriction in Vicinity of Parliament House

14. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Will he give consideration to imposing a restriction on the height of buildings between Parliament House and the Swan River?
- (2) Does he agree that, if the erection of multi-storey flats continues in this area, the aesthetic aspect from Parliament House will ultimately be destroyed, and that Parliament House will be overshadowed?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) The imposing of restrictions on the height of buildings between Parliament House and the Swan River is primarily the responsibility of the Perth City Council. However, the Town Planning Department has had this matter under consideration.
- (2) Without an overall plan this can only be a matter of opinion.
- (3) Answered by No. (1).

TELEVISION

Senate Select Committee's Inquiry

15. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has he received a letter from the chairman of a Senate Select Committee set up for the purpose of "Encouragement of Australian productions for Television"?

- (2) Did the chairman of the committee request him to supply the committee with information relative to the probable needs of the State Education Department in the field of television?

- (3) Has he supplied the committee with the information requested?

- (4) If not, does he intend to supply the information to the committee? If so, when?

- (5) Does he know that the Select Committee must present its report to the Senate on or before the 30th October, 1963?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No; but the Chairman of the Australian Council of Ministers for Education did.

- (2) No; but a personal approach was made by the chairman to the director-general.

- (3) and (4) No; but I understand that the persons mentioned in the answers to questions Nos. (1) and (2) did.

- (5) No.

PENSIONER FLATS

Allocation of Units at Swanbourne

16. Mr. D. G. MAY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) In connection with the pensioners' flats now completed at Swanbourne, how many units have been allocated?
- (2) What is the anticipated date that all units will be occupied?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) 72.
- (2) All occupied.

CHILD DELINQUENCY

Availability of Committee's Report

17. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Child Welfare:

- (1) Is a report available from the committee dealing with child delinquency?
- (2) When will members of Parliament be supplied with a copy of the report?
- (3) Is it usual to supply members of the public with copies of such reports before members of Parliament sight same?
- (4) Where can the general public purchase copies of the report?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Copies are available now.

- (3) This was not a statutory document to be laid on the Table of the House. All members of Parliament were included in the mailing list.
- (4) At the Child Welfare Department.

PASTORAL STATIONS

Registration Details

18. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice: In respect of each of the following pastoral stations:—

The Nicholson Grazing Co. Pty. Ltd.;
Gordon Downs Ltd.;
The Turner Grazing Co. Pty. Ltd.; and
Ord River Ltd.

that are classed as "foreign" under the Companies Act, would he please indicate, from information required under section 346 of the Act to be lodged with the Registrar of Companies—

- (a) the place of incorporation or initial registration;
- (b) a list of its directors and those directors (if any) resident within the State, who are members of the local board of directors;
- (c) names and addresses of persons resident in this State who possess a power of attorney or like power, authorised on its behalf to accept any notices required to be served on the company; and
- (d) the Western Australian agent in any case?

Mr. COURT replied:

The Nicholson Grazing Company Pty. Ltd.

- (a) Incorporated in New South Wales.
- (b) As at the 27th June, 1963:
Alison Seymour Bingle, 35 Macquarie Street, Chatswood, N.S.W.
Edwin John Bowater, "Holmbury", Blackhills, Esher, Surrey, England.
James Maurice Hall, 9 Dettman Avenue, Longueville, N.S.W.
Henry Holland, 4 Beresford Crescent, Bellevue Hill, N.S.W.
Peter John Stanley Morris, 54 Elizabeth Gardens, Holdsworth Avenue, Elizabeth Bay, N.S.W.
Geoffrey Cochrane Remington, 58 Shirley Road, Wollstonecraft, N.S.W.

- (c) Memorandum of appointment to Robert Walter Wilson, 298 Crawford Road, Inglewood.

(d) Robert Walter Wilson.
The Turner Grazing Company Pty. Limited.

- (a) Incorporated in New South Wales.

- (b) As at the 27th June, 1963:
Alison Seymour Bingle, 35 Macquarie Street, Chatswood, N.S.W.

Edwin John Bowater, "Holmbury", Blackhills, Esher, Surrey, England.

James Maurice Hall, 9 Dettman Avenue, Longueville, N.S.W.

Henry Holland, 4 Beresford Crescent, Bellevue Hill, N.S.W.

Peter John Stanley Morris, 54 Elizabeth Gardens, Holdsworth Avenue, Elizabeth Bay, N.S.W.

- (c) Memorandum of appointment to Robert Walter Wilson, 298 Crawford Road, Inglewood.

(d) Robert Walter Wilson.
Gordon Downs Limited.

- (a) Incorporated in the Northern Territory.

- (b) As at the 22nd June, 1962:
Alison Seymour Bingle, Flat 1, 120 Ocean Street, Edgecliffe, Sydney, N.S.W.

Reginald Stephen Beak, Avenida Roque, Saenz Rena, 788, Buenos Aires.

Eric Gerard Durack, Parap, Darwin, N.T.

Peter John Stanley Morris, 40 Dorset Street, Epping, N.S.W.

Allan Francis Newton, 19 Malga Avenue, East Roseville, N.S.W.

- (c) Memorandum of appointment to Robert Walter Wilson of 298 Crawford Road, Inglewood.

(d) Robert Walter Wilson.
Ord River Limited.

- (a) Incorporated in the Northern Territory:

- (b) As at the 22nd June, 1962:
Alison Seymour Bingle, Flat 1, 120 Ocean Street, Edgecliffe, Sydney, N.S.W.

Eric Gerard Durack, Parap, Darwin, N.T.

Peter John Stanley Morris, 40 Dorset Street, Epping, N.S.W.

Allan Francis Newton, 19 Malga Avenue, East Roseville, N.S.W.

James Flynn, 23 Rue des Halles, Paris.

(c) Memorandum of appointment to Robert Walter Wilson of 298 Crawford Road, Inglewood.

(d) Robert Walter Wilson.

FLUORIDATION OF WATER

Cost of Fluoride Tablets as an Alternative

19. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) What would be the cost per 100 to the Government to issue flouride tablets free to the public?

Use of Chris.Phos. as an Alternative

- (2) Has the possibility of fluoridating table salt with Chris.Phos., available retail at approximately 13s. for 80 lb., been investigated, and if so, with what result or recommendation?

Adoption and Discontinuance of Practice

- (3) Which countries and towns in those countries have fluoridated water supplies?
(4) Which towns have since discontinued this practice?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) The cost of fluoride tablets for over 200,000 children and the 20,000 expectant mothers needing them, would, on the basis of bulk purchase, approach £100,000 per annum. This does not take into account the cost of distribution.
(2) It has been considered; and it is known that individual families in the State are using it.

The addition of fluoride supplements to milk, salt, and bread have been investigated as alternatives to fluoridation of water supplies, particularly in areas where reticulated water supplies do not exist. These alternatives, however, are regarded as considerably less satisfactory from the viewpoint of uniform dosage and continuous administration.

- (3) According to the latest report on the Status of Fluoridation in the United States and Canada (Journal of the American Water Works Association, 1963, volume 55, pages 571-580), 1,329 water supply systems serving 43,700,000 people are distributing fluoridated water in those two countries alone. In addition there were 7,300,000 people drinking naturally fluoridated water. The communities and towns involved cover every State

of the Union and it is obviously impracticable to enumerate them in this answer; but much of the detail sought can be obtained in the report referred to.

In addition to the United States and Canada, fluoridation is in operation in communities in the following countries: Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong, Singapore, Japan, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Sweden, Finland, West Germany, East Germany, Russia, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, Panama, Venezuela, Paraguay, and the United Kingdom.

- (4) In the U.S.A. during the year reviewed in the above report, 80 new communities commenced fluoridation, nine resumed after previous discontinuance, and three discontinued during the year (located in Massachusetts, Minnesota, and West Virginia).

Altogether during the period 1945-1961, 99 communities—about 7 per cent. of the total fluoridating—discontinued fluoridation of water supplies, but 20 of these reinstated the measure.

FIVE-YEAR HIGH SCHOOLS

Enrolment Figures and Gymnasium Facilities

20. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the enrolment figure of each of the five-year high schools in Western Australia?
(2) At which of the above high schools are gymnasiums and adequate incidental facilities provided?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

Senior High School Enrolment

	Enrolment
(1) Albany	1,021
Applecross	1,545
Armadale	1,153
Bunbury	999
Busselton	361
Collie	498
Eastern Goldfields	1,086
Geraldton	665
Governor Stirling	1,486
Hollywood	1,051
John Curtin	1,565
Katanning	339
Kent Street	1,369
Manjimup	445
Merredin	348
Mt. Lawley	1,311
Narrogin	696
Northam	816
Perth Modern	1,452
Tuart Hill	1,509

- (2) Gymnasiums and adequate incidental facilities are provided at Albany, Armadale, Bunbury, Governor Stirling, John Curtin, Mt. Lawley, and Northam High Schools and Perth Modern School.

SECOND CITY FOR WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Town or Site Suitable

21. Mr. HALL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Has the Government given consideration to planning for a second city in the State of Western Australia?
- (2) If so, what towns were considered suitable for the development of such a project?
- (3) Has the Government made any firm decision as to where a second city should be built or developed?
- (4) If no action has been taken by way of planning, will the Government make such investigations, bearing in mind the need for such expansion and thought?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) See No. (1).
- (4) Not at the present time.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Charges in Country and Metropolitan Areas

22. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) What country towns and specific undertakings are supplied by the State Electricity Commission and assessed on a basis of country S.E.C. charges?
- (2) What is the total area classified as "metropolitan" by the S.E.C. for the means of assessing electricity charges?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) and (2) The commission's area of supply is shown on the map which is tabled.

Consumers in the area shown green are assessed at metropolitan rates, except in the case of Mandurah, Furnissdale, and Yunderup.

All consumers outside this green area and Mandurah, Furnissdale, and Yunderup, are assessed on the south-west rate.

The map was tabled.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY SEATS

Enrolments

23. Mr. TOMS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) What are the respective enrolments in the Legislative Assembly seats at the present time?
- (2) What increase or decrease has occurred in each electorate since the redistribution of boundaries?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) The information sought by the honourable member is lengthy and is therefore laid on the Table of the House.

The information was tabled.

STANDARD GAUGE RAILWAY

Cost of Materials and Labour

24. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Will he state the approximate breakdown into rails, sleepers, bridges, etc., and wages for the standard gauge railway?

Number of Employees

- (2) What is the approximate number of employees currently engaged on the project?
- (3) When is it expected the maximum number of employees will be engaged?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Materials including the cost of labour for production—

	£
Rails and fastenings	8,800,000
Sleepers	2,800,000
Bridges and culverts	2,200,000
Ballast	3,200,000
Fencing	200,000
Buildings	800,000
Signalling	2,500,000
Labour, including formation, track laying, etc.	9,500,000

This is exclusive of rolling stock, locomotives, etc.

- (2) Administration and design 75
and others 225

Note: Wet weather has had a marked effect on the labour force engaged on the Avon Valley earth-works.

- (3) 1965-1966.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

FIREARMS

Single Licenses

1. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Police:

Of the total number of firearms licensed in current issue, how many licenses in respect of one firearm per licensee are in issue?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

I thank the honourable member for prior notice of the question. The answer is: Approximately 44,000.

WEED CONTROL SCHEME

Conclusions from Geraldton Trial Group

2. Mr. D. G. MAY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has the trial group weed control scheme operating in the Geraldton district for the past three years reached any conclusions?

(2) If so, were they successful?

(3) Is it the intention to carry out this scheme in other districts?

Mr. NALDER replied:

I thank the honourable member for giving me prior notice of the question. The answers are—

(1) and (2) Yes.

(3) No decision has been reached in this regard owing to lack of funds.

FREMANTLE HARBOUR TRUST

Utilisation of Borrowing Powers

3. Mr. TONKIN: I regret it was not possible to give the Minister for Works some notice of this question, but the idea only occurred to me a few minutes ago. I desire to know whether the Fremantle Harbour Trust has utilised its borrowing powers which were conferred upon it in 1960.

Mr. WILD: It has to some extent, but I cannot tell the honourable member the exact amount that the trust has borrowed. I could check the figure and tell him before 5 o'clock; but I think that this year it was £100,000.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Prosecution of Former Agent W. G. Donohoe

4. Mr. TONKIN: Over a month ago I asked the Minister for Police some questions which he postponed on the ground that an inquiry was proceeding. In answering a subsequent question, without notice, as to whether he would make the information available when the inquiries had ceased, he said he did not think they would be protracted inquiries and he would make the information available. I ask him—

(1) Have the inquiries ceased?

(2) When does he expect to be in a position to make the information available?

Mr. CRAIG: I do not think the question was posed over a month ago.

Mr. Tonkin: It was asked on the 8th August.

Mr. CRAIG: It was in connection with a case on which a series of questions were asked.

Mr. Tonkin: It was on the 8th August.

Mr. CRAIG: I think it was later than that. However, I am not yet in a position to give the information sought; but as soon as I am, I will make it available to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

BEEKEEPERS BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 5th September, on the following motion by Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. SEWELL (Geraldton) [4.51 p.m.]: The preamble of the Bill before the House states—

An Act to make better provision for the eradication of Diseases and Pests among Bees, the orderly conduct of the industry, and for the improvement of the products of beekeeping.

I know members will wholeheartedly agree with the sentiments expressed in that preamble. As explained by the Minister when introducing the Bill, it will supersede the Bees Act; and when it is proclaimed, this legislation will be known as the Beekeepers Act. Most of the provisions contained in the existing legislation will be reprinted in the new Statute, many of these being only machinery provisions.

This Bill is designed to apply to people who make their living from the keeping of bees and the production of honey. It deals with the registration of beekeepers, which is very important. It also seeks to provide for the branding of hives and their removal from one site to another. People living in the north frequently see huge trucks coming from the south of the State transporting whole colonies of bees from the red gum forests in those parts to what are known as the ti-tree thickets which, I understand, are excellent for the production of honey. The Minister has mentioned the large amount of money which is brought to the State each year from the export of honey. Therefore, the industry deserves all the protection that can be given to it, and we should ensure that every effort is made to preserve it.

The Bill provides that every beekeeper, on learning of the occurrence of any disease in his apiary, shall report such disease immediately in writing, either to the senior apiculturist or to an inspector. We know that bees are subject to

certain diseases, such as the moth, and there are also diseases that affect the hives, which sometimes are destroyed completely. There is a provision granting power to an inspector to inspect the hives at any time, and if necessary to order their destruction. Restrictions are also imposed on the keeping and disposal of infected materials.

Another provision seeks to prevent any beekeeper from exposing new hives, combs, or honey in such a manner that they may attract bees to rob the hives. This is also an important provision. It is contained in clause 18, which reads as follows:—

A person shall not expose used hives, combs or honey in such a manner as may attract bees to rob from the hives, combs or honey; but nothing in this section prevents the exposure in an apiary of hives containing dry combs not containing honey, for the purpose of attracting, and catching, swarms of bees.

Members are aware, I feel sure, that there are persons in this industry who would not hesitate to steal honey from hives which do not belong to them.

A further provision also states that a beekeeper shall not keep bees in a hive other than that which is prescribed. Members will recall that last year in the Upper Swan district people engaged in the dried fruit industry were plagued with swarms of bees which spoilt their fruit as it was being dried. To prevent such an occurrence in the future there is a provision in the Bill which grants power to an inspector to order a beekeeper to remove his apiary if his hives are the cause of such nuisance. Anyone who has grown a grapevine, even in the backyard of his home, knows the damage that bees can do to ripening grapes.

There is a clause in the Bill which provides that unless water is available from natural sources, a beekeeper must provide a good supply of water for his bees. It is only commonsense for a beekeeper to ensure that his bees have a supply of good water because, by doing this, he is ensuring that they will not annoy other people by swarming around water tanks on private property.

I have read this Bill thoroughly, and its clauses are quite lucid to anyone who wishes to study them. As I have said, when this Bill is proclaimed the Bees Act will be repealed and this new legislation will take its place. I support the second reading.

MR. KELLY (Merredin-Yilgarn) [4.56 p.m.]: I will not have much to say on the Bill because, in fact, I have had very little time in which to study it. I know it seeks to repeal the Bees Act, and I think that is wise because many amendments have been made to that Statute over the years, and

it is time the legislation was consolidated. I understood the Minister to say the Bill met with the approval of the beekeepers' section of the Farmers' Union. I was wondering whether that section covered the whole of the beekeepers of the State.

Mr. Nalder: It represents by far the biggest percentage of the beekeepers in the State. It does not represent them all, but most of them.

Mr. KELLY: I was wondering what the position was, because I think the beekeepers have a separate organisation of their own, apart from those which form the beekeepers' section of the Farmers' Union, and I could not understand the differentiation between the Farmers' Union section of beekeepers and the Beekeepers' Association.

Mr. Nalder: I have never been approached by any other organisation.

Mr. KELLY: I take it that if the majority of the beekeepers are in favour of the Bill it should, by and large, come within the orbit of their requirements. The eradication of disease in the hives and among the bees themselves, of course, is vital to the industry, because I understand disease has been rather prevalent in recent years among some apiaries.

The production figures which the Minister supplied to the House were enlightening and they show that this is a very important industry, not only because of the quantity of honey produced, but also from the point of view of what it earns in our export trade. It is on that score we are gaining most from the industry. On the question of the production of honey for export, we have been lagging behind for some time with that which is sent to England.

When the Western Australian honey reaches England it is bulked with other honey and so loses its identity. I was wondering whether the Minister and the Government could not prevail on the Commonwealth Government to take steps to alter that situation. Our honey exports are in a similar category to a great deal of our wines which are exported to Britain. When the Australian wines reach Britain they also are bulked with wines from other countries; and, like honey, those wines lose their identity and are no longer known to be a Western Australian product. That is a great pity. We should be gaining some kudos from the honey we export overseas because the quality is excellent and it can take its place with honey produced in any other part of the world.

Some pressure should be brought to bear on the authorities who have to determine these things, in order that this method of disposing of Western Australian honey may be stopped. I suppose I can refer to several other industries in which a similar practice takes place, one of the most important

being the crayfishing industry, where almost entirely the crayfish tails are mixed with those from South Africa and other centres.

In principle it is time this State stood on its own feet in regard to its products. I would be pleased if the Minister would take this matter up very vigorously with the Commonwealth Government which determines these matters, to see whether it is possible to effect some alteration.

In this measure the provision requiring the registration of hives is a very important one; and as in any other industry where legislation has been promulgated, it is vitally necessary for the tools of trade to be registered so that a check can be made. There is nothing worse than to have a semi-efficient check on some producers, and not on all; with the proposed method of registration of hives, and the marking of hives, that could easily take place.

I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to another matter contained in the Bill. I notice that authority is to be delegated to inspectors to destroy hives, bees, and infected materials; and I am wondering whether that is not too wide an authority to vest in any one person. Undoubtedly, the prevention of the spread of disease is very important; but I am not very happy with the provision which seeks to confer on an inspector the power to destroy those things immediately, without reference to the Minister or other authority. In my hasty perusal of the Bill I could not find any provision which requires the inspector to make reference to anybody at all, before destroying the hives or the material. I think such a provision confers too much authority on an individual.

On many occasions an inspector has been in his particular job for some years and has wide knowledge of the industry, and such a person can be trusted to be fair and equitable in carrying out his duties. But there are some inspectors whom one could not trust with the heel in one's boot! I am not mentioning any particular industry when I say that, but there are one or two such inspectors. Personally I would become very indignant if such an inspector came on to my premises and dictated destruction.

I would like the Minister to inform me whether there is to be any overriding authority, because it is vitally important that such powers of destruction as I have referred to should not be vested entirely in one person. The Bill is mainly a precautionary measure, in the manner in which it has been presented to the House. I support the second reading.

MR. HALL (Albany) [5.3 p.m.]: This measure seeks to repeal the existing legislation. After conferring with the people connected with the industry, with the apiarists' society, and with the different

bodies linked with beekeeping, I found it was quite acceptable to them. They have not raised any objection, and are prepared to accept the Bill on the basis of trial and error for the future adjustment of the beekeeping industry.

Those people feel that with the progress which has been made, particularly in the field of air transport, in the boosting of Western Australia's overseas markets, and in the establishment of legislation for a Federal honey board, some protection is necessary for sustaining and for bringing about better housekeeping of the industry. Western Australia is one of the largest honey-producing States in the Commonwealth, and the prices received overseas today are much more lucrative than those received in the past; furthermore, our local market for honey is growing. All that has brought this field of primary industry into the same prominence as the other primary industries of this State.

I commend the Bill; and although it may contain certain disadvantages, I believe that as the people concerned with the industry are happy we should accept it, because amendments can be made to the legislation from time to time.

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [5.5 p.m.]: I thank members for their acceptance of this measure. I would like to make some comment on some of the points raised by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn, the first of which relates to the sale of Western Australian honey on the overseas market, especially in England, and the loss of its identity. Such a practice is not a new one, because it is found in other primary industries too.

In that respect I can refer to the sale of flour milled in Western Australia. A visit to any of the flourmills in the State will reveal that the flour loses its Western Australian identity before it leaves the mill. Quite a number of the mills at present are exporting flour to other countries, and such sales are made under certain conditions. One of the conditions is that the flour be bagged, and stamped with the brand of the importer of the flour. Although I am aware of the point raised by the honourable member, there is very little that we can do about it.

Wherever we can, we make sales of our primary produce. If these sales are made at a profit then we have to accept the conditions under which the products are sold. We all recognise the need for this State to use its products, especially the quality products, to advertise the commodities for which we are seeking export opportunity; but when a country or an organisation is agreeable to purchase our product, then, when the sale is made, they can do what they like with the product.

Western Australian honey is purchased in bulk. Mainly, it is used for blending with honey purchased from other parts of

the world, and there is very little that we can do to prevent the loss of identity. However, we have succeeded in selling Western Australian branded honey, because the Honey Pool has put up small cartons of honey extracted from particular types of tree. These cartons are branded accordingly, and are sold on the English market as a special product from Western Australia. I understand that quite a lot of honey is sold in this way. The bulk of the honey is sold in bulk form, and is used by the purchasers for blending with other honey.

Mr. Kelly: Don't you think Western Australian honey is of sufficiently good quality to stand on its own feet?

Mr. NALDER: I do.

Mr. Kelly: Why not make some effort to identify it?

Mr. NALDER: Every effort has been made to sell our honey under that condition; but as I indicated earlier when the honourable member was not in his seat, the loss of identity also applies to the flour produced in this State. In the mill the flour is bagged and branded with the stamp of the importer. Therefore, there is no way in which we can suggest to the people, say, in Ceylon, that the flour has come from Western Australia.

We make a sale of every product to the best advantage; but if it is sold in bulk, and is branded in the form I indicated, there is very little we can do to alter the practice. It is quite true that our honey loses its identity when it reaches Great Britain. I believe the same applies to the honey we export to Germany.

Reference was made by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn to the powers to be vested in the inspectors. I would like to point out there is ample precedent in other Acts which contain provisions similar to the one proposed in the Bill. It is quite a fair and reasonable provision, because an inspector would not just visit an apiary and order the destruction of hives or materials immediately. He would have to give a warning. If the honourable member looks at the provision he will find that whatever the inspector orders to be done has to be put in writing and presented to the owner. If after a period of time such destruction does not take place, the inspector can then either burn or destroy the hives and infected material. In that event, the cost—whether the destruction be carried out by the inspector or somebody else—will be borne by the owner. That is a reasonable provision, and I do not think any objection can be raised to it.

Mr. Kelly: In the provision the word "forthwith" is used.

Mr. NALDER: I draw the attention of the honourable member to clause 16 (2) which states that any direction given shall be confirmed by the inspector in writing.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. I. W. Manning) in the Chair; Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5 put and passed.

Clause 6: Inspectors may enter apiary and plant—

Mr. HALL: What identification will the inspectors have when they visit premises?

Mr. NALDER: The inspectors are known to the members of the beekeepers' association. I cannot tell offhand how many inspectors are employed, but their identity is known. Therefore, it is not necessary for them to wear any distinguishing badge, because in the past no difficulty has arisen.

Mr. W. Hegney: They should have an authority signed by you.

Mr. Cornell: How valid in law is that argument?

Mr. NALDER: If on an inspection an inspector finds disease in the bees and the need for destruction, he makes out the details in writing and signs the document. A period of time is given for the person to take the necessary action. The same thing applies with reference to stock inspectors. We have a lot of stock inspectors in the Department of Agriculture stationed at different places throughout the State. They go to a sale to inspect the sheep and are known to the various people in the industry. If a disease is found in any of the sheep or if, for any reason, the sheep should be taken from the saleyards, the inspector signs a document and hands it to the owner or the person handling the stock. The same thing applies in the beekeeping industry. There is no doubt at all that the people in the industry know who the inspectors are.

Mr. HALL: I do not think the Minister has made the position clear at all. Recently we discussed a similar action with regard to the marine stores Bill and we found that someone could wander around someone else's property. If the owner, at the time, is either not available or is not there and only his attendants are present, who is to authorise the inspector to go on to private property where bees are kept?

Mr. Craig: He would have to have a lawful excuse. It is covered under the Police Act.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 7 to 29 put and passed.

Schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 5th September, on the following motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Health):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park) [5.20 p.m.]: This Bill seeks to amend the Occupational Therapists Act which was passed by Parliament in 1957 and proclaimed to come into force from the 1st January, 1960. The Act provides the machinery for the official establishment of the Occupational Therapists Registration Board of Western Australia to regulate and control the training of occupational therapists in accordance with the curriculum laid down by the World Federation of Occupational Therapists. Upon successful completion of the course the board can grant registration to persons who are over the age of 21. Members of the Australian association are then eligible for individual membership of the World Federation of Occupational Therapists, and thus get world-wide recognition.

This is a very skilled profession which covers a far wider range than I was previously aware of. In a pamphlet entitled "Career Opportunities", issued by the Royal Perth Hospital, occupational therapy is described as any mental or physical activity given by the therapist and prescribed by a medical officer, to aid in the rehabilitation of a patient. It is concerned with the conditioning of the individual to a maximum work potential and capacity for normal living; and, where necessary, assessing him for placement in an occupation more suited to his ability.

The School of Occupational Therapy was established by the Royal Perth Hospital in association with the University of Western Australia and the Technical Education Division of the Education Department. The school itself is situated in premises opposite the main block of the Royal Perth Hospital in Wellington Street. The course extends over a period of three years, and I understand that the first two years are spent in theoretical and technical education, and the third in clinical practice with affiliated hospitals and institutions under the supervision of qualified occupational therapists.

It is not a cheap course by any means. In the pamphlet issued by the school it is pointed out that the three-year course costs something like £300 in tuition fees, plus additional costs of approximately £15

for materials, £10 for tools, £25 for textbooks, and £16 10s. for uniforms. There are other incidentals as well; so one can see it takes a considerable amount of time and money to successfully complete the course. The prerequisite educational qualifications necessary to even gain admittance to the course are matriculation of the University of Western Australia, or the Leaving certificate with English, one science subject, and three other subjects.

The examination subjects studied during the three-year course are anatomy, physiology, psychology, medicine, surgery, psychiatry, practice of occupational therapy, and therapeutic activities.

At present, of course, the board is unable to grant registration to persons under the age of 21 years. A person can have the necessary qualifications to be admitted to the course at the age of 17 or, in some cases, perhaps a few months younger; but generally between the ages of 17 or 18 they can be admitted, and are admitted, provided they have the necessary qualifications.

Members will see that with a three-year course the students can qualify before they reach the age of 21 years; but although they have the capacity, ability, and knowledge to carry out the duties of occupational therapists, they are unable to be registered. They can be used in a minor way, but I believe there is a difference in the salaries paid to registered and unregistered occupational therapists.

The amendment to section 8 of the Act will overcome this. The further amendment provides a legal safeguard where an occupational therapist is a minor. He or she cannot practise in his or her own right, but must practise under the jurisdiction of a person over the age of 21 who is registered with the board. As I said earlier, the Act was only proclaimed to come into force as from the 1st January, 1960, so the first students to graduate from the course that has been conducted by the board will be graduating this year. I understand there are approximately seven of them.

There is one person in the State already who is working at Royal Perth Hospital. This person did the course in Sydney, and although she is fully qualified she is unable to obtain registration. I spoke to this person, who is obviously very keen on the profession; and she is, indeed, very anxious to be able to be registered so that she can receive the world-wide recognition to which her qualifications entitle her. There are others who will be in a similar position at the end of this year when the first course graduates.

The course itself is exacting; and I believe the type of person who enters this profession is dedicated and must of necessity have a very high educational standard. The amendments appear to provide the necessary legal safeguards. I

feel it is only right that upon completion of training the occupational therapist, who in practically every case is within a few months of reaching the age of 21, should be entitled to the benefits of registration.

The board, of course, under the existing Act, has the right to refuse registration under certain conditions; so I do not feel there is any danger at all in providing for this registration of minors. I support the Bill.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Health) [5.28 p.m.]: Briefly, I would like to thank the honourable member for his support of the Bill and also for his discourse on the work done by the School of Occupational Therapy, which is set up under the auspices of the Royal Perth Hospital and the Medical School. I do not think there remains anything else for me to say.

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.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 5th September, on the following motion by Mr. Wild (Minister for Water Supplies):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.32 p.m.]: This Bill proposes a very drastic change in the functioning and operating of the metropolitan water supply system; and it is rather strange that in introducing a measure which proposes such a drastic alteration, the Minister should have given such a small amount of information, and should have done it in such a very short time. It took the Minister exactly eight minutes to propose this change. It took two years to get the Bill here, and eight minutes to launch it in the House.

Under the circumstances I find it difficult to believe that the Government is serious about this Bill. I well remember that the operations of the Metropolitan Water Supply Department were the subject of very violent controversy during the Darling Range by-election. There, it will be recalled, the Minister for Water Supplies went to a meeting and promised to give the district a water supply scheme; to do something which the Government had refused to pronounce on for some considerable time and in connection with which

the then member for the district had been making representations over a period of years. I recall his making representations to me. It was entirely a matter of ministerial decision as to whether or not that water supply scheme was put in, and at the time of the by-election the Minister announced that it had been decided the scheme should be put in.

I was conscious of the fact that a pronouncement had been made in the policy speech of the Government at the general elections that if the Government were returned, the Metropolitan Water Supply Department would be placed under a board which was to be free from political control. Therefore, I could not quite see how the Minister could go to Forrestfield and give an undertaking which he might not be in a position to carry out; because, obviously, if the Metropolitan Water Supply Department were to be placed under a board free from political control, that board would not be concerned with a promise which the previous Minister for Water Supplies had given.

Quite naturally, that was the line I took at my public meetings in the electorate. Labor had already made the declaration that it would put in a water supply scheme. I said that we would not change the administration of the department and therefore an undertaking being given by us would be an undertaking which would be honoured for certain. "But," I said, "you cannot place the same reliance upon the undertaking which has already been given by the Minister for Water Supplies, because he can get out from under. If he goes ahead and appoints this board, he will then be able to say, 'It was my intention to give you your water supply, but I am no longer in control and the board is not prepared to do it.'"

Representatives of every party held meetings in that electorate. At Forrestfield our meeting was the last and there were present at my meeting persons who declared at question time that they had been present at all three meetings. One of the persons who claimed to have been present at all three meetings made a remark which was uncontradicted by any person present. That remark was to the effect that the Country Party Minister who had been present at the Country Party meeting had said, "You need not be worried about this promise not being carried out, because the Country Party is not in favour of a board. It is not Country Party policy to establish a board, and therefore there will not be any board; and so the Minister will be able to carry out this promise." I understand that that Minister was the Minister for Education.

It is a shocking thing if the Minister deliberately misled the electors in connection with that point, which was vital to the election; and it is equally shocking if

he were speaking the truth on that occasion and it was the policy of the Country Party not to support a board, but, in the meantime, the Country Party has been subjected to pressure and it now has to kowtow to the Liberal Party in order that this promise given at the general election can be fulfilled, or some showing can be made of its being fulfilled.

That is not a figment of my imagination. That is in accordance with the facts. It cannot be denied that the Country Party's attitude was declared publicly at that meeting in order to gain support for its candidate at the election; and I firmly believe, Sir, that the Country Party was—and I hope still is—opposed to handing over this department to a board. It is very significant that a Bill of this kind was put on the notice paper last session, and it stopped there and was not proceeded with. If it is such a marvellous proposal; if it had the full support of the Government, why was it not proceeded with?

I suggest, Sir, it has taken 12 months to break down the opposition of the Country Party, which very truly was opposed to the handing over of the metropolitan water supply to a board, in connection with which it made a forthright declaration during the election. That forces me to the conclusion that this is a gesture only. The Government is not serious about it at all; and I would hope that is the true position—

Mr. Brand: You will see whether or not we are serious!

Mr. TONKIN: —because it will be a bad thing for this State if this half-baked proposal is ever put into operation.

Every proposal should have an objective. What is the objective of this proposal? According to the Minister it is that the functions and operations of the Metropolitan Water Supply Department shall be directed and controlled by a board. That is the objective which this Bill is supposed to achieve. Its functions and its operations shall be directed and controlled by a board. I submit that the Bill will not achieve that or anything like that, and I propose to show why.

According to the Minister this Bill has a prime purpose. I think that more correctly he should have said prime purposes, because having said that the Bill has a prime purpose he proposed to enumerate three things. Before I go on to deal with those three things, let us see what the word "prime" means. "Prime" means the chief, the most important, the fundamental. So the prime purpose of this Bill is its chief purpose, its main purpose, its fundamental purpose. What did the Minister say it was? He gave three purposes: Firstly—and I take it that this is in the order of importance—to widen the borrowing powers for use only as occasion demands; secondly, to enable ratepayer

representatives to gain and take a more intimate part in the functions and operations of the undertaking. What particular merit there might be in that, I have yet to see, but that was one of the purposes—one of the prime purposes. Thirdly—and this is a real joke—to give control unhampered by political influence.

Having delivered himself of those prime purposes, in the very next breath the Minister said, "The board will be subject to the Minister." It is going to be unhampered by political control, yet it is going to be subject to the Minister. He said, "The Minister is necessary as a liaison between the board and Parliament, and also to have final control in the event of extraordinary circumstances arising." The Minister is to have final control.

If one looks at the Bill one will find that the whole administration of the board is subject to the Minister, to start with—its whole administration. The board's powers are to hold and dispose of real and personal property. But if it wants to buy personal property exceeding a value of £50,000 it has to seek the Minister's approval. If it wants to sell property exceeding £50,000, it cannot do so without the Minister's approval. Unhampered by political control, mark you!

If it wants to enter into a contract to do anything, and the contract exceeds £50,000, it must get the Minister's approval. Therefore, if it wanted to let a contract to put a water supply into Forrestfield it could not do it without the Minister's approval. Yet this is unhampered by political control! What a ridiculous situation! To all intents and purposes it will be subject to the same amount of political control as it has been up to now, with this exception: That the board will be able to levy what rates it likes, but it will have to take the responsibility. Then the Minister can say, "It is nothing to do with me. It is nothing to do with the Government. The board levies the rates." That is the purpose of this.

It is not unhampered by political control; it is to relieve the Government of the political consequences of imposing too high a rate. Why, the thing is a farce! For the Minister to get up and seriously talk about the board being unhampered by political control, and then to find that it is fettered all the way down by ministerial control, makes one wonder what the Minister is up to.

Why, the very Bill says the general administration is subject to ministerial control—the ordinary work of administration. The Government will determine the remuneration to be paid to the members of the board; the Government may terminate the appointment of any member of the board whenever it suits the Government; in other words, the members are completely subservient to the Minister and

the Government; they have no security of tenure of office. Can they be expected to take a fearless line in their work on the board if they have no security of tenure, and if they can stay there only so long as they please the Minister? Why, the board cannot even appoint its own general manager! The Government is to appoint a general manager of the board. The Government is to appoint the secretary to the board. Yet we are told it will be free and unhampered by political control.

It does not stop with the appointment of the manager and the secretary. The Bill also says the Government may appoint such other officers as are necessary. What is the board going to do? The Minister controls the borrowing. The board cannot determine that it will raise a loan and go ahead and do it, because it is subject to ministerial control as to terms, as to the interest to be paid, and as to the purpose for which the money is to be used. Could there be any more ministerial control than that?

We give the board borrowing powers and then the Minister says, "I will control your borrowing powers—firstly, on the terms as to which you will borrow; then as to the interest which you will pay; and, thirdly, as to the purpose for which you are going to use the money when you have it." If that is unhampered by political control the word has suddenly been given a new meaning as far as I am concerned.

The Minister will also determine the manner of repayment of the money; in other words, everything that the board will do in connection with borrowing money will be subject to ministerial control; everything. The borrowing of the money, the amount to be borrowed, the interest to be paid, and the purpose to which the money is to be put, and the method of repayment will all be subject to ministerial approval. Yet we are given this poppycock that one of the prime purposes of the Bill is to make sure that the operations of the board will be free and unhampered by political control.

I have endeavoured to ascertain what are the conditions applying in connection with the persons who might be appointed to this board. Firstly, the Perth City Council is to be allowed to select somebody. I have not been able to conclude, without any doubt, whether the person selected by the Perth City Council must be a councillor. It seems to me he can be anybody who is suitable to the Perth City Council; and if that is so he need not necessarily be a ratepayers' representative.

Then again, what is the position regarding the two members who are selected from a panel of names submitted by the Local Government Association? It is clear that in the first place these two members must actually be connected with local government either as mayor, as president,

or as councillors. But the Bill does not say that when they cease to be on the council they shall no longer retain their right to remain members of the board. So I visualise there might be a member of a council who is appointed, say, in January, but loses his seat at the following election, and who then obviously is no longer representing the ratepayers. But he will still remain on the board.

Then comes the question of reappointment after three years. In my opinion the Bill is not explicit on this point, and I have not been able to conclude, definitely, whether a person who is a member of a local authority when first appointed can or cannot be reappointed at the end of his term if he is no longer on the local authority. I see nothing in the Bill which says he cannot be reappointed. It simply says that at the time of his appointment he must be a member of a local authority. If he ceases to be a member six months afterwards, but does not lose his membership on the board, I see no bar to his reappointment subsequently.

Therefore we could have a situation where the three persons who were originally put on the board to represent ratepayers were no longer representatives of the ratepayers, but were still on the board. If that is so, then the primary purpose is completely lost as well; because there are no ratepayers' representatives in a position to take and to hold a direct interest in the operations of the board.

On that question, what particular knowledge of running a big undertaking like the Water Supply Department would one expect to find in some members of local authorities who take a prominent part in their deliberations? They might be proficient in debating and on matters of local interest, but it does not necessarily follow that they would be competent to run a big show which is spending millions of pounds and which is levying rates on thousands of consumers. So I cannot be told that that is any improvement on a department which has administered this undertaking successfully in Western Australia; and shortly I will point out that the department has run the show more successfully than the Metropolitan Board of Works in Victoria.

Another point which needs clarification is that relating to the dismissal of members of the board who, quite unwittingly, may find themselves caught up in a business deal which, to them, is prohibited. The Bill seeks to provide that if the board enters into a contract which is likely to benefit any member of the board and ministerial approval has not been obtained for that contract, the person who is to benefit directly or indirectly from it automatically forfeits his position on the board. An officer of the board could make such a contract for £5,000, £10,000, £15,000, or

£20,000, which does not require ministerial approval, and without knowing that one of the members of the board was connected with the firm which was getting the contract. That fact alone would disqualify that member from remaining on the board.

In local government there are many businessmen engaged in all kinds of businesses under firm names in many instances—not their own names. So we could have the situation where the manager of the board lets a contract for £5,000 or £10,000, which does not require ministerial approval, and after letting it discovers that one of the members of the board is connected with the firm that has won the contract. That member is then taken off the board. However, he should have some protection, so that if he is likely to suffer he should be given an opportunity to say he does not want the contract. It is too late for him to reject it when he finds he is off the board because a contract has been entered into by a board officer and about which the board member knew nothing.

I would think that if there is to be an argument in favour of the establishment of a board instead of the department, we ought to be shown how the consumers are to benefit. We ought to be shown how those who pay the rates and who get the supplies are likely to benefit from the change in administration; because if they are not to benefit what possible justification could there be for the change? I think I have exploded this myth about unhampered ministerial political control, so that is no benefit. I will concede that there may be some benefit obtained when it comes to borrowing, but I think it will be more than offset by the cost of the money that is obtained. The criterion surely should be: To what extent will this change benefit the State of Western Australia and its people? I cannot see a single argument in favour of it.

The Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works has been in existence for a very long time. It has extensive borrowing powers; but it has fallen down badly with the work it has undertaken, because it is years behind with sewerage and water supply services. Questions on this matter were asked in the Victorian Parliament to obtain information on how successful the board had been in Victoria. On page 231, vol. 261 of the 1960-61 Victorian *Parliamentary Debates*, Mr. Holland (Flemington) is shown as asking the following question:—

1. What was the recorded number of—

(a) pan services; and

(b) septic tank installations, in each individual municipality in the Metropolitan Health District for each of the years 1958 and 1959?

2. What was the recorded number of each of the following infectious diseases—

and in setting these out the honourable member was trying to show an association between these diseases and the continued existence of the extensive pan services. The reply he was given set out some thousands of pan services in the metropolitan area because the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works was unable to find the money to replace these services with sewerage installations.

The matter was again raised later in the session and I now quote from page 271 of the same volume of the Victorian *Parliamentary Debates* as follows:—

MR. HOLLAND (Flemington) asked the Minister for Local Government—

What number of houses in the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works area during each of the years 1958 and 1959 was not connected to the reticulated water supply?

The reply was—

As at 30th June, 1958—1,066.

As at 30th June, 1959—1,141.

Included in the buildings not supplied with water are—

- (1) Scattered houses on the outskirts of the metropolis in areas to which water supply reticulation has not been extended.
- (2) Sundry rateable buildings which are not habitable dwellings, e.g., tennis court pavilions, small sheds on rateable land.

The question was raised again by Mr. Holland on the Budget debate, and I quote his remarks from page 303 of this same volume—

Obviously, the Government is preparing to adopt a similar course in connexion with the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works as, last year, it increased the ceiling in regard to rates. There was such a "hullabaloo" in this Chamber concerning the proposal that we were able to exact a promise from the Government that there would be no rate increases last year.

Mr. Holland went on and pointed out that, despite the fact that the board had ample borrowing powers, it was always short of money with which to carry out essential works; and there were instances in Victoria where some new houses in the metropolitan area had been erected for more than 12 months, and the occupants were unable to get a water supply. The situation with regard to sewerage installation was even worse.

I submit we have never, in the history of our own department, been in a situation as bad as that. It is true that in some areas remote from the city centre water supplies have not yet been installed—Forrestfield is one of them. But when one considers the population in the metropolitan area here, and compares it with the population in Melbourne; and when one takes into consideration that in addition to being able to obtain loan funds on a much more lavish scale than is possible in Western Australia; and the fact that the board had its own borrowing powers, and was still unable to ensure to the people a proper water supply service and sewerage installation, one can appreciate the sort of position that can develop.

The Government has said—and it puts this purpose as No. 1 in its prime purposes—that this Bill will enable the board to borrow. It may do. But there are some disadvantages. We put through a Bill in 1960 to enable the Fremantle Harbour Trust to borrow. The Minister told me this afternoon that in 1961-62 the Fremantle Harbour Trust borrowed £200,000; and in 1962-63 it borrowed £225,000.

I take it the trust borrowed that from private sources, because it has not endeavoured to raise a public loan. It is possible that in taking that money from private sources it will be making it increasingly difficult for an undertaking like the State Electricity Commission to continue to fund its loan. However, in *The West Australian* of the 6th September, I read the following, under the heading "5 Extra Berths Delayed A Year":—

The Fremantle Harbour Trust's plans to construct five up-river berths will be delayed at least a year, general manager F. W. E. Tydeman said yesterday.

He said the trust had hoped to start preliminary dredging almost immediately but it had now been told that no money would be available this financial year.

Why does it not borrow some money? If this is to be the solution; if the borrowing powers are to enable the department to do more work and relieve the Treasury, why does not the Fremantle Harbour Trust get on with the job and borrow some money? Apparently it wants these berths. It had intended to put them in, and the only reason it is not putting them in this year is that it has not got the money.

So it looks to me as if one inevitable result of this change will be that the Government will throw the water board more on to its own resources; and instead of its having more money with which to do this work, it will have less. So we will have a repetition of the situation which has occurred in Victoria, where there are houses built in the metropolitan area, and

where the people cannot get a water supply laid on because there are no funds with which the board can do the job.

It is such a hollow pretence to suggest that clothing the board with borrowing powers will enable it to get on with the job better, because the Fremantle Harbour Trust has been established as a board for many years; it knows its way about, and it has delayed necessary and essential work because it has no money. It is also controlled by the same Minister who will control this board. Why does not the Minister say, "Get on and borrow some money; get on with the job!" He accepts the situation that the trust has no money; and that will be precisely the position with the board that is to take over the metropolitan water supply. The Government will say, "We have given you borrowing powers; so your allocation from the Treasury will be less." We will then find that the work done will be less.

Let us have a look at the cost. Members know that money obtained from the Government costs 5½ per cent.—4½ per cent. interest and ½ per cent. sinking fund. That is the total cost of the money to the department. There is no brokerage, and no underwriting fees. As interest is one of the biggest charges in the budget of the department, every ½ per cent. means quite a lot of money. What will loan money cost the department—and this is the reason why the Fremantle Harbour Trust does not want to borrow money for this job—and also the ratepayers?

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, every additional £10,000 in the cost of running the show must be recouped by the board from the consumers. There is no other way to meet it. The board will get no subsidy from the Government. It will have to finance its operations; and if it costs the board more to carry out its operations, it will have to recover the money from the consumers.

Let us have a look at the cost of doing these works. When the State Electricity Commission—which operates gilt-edged securities—goes on the market it provides an interest rate of £4 17s. 6d. per cent. for a short term; £5 per cent. for a little longer term; and £5 2s. 6d. for a term of 16 years.

To that 5½ per cent. we must add at least 1 per cent. for underwriting charges to firms like Ian Potter & Co., and another ½ per cent. for brokerage. The money is borrowed for 10 or 12 years; it is used; and at the end of 12 years one has to pay the people from whom one borrowed. The department does not have to pay the Government the ½ per cent.; the sinking fund looks after that.

But if the board borrows—and let us assume it borrows for a period of 10 years—at the end of 10 years it must borrow again to repay the lenders. So there is another 1 per cent. for underwriting

charges, and another $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. for brokerage. Let us take an illustration. Let us say the board borrows £1,000,000 in 1964. The total charges are 5 per cent. to the public, to which must be added another $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. for brokerage and underwriting charges. So the board is up for $6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. to start with. According to this Bill it has to charge another 1 per cent. sinking fund. So there we have a charge of $7\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. to the ratepayers, as against $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.

At the end of 10 years, after it has spent that money, it will have to borrow another £1,000,000 to carry the loan on. So, to the $7\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. we add another $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., which means that we are now up to $8\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. At the end of another 10 years the board must borrow another £1,000,000, to which must be added $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., which means it is up for $9\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. for its original loan.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. TONKIN: Before the tea suspension I quoted from figures to show the extra cost involved in carrying out the operations of the Water Supply Department, if it were placed under a board and if the board had to borrow money. In order to see the figures clearly, and to realise their import, it is necessary to average them out.

I calculate that if we were to assume the board borrows at the rate of £500,000 a year—that would not be a lot of money for the board to borrow if it had to do much work and relieve the Government of its obligation—then at the end of 20 years it would be paying 6.875 per cent. for the whole of its money, as against $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. which is now being paid. That would mean the interest bill would be increased by £162,500 a year, assuming that the rates remained the same in respect of money from the Government and money from outside. If there was no increase in the money from the Government there would be a corresponding increase in the amount of money obtained from private sources.

So we can disregard any difference there, and revert to the figures I quoted. If the department carries on, as it is now carrying on, and obtains its money at $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.—that is $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. plus $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. sinking fund—and assuming it is superseded by a board, and the board borrows, say, on a 10-year term at the ruling rate of interest plus underwriting fees and brokerage and assuming further it borrows approximately £500,000 a year, then at the end of 20 years, when it has borrowed £10,000,000, its interest bill will be £162,500 more than would be the case if it remained as a department as it is at the present time.

The interest is a very large proportion of the cost of running the department. I have here the annual report of the department for the year ended the 30th June, 1961. On page 9, under the heading of "Finance", the following is stated:—

Interest and sinking fund charges for the year ended 30th June, 1961, totalled £1,320,430, representing 47.5 per cent. of the year's income, and consisted of interest on capital £1,079,657

On page 51 of the report are shown some diagrams. They reveal that for the year 1958-59, interest absorbed 42.04 per cent. of the total expenditure of the department; for 1959-60 the figure was 42.05 per cent. of the expenditure of the department; and for 1960-61 the figure was 40.35 per cent. of the expenditure. On the figures I quoted earlier, if the board is established and borrows £500,000 a year for 20 years, then at the end of that period, with this increased interest bill of £162,500, its interest charge would rise by more than 30 per cent. As the interest charge represents at least 40 per cent. of the expenditure of the department, members can appreciate what it will mean to the board if its interest bill is increased by 30 per cent. For what corresponding advantage would that be?

This increased charge must be recovered from the consumers. So it is inevitable that this proposition will bring about an increase in rates; and, on the experience of Melbourne, I would say it will bring about not as efficient a service.

I quoted earlier from the Victorian *Parliamentary Debates*. Some questions were being raised by the member for Flemington (Mr. Holland). I quote again from the same volume, page 307, in which, on the 28th September, 1960, he said:—

I have asked questions on notice relating to the number of houses in the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works area not connected to the reticulated water supply and to the recorded number of pan services and septic tank installations. The Board finds it easiest to keep pace with water services, but it still has not made connections to more than 1,000 houses. As regards sewerage, I have been informed that the totals of unsewered houses in the metropolitan area for the last few years have risen from 66,000 in 1957 to 74,000 in 1958, 82,000 in 1959, and 85,000 in 1960.

It was clear that the board in Melbourne was going from bad to worse. Instead of picking up the leeway, it was falling further behind in the services which it should have rendered to the metropolitan area of Melbourne. This was a board which had borrowing powers to make good

any deficiency in funds coming from the Government. Mr. Holland went on to say—

Those properties have pan services, and, in addition, 32,000 houses have septic tanks. I point out these facts to show just how far the Board of Works is dropping behind, and this is an indication of the manner in which the public sector in this State is unable to cope with the duties thrust upon it.

Are we to follow that example and establish a board here which will suffer the same disabilities? If so, what are we to achieve?

We have been told there were three primary purposes for the establishment of a board in Western Australia, one being that it shall be unhampered by political control. I say that is a myth, because on reading the Bill carefully one will find the board is to be controlled all along the line—in its general administration, in the appointment of its officers, in the remuneration to be paid, in the amount it will borrow, and in the contracts it will let. All those aspects are to be subject to the approval of the Minister. So it is useless to say that the board will be unhampered by political control.

As for its borrowing powers I have already pointed out that the Fremantle Harbour Trust, which has borrowing powers, has already deferred work which it could be required to do this year; it has to do that because it has not the money available. So, with increased costs, and loan money to a board still under political control, what advantage is to be gained by the proposal?

There is something worse. It is well known that the policy of this Government is to discharge the men in its employ and let contracts outside. What happened to the day-labour force of the Public Works Department? It is completely gone; and, in addition, the larger part of the maintenance force is gone, despite the fact that we were told it was not intended to upset the maintenance force. But that has been decimated, as it is Government policy; and the Government will control the policy of the board. Therefore, it has to be assumed that that will be the policy of the metropolitan water board—that it will dispense with the services of the men who are engaged in laying the mains and carrying out the reticulation for the department as at present.

Why is it that the Government has not, up to this stage, when its policy is definitely to dispense with day labour, dispensed with the day-labour force of the Metropolitan Water Supply Department? I will tell members why—because the officers of the department have been able to prove to the Minister it would be uneconomical to

dispense with the services of the men in Government employ and let the work out on contract. We have had some experience of it. There was a job let on contract to put a pipeline through to Mt. Eliza, and we finished up with the department doing it because the contractor made such a mess of the job.

I have reason to believe that the Government looked very carefully into the possibility of having some reservoirs constructed by private contract, but the officers of the department were able to convince the Minister it would be uneconomical to do it. It is significant that despite the fact that employees of the Public Works Department were sacked one after the other, that has not taken place in the Metropolitan Water Supply Department, and the work force still remains as it was under the Hawke Government with, of course, additional men, because of the expansion of the services.

With the establishment of a water board, and the Government freed from the obligation of having to take the responsibility for any increase in rates, one can assume straight out that that work force will be reduced to the point of annihilation. The work will no longer be carried out by employees of the department, but contracts will be let for the various jobs to be undertaken, again with increased cost to the consumers of water. I ask: What possible advantage is likely to accrue from this proposal?

I would suggest to the Government that if it is determined to proceed with this proposition and set up a board of seven members, three of whom shall initially be representative of local authorities, it ought to see there is a representative of the workers on the board. The Minister referred to certain aspects of the State Electricity Commission. Well, it ought to be remembered that this House agreed to place upon the State Electricity Commission a representative of the workers employed by the commission; because surely they have a point of view as much as the ratepayers have a point of view. Therefore I think it would be a reasonable proposition to alter the construction of the board in order to provide that on it there shall be a representative of the persons employed by the board so they will be able to present their ideas in connection with the way the board ought to be run.

I hope that wiser counsels will prevail and that the Bill will be defeated because, as I have endeavoured to prove, it will not confer any benefit whatever upon the State or upon the consumers of water. On the contrary, it will result in an added burden upon the consumers for the services which they now enjoy. Although there are some districts now which are still without a reticulated water supply, I venture to suggest that if we put this concern under a

board then those districts now without supply will wait far longer than would otherwise be the case.

I come to that conclusion from a study of what is taking place in Victoria in connection with the services of that State, because it is inevitable that if the cost of carrying out the services continues to rise, there will be greater difficulty on the part of those in control to expand the services. I can see nothing else for it but an inevitable increase in the cost of running the whole concern; firstly, because of the nature of the board—the construction of it—which will be in charge; and, secondly, because the board will be obliged to obtain more expensive money than is now the case in order to carry out its operations.

This is to be achieved in order to get the objective, we are told, of having something that is unhampered by political control. If that were being borne out in practice—if this board were being set up so it would be unhampered by political control, completely free from political control—one might agree that there would be some merit in having a board which could not be pushed about in order that Governments might use it as a taxing machine at the expense of the consumers. But this board will be almost as completely under political control as is the department today.

What work could be carried out for £50,000? If my memory serves me correctly, the Forrestfield water supply cost about £115,000. That was one for which ministerial approval would have had to be obtained, and similarly for any other service now. The way costs are today, there would be very few new schemes which could be put in for less than £50,000. So it virtually means that every new scheme will have to obtain ministerial approval. So how can it be said the board will be unhampered by political control? And the same applies with regard to any purchases the board is going to make.

Take a deal for pipes to be used in connection with a reservoir. Pipes are very costly items. It would be a very small contract indeed for large mains which did not greatly exceed £50,000; and such a contract could not be let without ministerial approval. So it seems to me it smacks more of subterfuge than anything else to bring this Bill down and say its primary purpose is to set up a board that is going to be unhampered by political control. I just cannot see how it can possibly operate in that way. This is a question which should receive the very closest attention by every member, particularly every metropolitan member, because it is the metropolitan people who will have to pay the piper if this legislation goes through.

Of course, to be logical, if this proposal goes through because members are able to see merit in it, then the next step will be to put the country water supplies under a board; because surely the same arguments

would apply there. If one of the advantages in connection with the metropolitan water supply board is to give it borrowing powers so it will have more money, would not that argument have still greater force with regard to country water supplies, where there are many districts which are not being supplied today because the Government is not providing the department with enough money?

So, if it is a sound argument to put the metropolitan water supply under a board because it can borrow money, then the same argument must be used with regard to the country water supply, and that also must be placed under a board so that it can borrow and thereby relieve the Government of the obligation to find money.

Take the next primary purpose: It is desired to be unhampered by political control. Surely if that is a merit with regard to the metropolitan supply it is also a merit with regard to the country water supply. I fail to see how we can regard it as advantageous to have the metropolitan area unhampered by political control, and yet have full political control over the country districts. If it is a sound argument with regard to one, it is a sound argument with regard to the other; and so it would seem to me to be a logical progression that, having put the metropolitan area under a water board, the next step would be to put the country under a water board. And what a fine mess there would be then! There would be additional cost to the country consumers because they would be using more expensive money and using less money.

Therefore I think the whole thing ought to be dropped, and the Government would not lose any face over it either. The Bill was here for twelve months last session and was not proceeded with. Has it suddenly gained some merit? Have the arguments been strengthened? Of course they have not! All that has happened is a change of attitude on the part of those who were preventing the Bill from being proceeded with. I think they have sold their birth-right for a mess of pottage if that is what has happened, because they will be hard put to it to stave off progression once this step is taken.

Now I would hope that the ratepayers in the metropolitan area—the consumers—would take a lively interest in this and examine the arguments advanced for the Bill—and all the arguments were advanced by the Minister in eight minutes. That is how much information and argument was given to justify the passage of this measure—a talk by the Minister, not exceeding eight minutes, and with scarcely any information or figures to show how the new set-up would be an improvement upon the existing one.

I submit that there is an obligation on the Government to demonstrate whether any advantage is to be derived, in what

way it will be derived, and in what way it will benefit the people of Western Australia. I challenge anyone opposite to submit a logical argument in support of such a contention.

Let us deal with this on its absolute merits. See if it does achieve the objectives which the Government says it sets out to achieve. See if these primary purposes which are supposed to be the objectives will, in fact, be attained. Then we can determine whether it is the right course to follow; because our job is to do what we honestly believe to be the best for the State and the best for its people. In my view this is a retrograde step.

We must remember that many years ago the Water Supply Department used to be under a board. There used to be a board. Why was it not kept in operation? Why was it not perpetuated? Why was it superseded by Parliament, and the Metropolitan Water Supply Department set up in its place? It was because obviously there were advantages to be derived from such a set-up. Now, after all these years, to turn the clock back and revert to a board such as is proposed here would require much more justification than has been submitted by the Government so far.

I ask members to have a look at the composition of the board and ask themselves whether they would like to entrust their assets to such a board, liable to be changed at the whim of the Minister at any tick of the clock. What continuity of thought will there be from that existence? What efficiency could be anticipated to flow from that type of organisation, which will be subject to local government pressure as well as political pressure? It is quite idle to talk about the board being unhampered by political control. If there is anyone in this Assembly who is prepared to swallow that, he is the most gullible person I have met in years.

Read the provisions in the Bill setting out where the Minister's control comes in! From the very commencement, right to the end, he controls practically everything. The appointment of officers, salaries of officers, amounts to be borrowed, things to be sold, and contracts to be let, are all subject to the Minister. So to talk about being unhampered by political control is just a lot of nonsense.

I would hope that the argument against the Bill will be so overwhelming—as I believe it will be—that the Assembly will have no hesitation in defeating the measure and ensuring the continuation of the present Metropolitan Water Supply Department in the best interests of the State and its people.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn) [7.58 p.m.]: As a member representing a metropolitan constituency, I propose to voice

my strong opposition to the proposal before the Chamber this evening. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition remarked during the course of his address, this Bill was on the notice paper during last session, and one would be justified in suggesting that when notice of a Bill of such an important character has been given by a Minister early in a session, it would be proceeded with during that session. If one looks at the programme of legislation last session one sees that there were many measures of a comparatively minor nature dealt with by the Government, but this one was left to lapse.

Why was it left to lapse? As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, there must have been some reason. I have here an article which appeared in the *Weekend News* of the 28th July last year, referring to the famous—or infamous—by-election for the Darling Range seat. When I say “infamous” I am not casting any reflection on the member for Darling Range. He is one of the babes in the wood. I consider he was entirely innocent. However, there was some political skulduggery engaged in during the course of that by-election, as this extract, relevant to the position, will indicate—

You'll recall that Wild produced the fait accompli with his announcement of a water scheme for Forrestfield and Wattle Grove quite soon after he had allegedly told the Country Party that he had no money for such work.

Now, the Country Party men claim he DID find the money . . . by taking it away from Avon, a Country Party seat formerly held by the Liberals.

The member for Avon might know something about that.

Mr. Jamieson: That has been done before.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The article continues—

Work had been approved, they say, for the extension of a water pipe line from Cunderdin to Quairading. Now, because the money set aside for this job is to provide water to Forrestfield, Quairading will have to wait another year.

It is a situation that gives Avon's new Member Mick Gayfer little reason for satisfaction. As the local Member, he will be called on to answer for any Government failure to carry on with the Quairading job.

Arising out of that, I am advised on very sound authority that the Minister for Education, the member for Moore—

Mr. H. May: For “Moore” education.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: —was at Forrestfield furthering the interests of the Country Party candidate.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! Has this anything to do with the Bill?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: It has everything to do with it. If you, Sir, will allow me about one minute, I will prove it conclusively. I think I am entitled to make my point. If you will bear with me, Sir, for a couple of minutes, you will understand.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I will bear with you for only one minute.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The Minister for Works and Water Supplies stated that there would be a board in lieu of the present departmental form of administration.

Mr. Hawke: That is the point.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: And a very important section of the Government said there would be no board. Is that not relevant to this situation? We are entitled to know, as representatives of the people, why the change of attitude on the part of the Government; and you too, Mr. Speaker, would want to know, and I think you are entitled to know. That is the point I wish to make. I should like to know from members of the Country Party, or from the Minister for Education, or from the Minister for Works, what the change of attitude is due to. I think we are entitled to know that.

I have no hesitation in saying that the proposal is in accordance with Government policy—or at least the policy of the Liberal Party section of the Government. That section has overpowered or subdued the opposition of the other section of the Government. I would say that one of the reasons which prompted the Liberal Party section of the Government to introduce this legislation was to put the skids under the departmental administration and in due course—and it would not be very long—to remove a big section of the present work force, and to institute the contract system.

I agree with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who referred to an earlier action of the Government when it practically demolished the day-labour organisation set-up which had been operated for many years by the Public Works Department. If this Bill is passed and is placed on the Statute book it will not be very long before a large number of the present efficient work force of wages employees of the Water Supply Department will be given notice, and they will be advised to accept work from contractors.

I would say in passing—and I think I am correct in saying this—that I know some departmental men regard the proposed legislation as a direct insult to their administration. The Metropolitan Water Supply Department, from the chief engineer down, is very competent and very efficient. It has for a long period displayed wonderful efficiency and ability to carry

out onerous and difficult tasks. From the chief engineer down to the nipper on the job the staff have performed a very fine service.

I notice in the Bill that the rights of those persons who come under the Public Service Act will be protected; but so far as wages employees are concerned there is a provision in the Bill which says, "subject to the provisions of any current relevant industrial award or agreement made under the Industrial Arbitration Act, 1912, the Board may appoint and dismiss such temporary or casual employees as it thinks fit on such terms and conditions as the Board determines."

The Government already knows that under the provisions of the particular industrial award a week's notice is required for ordinary employees. I can visualise a number of people who have been working for years in the Water Supply Department being given a week's notice. They will be paid pro rata long service leave and told to go and work for contractors. Those persons have enjoyed long service leave provision since 1928 on the basis of three months for 10 years. When they are discharged—as I have no doubt they will be, because we have a very appropriate precedent in the dismissal of a large number of the Public Works Department work force—they will be obliged, if they work for contractors, to accept long service leave on the basis of three months for 20 years. That is one of the things which is going to happen if this Bill is passed. The system of day labour will be overthrown and the contract system will operate.

The Minister indicated—I thought he took seven minutes to do it, but the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said he took eight—that the removal of political control from this undertaking would be most desirable. If it were not so amazing, it would be very amusing; and if it were not so serious a project, it would be most amusing. I do not propose to quote the various clauses in the Bill, but I propose to show how far political control will be removed from the undertaking.

On page 9 of the Bill it will be seen that the Minister may at any time convene a meeting of the board. It says that the Minister or the chairman may at any time convene a meeting of the board. If this is going to be an independent authority set up by Statute, how does it come about that the Minister can convene a meeting of the board at any time? He can override the chairman, the deputy chairman, or the whole of the members of the board, and call a meeting at any time. Where is the removal of political control? Of course, this is subject to political control. As a matter of fact it has already been pointed out, and the Bill very clearly indicates, that the board

will be in charge of the general administration of the Act subject to the Minister. I say that the Minister will have as much power as he wants.

I am not at all satisfied with the proposed constitution of the board. I quite agree there should be a representative of the Treasury Department; but what particular claims has anybody who happens to be a councillor, a president, or a mayor? Is it not incumbent upon the Government to make the field wider? I am not casting a slur on mayors, presidents, or councillors; but why restrict the selection? As a matter of fact, if the president of a very prominent and very important shire council were selected from a panel of names, he would not be able to take his seat on the board, because he is a member of Parliament and, as such, I suggest he would be accepting an office of profit under the Crown and would be liable to forfeit his seat. So I think the honourable member would be very careful not to accept nomination.

Dealing with the question of the personnel of the proposed board, there will be a representative of the Treasury and certain men with engineering qualifications. I can understand that, because it will be necessary to have that type of person on a board or authority such as this. There is also to be one representative selected from a panel nominated by the Perth City Council, and two from the Local Government Association.

From time to time we hear a good deal from members of the Government, especially from the Minister for Labour, who also holds the portfolios of Works and Water Supplies, and the Minister for Industrial Development, and also the Premier, about co-operation between employers and workers to the effect that they should get together more. They say, "Let's understand one another more and remove some of the prejudice and bias which exist between employers and employees."

But what has the Government done on this occasion? Has it no regard for the work force—the men who carry out all the work involved? Has the Government given any consideration to the large number of employees of the Water Supply Department who are directly involved in this measure? They have not been mentioned. The Government is quite impersonal about them. There is no consistency in the Government's efforts to improve industrial relationships. This Bill is an indication of the Government's lack of regard for working people; and, on their behalf, I take strong exception to the personnel of the proposed board.

As regards the borrowing powers of the board, I can understand that such an authority would need to have powers to borrow, and the necessary machinery is set out in the Bill for the purpose of enabling the board to borrow from time to

time as circumstances demand. I do not intend to go into the matter of the increased rate of interest which will be payable, because the Deputy Leader of the Opposition effectively dealt with that aspect of the question. Suffice it to say it is quite obvious that a higher rate of interest will be chargeable to this authority, if it borrows money, compared with the rate which would be charged if the money were obtained through the Loan Council.

Here again, this board is supposed to show great initiative and be independent of political control and governmental supervision; but we find that so far as the acquisition of property, or the letting of contracts, or the disposal of property is concerned, if more than £50,000 is involved the board must go to the Minister for his approval or disapproval. To have a provision of that character in a Bill which sets up a board to administer an undertaking where millions of pounds and important public works are involved is entirely unwarranted, and it shows that the Minister, or the Government, is at all times going to have a complete grip on the administration of the board.

I ask the Minister, and I would like him to indicate in his reply, or before the Bill is finally passed—which I hope it will not be—what his attitude will be regarding the levying of rates; because in this connection sections 90, 91, and 92 of the present Act are most explicit. With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote a subsection of section 90 of the present Act. It states—

The Minister shall, from time to time, make and levy water rates in respect of all rateable land within the several Districts, whether actually occupied or not, situated wholly or partly within sixty yards of any main or other pipe, although the land may not be actually supplied with water.

A similar provision empowering the Minister to levy rates for sewerage and drainage is to be found in subsequent sections of the Act.

The Bill provides that the word "Minister" shall be deleted and the word "Board" substituted; and the board will levy rates for water, sewerage, and drainage. I would like to know from the Minister whether the board, in regard to increasing water rates, will be subject to ministerial control; or will the Minister say to all and sundry, including ratepayers in the metropolitan area, "I am sorry, but Parliament has removed the power which I formerly held and has concentrated the power in the board. You have no redress unless you appeal under the provisions of the Act which gives the right to any ratepayer to submit an appeal to the appeal authority."?

I would like to know whether it is the Minister's intention, or the Government's intention to scrutinise, approve, or disapprove of any increase in water rates; because I believe—and I hope my belief is unfounded—that if this Bill passes the time will not be far distant when there will be an increase in water rates in the metropolitan area.

I have strong recollections of a session or two ago when I protested on behalf of the electors of the district of Mt. Hawthorn against the attitude of the Government in increasing water rates. The member for Subiaco knows quite a bit about the question of increasing water rates, and I have no doubt that other members representing metropolitan constituencies remember it too.

As far as I am concerned, the Act as it stands has stood the test of time; and the Minister either cannot or has not cared to give the House an indication of where the present departmental administration is ineffective, unreliable, weak, or not up to expectations. He has given us no justification for such a radical change in the administration of such a large Government undertaking. Some of the engineers in the department have served a cadetship, and some of them have studied at the University of Western Australia. They have made a career job of the Water Supply Department, and a number of workers on the wages staff have been there for years. They understand the work, as do the administrative and clerical staff, the inspectors, and the foremen. They have all pulled their weight and done a fine job. Consequently there is no justification for such a radical change.

I can see something sinister behind the move, and that is to remove this work force—a very large section of the work force—to allow a great deal of the work to be done in future on contract. This is in accordance with Government policy.

Finally, I would like to know from the Minister for Education, as the acting leader of the Country Party section of the Government, what induced the change in Country Party thinking since last year, when he told the electors of Forrestfield that there would be no board? We are entitled to know that; and I hope that before the debate closes the Minister in charge of the Bill will answer some of the objections that have been raised, and that the Minister for Education will do us the courtesy of letting us know why some of the members of his party have obviously changed their minds.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [8.19 p.m.]: I, too, oppose the Bill. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out, its introduction rated only a few minutes of the Minister's time. Also, significantly, it rated only about three

inches of news space in *The West Australian* of Friday, the 6th September. It rather smacks of collusion between the Government and the newspaper. It is significant that this is introduced by stealth in the manner I have outlined.

The member for Mt. Hawthorn has raised issues which cause me concern for those men who now work for a public undertaking. As has been pointed out they could find themselves—in a way similar to men who used to work for another department—working for private contractors; that is, those among them whom the private contractors agree to employ. By that I mean those who are below the age of 40. Those who are over 40 years of age would stand little chance of being engaged by them.

The position is that the board shall have power, without permission, to enter into a contract which does not exceed £50,000 in value, but the approval of the Minister has to be obtained by it for any contract in excess of that amount. A contract entered into by the board could be the centre of a political issue in much the same way as Forrestfield was the centre of a political issue in the Darling Range election. Despite this, the Minister contends that one of the objects of the Bill is to remove the administration from political influence. In my opinion, the Bill could make the board a political football.

If this board were to go on to the market for the purpose of borrowing money I cannot see how the costs involved in such a loan would not be passed on to the price of the commodity sold. As the commodity is water, this would mean dearer water for the consumers. Does the Minister think we have forgotten the increases in water rates that have already been made by this Government? It is inevitable that the board will have to borrow money, and it is also inevitable that the cost of such borrowing will be included in the price of the water sold. As the representatives of the little people who have to pay the rates, it behoves us to make every endeavour to ensure that there is no increase in water rates to the ordinary householder.

This Bill is merely a means whereby the Minister can say that he or his Government is not responsible for any increase in water rates. If the Bill is passed it will be possible for the Minister to say, "It is not our fault the price of water has increased; it is the fault of the board." The Bill merely presents an opportunity to the Minister to blame somebody else for something for which he is responsible.

The member for Mt. Hawthorn also referred to the prospect of retrenchments among those men who are now working for the Metropolitan Water Supply Department. It is not just a prospect. I remind the Minister of what happened to those men who were working for the Public Works Department by quoting some questions and answers taken from the 1961

Parliamentary Debates. Before doing so I would point out that if retrenchments have happened in the past they can happen again. On the 8th August, 1961, the Minister for Works was asked—

What was the total number of employees attached to the day labour force of the Public Works Department as at the 1st May, 1959?

The Minister replied—

Retrenchments	929
Resigned	460
Total		1,389

I might mention that I have abbreviated the answer, quoting only those figures which are relevant.

That scandalous act took place as a result of this Government taking office, and the point is that I can foresee the same thing happening again with workers in the Metropolitan Water Supply Department. Therefore the Bill is objectionable from that point of view. We can see how objectionable it is if members on the other side of the House do not.

Another question was asked in 1961 in regard to the P.W.D. Architectural Division apprentices, who are the lifeblood of the building trade. They are most essential to ensure a constant supply of tradesmen for the building trade, instead of having to import tradesmen. This question was asked of the Minister for Labour on the 9th August, 1961. The information sought was the number of apprentices engaged by the Public Works Department Architectural Division as at the 31st July, 1958, and the 31st July, 1961.

The Minister replied that in 1958, when the Labor Government was in office, there were 224 apprentices employed; but that in 1961, when the present Government was in office, there were only 42 apprentices employed. The drop in the number of apprentices was the result of the policy of this Government at that time.

We can see the prospect of a similar situation being created through the medium of this Bill. I appeal to the Minister to take notice of the disparity in those figures I have just quoted; that is, in 1958, when the Labor Government was in office, there were 224 apprentices employed by the Architectural Division of the Public Works Department; but in 1961, as a result of the policy of his Government, only 42 apprentices were employed. The rule is that three apprentices are employed for each tradesman employed; therefore, is it not inevitable, if more tradesmen are retrenched, the prospects for apprentices will decrease as a consequence? I want to know if any parents represented by members on the other side of the Chamber are wondering why their lads are unemployed.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): You will have to relate your remarks to the Bill. This is not a debate on day labour.

Mr. FLETCHER: That is quite so, but I am trying to show the consequences if this board is appointed, and that the policy of the Government in this instance could be analogous to the position that was created in the Public Works Department a couple of years ago. However, in view of your remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will not continue in that strain. I am concerned, however, at the prospect of retrenchments as a consequence of the Government's policy outlined in this Bill.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to the underwriting of any loan made by the board and the brokerage fees that would be incurred. As I have already said, the cost of such borrowings will be passed on to the price of water which is sold to the public. Such a course is inevitable.

When introducing the Bill the Minister said that the vote which is now allocated to the Water Supply Department could, if this Bill is passed, be used for the construction of more schools, hospitals, and other public works. That is the excuse he put forward in support of the Bill. If this comes about, it is inevitable that there will be an increase in the cost of administering the board's undertakings, and the Minister will then be able to say that it is the board which is responsible and not he. However, with the consequent increase in water rates, it will mean that the people of Fremantle, and the people of other electorates who are consumers of water, will be those who are financing the construction of the schools, hospitals, and other public works that will be erected. That is a most important point, of which members of this House should take cognisance.

When water rates were previously increased by up to 40 per cent. there was a furore in the Fremantle district and in other parts of the metropolitan area; but that will be nothing to the furore that will occur if the water rates are increased again. In referring to another matter which was also raised by the member for Mt. Hawthorn, I do not impugn in any way local government representation, but in view of the fact that this matter has been suggested in the Bill, I put forward this hypothesis: Let us assume, for example, that an estate agent is a member of a local authority. Let us say that estate agent had acquired land in a certain area at £10 an acre and there was the prospect, as a result of the expenditure of the ratepayers' money in that area, of the value being enhanced. Would he not, as a member of that local authority, have a vested interest in seeing that the ratepayers' money was spent in the best way pos-

sible to enable him to enhance the value of his investment from £10 an acre to, say, £100 an acre?

If this is possible in the case of an estate agent who happens to be a member of a local authority, is it not equally possible that there could be as a local authority member of the board, a cartage contractor or an earth-moving contractor who might attempt to use his position—or who could use his position—on the board to advantage himself or the firm he represented? If that member of the board represented a firm and there was the chance of certain contracts being given to that firm, it would be inevitable for him to ensure that his firm received those contracts. The Bill before us makes just such a thing possible, and I oppose it for that reason, if for no other.

It might be said that the next example I am about to give is not relevant, but if you will bear with me a minute, Mr. Speaker, I will show that it is. There is such a thing as a Commonwealth Bank Board, representative of various interests. That Commonwealth Bank Board could decide to make cheap money available to the people for, say, housing projects at 1 per cent. Alternatively, it could seek to help the farmers—and the farmers may be interested in the point I am about to make. If that Commonwealth Bank Board consisted of interests other than the Treasurer or the Minister, then it could be subservient to the interests of private banks that are not sympathetic to the interests of the electors of Australia. If the Minister happened to be the Treasurer, then the Treasurer would be answerable to the Government, and the Government would be answerable to the people. I hope I make my point clear. This board as constituted would be a collection of various interests which are not answerable to the people whose interests we on this side of the House represent.

This Bill introduces a private influence, and I believe that to be bad. As I have indicated, there is always the prospect of private interest trying to advantage itself at the expense of the community. The Minister should be answerable to the electors; he should not attempt to hide behind some innocuous board. I do not wonder that the country areas are not included within the ambit of the Bill. In view of the uneasiness that exists between the Government coalition parties it would be dangerous for the Minister at this point of time, to introduce anything as controversial as the inclusion of the country areas within the provisions of this Bill.

If stealth exists in the provisions of this measure then by stealth will the Government sneak up on the country areas; particularly if it is successful in achieving

its purpose with this measure. The farmers have enough pests and encumbrances on their backs at the present moment without having to face the prospect of dearer water as a consequence of some Bill that might be introduced later—particularly if they let this measure be passed.

The Country Party should join with us in opposing what might happen in the future as a result of this Bill. We are told that coming events cast their shadows before them; but the measure we are considering is something more substantial than a shadow. I know that provision is made for a date to be fixed by proclamation, but I suggest we retain the *status quo*. For the reasons I have outlined I hope the date to be fixed by proclamation never eventuates.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [8.36 p.m.]: I suggest that the main factors we have to consider in a debate such as this are whether the change that is envisaged by the Government is desirable, or necessarily required, or whether it has been brought upon Parliament by public opinion and demand. At this juncture I would say that none of those headings fits this move by the Government.

It is true that at the last election the Government did make play on the fact that it was prepared to introduce a water board to the metropolitan area. That was part of its election policy. That, however, does not mean it is a desirable move. We heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition earlier in the debate, indicate that previously Perth had a water board. As a matter of fact the whole thing goes back to the stake when it was privately owned and called the Perth water supply company.

I do not know whether it is ultimately the ambition of the Government to proceed in that direction; but, if it is, this Bill constitutes a preliminary step towards doing away with the responsibility of the Government to provide a metropolitan water supply service. The main difference seems to lie in the responsibility of particular persons to strike a rate, and the unpopularity of striking rates. That seems to be the main issue from which the Government is running away. Those of us who have been associated with governmental, or local governmental positions know that it is unpopular to increase rates; whereas to decrease them is always a popular move. However, the latter does not often occur in these days of inflationary practices. Increases in rates must occur from time to time.

The degree to which rates should be increased is always a subject of much contention by the electors on various occasions; and rightly so. Should a Government impose a rate it must be prepared to go before the electors and defend its

action in doing so. Its action might be justified; on the other hand, it might not. It is up to the electors, from time to time, to indicate whether the Government of the day was right in taking the action it did. Why should the Government run away from such a responsibility? Why should it place this responsibility in the hands of somebody against whom the people have no redress? The Government seeks to hide behind the cloak of letting the board strike a rate, and letting it be responsible for the authorising of capital works that will normally occur during its jurisdiction.

It has been repeatedly said that any works over the value of £50,000, or any obligations entered into by the board, must receive the approval of the Minister. We find that even the meetings of the board must be called by the Minister. That being so it is evident that the Minister has all the authority but no responsibility. If that is the manner in which the Government is prepared to govern, then it deserves the condemnation of the public at large; and I believe the present Government deserves condemnation for its attitude.

Of course, this action by the Government is in line with its recent thinking and practice, because in its term of office it has continued to appoint boards and administrators here and there, doing very little itself, but taking all the plaudits of the Press. Whether that is a desirable way to govern the State is a matter of opinion. I say it is not a desirable way, because the Government is elected to take on a responsibility.

Members of Parliament are elected by the people to put forward their points of view. If in putting forward those points of view a member cannot justify the stand he takes, then when the next election comes along I am sure he will not be returned. That is how members should be elected. To get behind a series of boards and administrators to the extent this Government is doing is to build a complete iron curtain between the Government and the public at large.

One of the greatest advantages in the present set-up of the Metropolitan Water Supply Department is the availability of a mobile work force to attend to normal work and emergencies. On some occasions it is necessary to switch part of the force on to a specific job, and to complete it in quick time. Under the present system that can be done, but if in future the needs of the department are to be subjected to the whims and designs of private contractors, the activities which I referred to will be strictly limited, because if they are not limited they will become very costly.

To get a contractor to implement the bidding or instruction of the board is a problem to be faced; and it can only be overcome by the payment of additional

money, or by having workers on call all the time. Private firms or contractors would not be prepared to remain on call unless it was worth their while. For this feature alone there is a necessity to retain the *status quo*, because everything appears to be going along satisfactorily.

Now, when an emergency arises, the department knows where to go to get gangs of men to deal with it, while another job is proceeding. The jobs will be attended to, depending on the relative importance of the projects. All that will be gone if the proposed board is established. For that reason it would be worth while for the Government to have a second look and a second thought as to where the proposed board would lead the State.

Another aspect on which I desire information is this: How far will the activities of the board extend? Are they ultimately to extend to a coverage of the goldfields water supply? In this connection I might mention that centres like Darlington, Mundaring, and many others closely adjoining the metropolitan area, are drawing their supplies from the goldfields water scheme. The water supplies for those centres should be covered by the Metropolitan Water Supply Department as the residents are really metropolitan area consumers.

If the board is to take over and control all reticulated mains for the metropolitan area, as well as the mains which are fed by the goldfields water supply, the Government should indicate that intention in the Bill. I am sure some Country Party members are a little concerned as to how far the proposed board is to go.

Most of the matters which I consider necessary to be pointed out have been referred to by earlier speakers, and very effectively by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who covered the position fully. However, there is one point I wish to make before I conclude. If a board is to be set up, then in my view a board consisting of experts in the particular sphere is the most desirable; but the Government seems to have a bad habit in recent times of appointing specific people to represent specific organisations or local authorities. That method of appointing board members has not been a success, because invariably trouble has been experienced in selecting the representatives.

In the Bill the Perth City Council comes in for special mention in the election of members of the board. If my memory serves me aright, the rating valuation of the Shire of Perth is so close to the rating valuation of the Perth City Council that the difference does not matter very much; but as far as the consumption of water goes, residents in the Shire of Perth consume twice as much water as residents in the Perth City Council area. So, if consideration is to be given to appointing a

representative from a specific local authority, surely the biggest consumer of water in the metropolitan area should have prior claim to representation.

There is no definite reason why any local authority should be given consideration in this respect, but if the Minister thinks the so-called consumers' representatives should be appointed to the board, then he should declare there shall be three representatives from the Local Government Association. In that event the Perth City Council could put up its representative in the panel for selection by the Minister. If that were done the position would be much clearer than is expressed in the Bill.

It is not clearly stated in the Bill whether the person to represent the Perth City Council is to be a councillor at the time of election; and, if so, whether he has to remain as a councillor in the future. Neither is the position clear in regard to the other two representatives from the Local Government Association. At least it is stipulated in the Bill what position they must hold at time of election, but there is no such restriction on the Perth City Council, and it could appoint the City Engineer to represent it on the board. If we are to have a board, it would be more advantageous to have representatives with a knowledge of the work involved. If a couple of hydraulic engineers were proposed as representatives there would be some justification for it.

Under the provision in the Bill, what are the representatives from the Local Government Association going to do, and what are to be their specific functions? We can all appreciate the definite functions of the general manager, the chairman, or the chief engineer; but when we get down to the other representatives of the board we have some doubt as to their functions, although the representative of the Treasury will be watching the interests of the Government from the financial point of view.

I do not know what are to be the functions of the three remaining representatives. Will they be elected to hamstring the others; and will they from time to time side with other members to arrive at a majority decision? Are they to be appointed so that any of the four Government nominees can have the opportunity to lobby for their support, thus causing disruption within the ranks of the board? It appears that the two sections in the board are completely opposed to the line of thinking of each other. Inevitably, there will be friction in a board set up in this way. If the Government intends to proceed with the setting up of a board, I suggest it proceed along the lines I have outlined.

I ask members of the Government whether we, as the representatives of the electors, should accept our responsibilities, or

whether we should unload them on to the shoulders of boards and administrators, so that when a higher rate has been struck we can say to the ratepayers, "It was not our responsibility at all." I maintain it is our responsibility. The greater the authority we delegate away from Parliament and the Government, the less will we be thought of in the community. I would throw that out as a final thought. I also say I will be opposing this Bill, and I hope there will be sufficient members on the floor of the House to vote it out at the second reading stage.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Guthrie.

FIREARMS AND GUNS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 5th September, on the following motion by Mr. Craig (Minister for Police):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. BRADY (Swan) [8.51 p.m.]: I have had a look through this Bill to amend the Firearms and Guns Act and in the main I intend to support it. I think that the objects of the Bill are laudable and that the Government is trying to do the right thing by the community. It would appear there are weaknesses in section 11A of the principal Act in regard to making a person sell a gun which might be in the charge of the Police Department, because that person cannot obtain a license. To remedy that weakness in the Act the commissioner wants the power to enforce the sale of the firearm and subsequently hand the proceeds to the owner. Having regard to all the circumstances in our present way of life I do not think there can be any great objection to that.

There is another provision in the Bill which provides that in the future the commissioner can issue a license for the registration of a gun and instead of a new license having to be issued each year, the one license can carry on indefinitely and be renewed. That would save a lot of paper work in the Police Department and give a person a continuous license, subject to the payment of a fee. It would appear that in the past if a person licensed a gun, the charge would be 5s.; and if two guns or more were licensed, the charge was 10s. It would now seem that the Police Department is going to charge 10s. for the first license, and that fee will cover all future guns that any person may have.

My only objection to this measure is the practice of the Police Department increasing the fee by 100 per cent. I refer to the license fee that will be charged to the person who owns one revolver. I think that this afternoon an answer was given

to a question asked in the House which showed that of the 70,000 or 80,000 guns licensed, more than half of the licenses are held by individuals. This means that the Police Department will obtain a considerable increase in revenue as the people who are unfortunate enough to own only one revolver are going to have to pay an increase of 100 per cent. in their license fee. When the new system comes about the Police Department will be saved a considerable amount of work.

Another provision in the Bill is that those who sell firearms can be called upon by the commissioner to give an account of the people who have purchased firearms. I think that is a desirable provision. So, by and large, there is not a great deal more to be said. I do not think there is any great objection to the amendments as presented to this House by the Minister for Police, but I think he should be grateful for small mercies in having the support of the Opposition to this measure and accordingly be prepared to reduce the proposed charge of 10s. per year for a license to the original charge of 5s.

In any case, at this stage I give the Minister notice of my intention to try to have the Bill altered in that manner, as I do not think he should get it both ways. By introducing the new system he will save the Police Department a lot of work representing hundreds and hundreds of pounds. The amendment will facilitate licensing generally and will reduce the work of the Police Department. Therefore, in all the circumstances, the Minister should protect the people who will have to pay 10s.—an increase of 100 per cent.—instead of the 5s. which prevailed before. I support the measure which, in due course, I suppose will be passed by the House.

MR. CRAIG (Toodyay—Minister for Police) [8.55 p.m.]: I thank the member for Swan for his support of this measure. Apparently his main objection is to the proposed increase of the license fee for a single firearm from 5s. to 10s. which, of course, brings the license fee to a uniform figure irrespective of the number of firearms involved. Might I say that the amount of work required is just the same, whether it be for one firearm or a dozen or more. The licensing of firearms is a laborious process. It entails considerable inquiry by the officer concerned, particularly into the merits of whether a license should be issued or not.

There is also a considerable amount of work involved at the time the licenses fall due for renewal. I think the member for Victoria Park, or some other member opposite, asked a question recently as to the number of cases involved in one particular part of the metropolitan area. He wanted to know the number of licenses that had to be followed up for the purposes

of renewal. A considerable amount of checking work is involved. As members will recall, there was recently a certain procedure followed which involved some thousands of firearms. It is also felt from the accounting point of view that matters would be simplified to a considerable extent if the fee were uniform, irrespective of the number of firearms.

Might I draw the attention of the honourable member to the fact that there has been no increase in the licensing fee for many years. To my knowledge the Act goes back to 1931, when the fee of 5s. was provided for.

Mr. Brady: There has been a big increase in the number of guns registered, though.

Mr. CRAIG: I know; but it entails a considerable increase in the amount of work involved in keeping a check on those revolvers and other firearms. There has been no increase in the license fee for over 30 years to my knowledge; and if it was considered that 5s. in 1931 was a minimum fee that could be charged for one firearm, I do not think 10s. is an exorbitant charge today. In support of that contention, there is no suggestion at all that there be any increase in the license fee required for more than one firearm. The amount of 10s. is being retained. I thank the honourable member for his support of this Bill.

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.

OFFENDERS PROBATION AND PAROLE BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 5th September, on the following motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Chief Secretary):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. BRADY (Swan) [9.2 p.m.]: This is a most important Bill in the life of the Western Australian community, and because of this I feel I must deal with it on a comprehensive basis in order to indicate the necessity for us to have a great deal more time to analyse it closely.

When introducing the legislation the other evening, the Minister referred to the fact that approximately 45 years have elapsed since any substantial alteration was made to this legislation, except that in 1918 the Indeterminate Sentences Board was created. He also made mention of the recent establishment of the Karnet institution at Serpentine.

By and large I think that everyone in this House and another place wants reforms made. We want prisoners and people who break the law dealt with on a different basis. However, I regret that the Minister did not tell us more about the working of the Pardelup Prison Farm, which I understand the late Mr. J. M. Drew established when he was Chief Secretary.

I am also sorry the Minister did not tell us more about Barton's Mill, and about the other requests by various members of the community to improve the system over the years.

However, to get back to my earlier statement that this is a most important Bill. It is going to place those who until recently were known as gaolbirds or lawbreakers in the category of people who have committed some minor offence, and will place on parole people who are given long prison sentences. It will also abolish the Indeterminate Sentences Board and set up in its place a board comprising a judge as chairman, and male members, to consider the granting of up to five years' parole to men who have been sentenced to long terms of imprisonment; and a board composed of a male chairman and two women members to consider the granting of parole to females under the same circumstances.

As members will realise, this is a rather important step and one which it is proposed to take in 1963 before enough information has been given to this House. It is a step which warrants the disclosure of far more information than the Minister revealed when introducing the second reading. He did tell us that in Victoria and in Tasmania this system has been tried. However, he did not tell us that because this system has been tried in those States a considerable number of headaches have been created, thus presenting great difficulties for the departments concerned.

Because this is a very big step which is being contemplated. I believe we should not accept this legislation holus-bolus. If we are going to accept it, it should be introduced a little at a time, because in my opinion we are going from the sublime to the ridiculous. Instead of achieving a lot of good, we could do a lot of harm. Even with our present system of gaoling, there is a great sense of insecurity in the community, particularly in the metropolitan area, where there has been some very serious crime in the last five or six years.

Therefore, members in this House and another place cannot consider this type of legislation lightly. We must have regard for its importance and for all the facets involved. We must analyse whether we are going to continue to maintain the gaol at Fremantle as the main one in Western Australia. We must also consider whether

we are going to continue to accommodate females, hardened criminals, minor criminals, natives, and foreigners under the one roof and deal with them in the one gaol, or whether we should separate the various types and characters. It may be that it would be a great advantage to have main gaols in the north-west, the south-west, and the goldfields; and also, perhaps, a separate gaol for natives.

When we read the prison records and realise what has been going on in Australia, England, and the United States, we must ask ourselves whether the types of legislation introduced in other parts of the world are suitable for us here in Western Australia in 1963. I have often felt, as an individual, that too often we follow somebody else, when in actual fact we should, as a young State, be initiating reforms and introducing legislation of an original character—of a character which could do some good for the community.

Let me confine myself to those people in whom I am greatly interested; namely, the natives. I cannot, for the life of me, see why a native brought from Broome, from Leonora, or from the Warburtons should be dealt with in the same category as a sophisticated person from the metropolitan area. They have come from a different world altogether. For them to be dealt with under the same legislation as people reared in the metropolitan area, does not add up. That brings me to the thought that we should have a separate institution for native offenders—aborigines—with an entirely different approach altogether to that which they are getting at Fremantle, where they are committed with habitual criminals, alcoholics, no-hopers; and so one could go on.

What I say concerning aborigines could apply to female offenders. Unfortunately, there are many female offenders today. I think the time is overdue when we should have a separate institution for them. The very fact of going through the gates, through the yard, and through the cells, of Fremantle, is enough, in my opinion, to break any woman, let alone a man. The very fact that some men go through that ordeal breaks them from the start. What I have said about aborigines applies, as I say, to females; and what I have said about those two sections of people could apply to teenagers. Lads and girls of 18, 19, and 20 years of age are being put in the one common place.

Let me remind the House of what is consistently being brought to our notice almost weekly in our Western Australian newspapers. Four out of five cases of young people under 21 years of age are being committed to Fremantle. Five out of six cases of young people under 21 years of age are being committed to Fremantle. Seven and eight cases out of nine of young people under 21 years of age are being committed to Fremantle.

There is something in what the Minister said. That situation is not helping to overcome the difficulties which this State is having to face up to. It is only helping those people to associate with hardened criminals and that situation is probably responsible for those people coming back to Fremantle gaol two, three, four, and five times.

The Minister mentioned that this type of legislation, under which we are now committing people to Fremantle gaol, has been on the Statute book for 45 or 50 years. It could well be that when we make this type of legislation which we are now considering we will be doing the same thing: we will be creating legislation which might remain on the Statute book for the next 30, 40, or 50 years. If we are doing that we must have more than a 20-minute session on the legislation in this House.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You are a little mixed up, I'm afraid.

Mr. BRADY: I am not mixed up; and as I develop my argument the Minister will find that I am on the ball very much more than the Minister who introduced the Bill; because the Minister has not told us what is going on in Victoria, despite the fact that he said legislation is in existence there. He has not told us what is going on in the Old Country. He has not told us what is going on in America, or in New Zealand; and he has not told us what is going on here in Western Australia. He has not told us any of those things. He wants us to pass legislation that may be on the Statute book for the next 30 or 40 years.

Mr. Graham: That's telling him!

Mr. BRADY: Let me remind the Minister of some of the things which are going on here in Western Australia.

Mr. J. Hegney: They would make your hair stand on end.

Mr. BRADY: We find that in Western Australia up to 4,500 people are being committed to Fremantle Prison each year. We find they are coming not only from Australian States, but from all over the world. That raises another point. When we are introducing this type of legislation the question is whether we should be looking into the aspect of why people from the other side of the world are being sent to Fremantle Prison in such numbers.

Recently I had occasion to be in the company of two or three New Australians. They told me that from the year 1942 to 1947 they lived as gaolbirds and criminals. They had to steal. They had to pinch. They had to commit crime in order to live, to keep body and soul together. That state of affairs exists in Europe, in some small measure, even today; and it has

been occurring in the case of hundreds of thousands of people for 10 or 15 years. We should have some regard for these factors.

The following appeared in yesterday's *The West Australian*:—

Close The Gaols, Says Rector.

Brisbane, Sun.: A Brisbane clergyman tonight advocated the gradual closing of all our gaols because they were the easy way out in the community's approach to the crime problem.

He is the rector of St. Mary's, Kangaroo Point, The Rev. R. A. Foote, who preached on the moral issues of crime and punishment.

Before the service he said that punishment of criminals was often too severe. They should be re-educated rather than confined to cells in gaols, which were useless.

Ideas of gaols were overrated and overdone and the question was being approached from the wrong angle, he said.

So he would close all the gaols if he had his way.

In addition to this type of representation, the Commissioner of Police, in his report for the year ended June, 1962, sets out details of seven cases of diabolical crimes—crimes in connection with which murder was committed. Mostly the people concerned were gaol for long terms. The commissioner finished his report by saying there were 48,220 offenders brought to trial. I will repeat that figure, because it is a staggering one for a young State like Western Australia. I repeat that 48,220 offenders were brought to trial—exclusive of charges against aborigines, lunatics, and neglected children—or 6.49 per cent. of the population compared with 6.77 per cent in 1960.

In addition to having this type of legislation—the Government might well have introduced some preventive legislation—there should be an inquiry into what is causing all this crime, and what we can do to prevent it. What is responsible for crime being in our midst to the extent it is? There is nothing in this legislation to meet that situation. Therefore I think the Government might have gone a bit further than simply bringing in legislation which will put hundreds of people on probation and parole. Nothing is being done to find out how to prevent crime. That is what we want more than anything else: prevention rather than cure. This is a measure for attempting to cure the crime after it has been committed, and I feel that the Government might well have brought in something to help in the prevention of crime. In other words, the Government is putting the cart before the horse.

In addition to reading extracts from the commissioner's report I also want to draw attention to another report on juvenile delinquency. This report has only recently been distributed and it deals with the Fremantle gaol. It reads as follows:—

The Committee recognises that a very small number of boys (and a very occasional girl) will be truly "very difficult." The admission of such boys to "Riverbank" would only disturb the treatment of its inmates without advancing the welfare of the irreconcilable minority. At present the only facility available for such cases is Fremantle Gaol—the main institution under the Prisons Department. This is essentially an adult gaol and while its staff gives every consideration to the needs of juvenile prisoners and every co-operation to Child Welfare officers in visiting them, it is no criticism of the gaol when your Committee recommends that within the next six years a new and separate juvenile gaol for boys should be built and managed by the Child Welfare Department. Such an institution would cater for the most difficult boys, and while its purpose would be their rehabilitation, its regime would be quite different from that at "Riverbank." This suggested juvenile gaol would, in the main, cater for members of group (iii) mentioned on page 44, i.e., those incapable of emotional response to kindness and understanding and who can only be trained (if at all) by hard, restrictive and repetitive drill. The provision of such an institution would remove an embarrassment from Fremantle Gaol and would complete the range of necessary Child Welfare facilities for the proper care of delinquent boys in Western Australia.

I could go on but I will stop there. I feel that the Government, when introducing a Bill of this type, might have given some indication of what it intends to do in regard to juveniles in the Fremantle gaol. That problem is referred to in this report which has been distributed by the Government. I feel that the Minister should have had some regard for that report.

The main question is whether parole or probation is the correct system. I will read a few more extracts; and I think the Minister will agree, after I have read them, that they have some relevancy to this very important matter. This quotation is from the book, *Human Relations*. It comes from the Harvard University Press and it is arranged by Hugh Cabot and Joseph A. Kahl. On page 301 there is an article entitled "Inside the Prison", and it is as follows:—

This new method of treating criminals, technically known as Guided Group Interaction, has been

in operation for two years throughout New Jersey's penal system. The idea developed during World War II, when the Army faced a crime wave among draftees. Thousands of young soldiers were accumulating in prison stockades. Nearly two thirds of these GI jail-birds had civil-arrest records previous to their Army careers. The discipline of military life had only emphasized their eternal feud against organized society. Wartime pressure demanded that these men be corrected, that every possible individual be returned to active service.

In another paragraph over the page appears the following:—

Prisoners were required only to listen when another man talked, and to speak, if they spoke at all, about themselves, each other, or the fact of their being in trouble. Before long Fort Knox's return-to-duty rate became so high, and its return-to-prison rate so low, that the Army demanded that all court-martialed prisoners be exposed to group sessions.

The scheme worked. The Army restored 42,000—three divisions—of its long-term military offenders to duty. And 85 per cent. of these men not only made good but were rated, after their first six months back in service, average or above in performance of duty and in personal conduct. Most striking fact of all: the return-to-prison rate dropped from the dismal 60-plus per cent. so common to civilian prisons to below ten per cent.

I think that article has some relevancy to the type of legislation we are dealing with here and the report concludes with several other paragraphs which I think I should read. One is as follows:—

A group meeting, of course, is unrehearsed; the leader takes only the fragments of life experience which members volunteer during the sessions and somehow brings them into a unified framework—"to give members a sense of going somewhere, toward mutually agreed-upon goals." The leader aims at teaching two things: first, your problems are not peculiar to yourself; second, if you want to change, you can. (In this respect the group resembles Alcoholics Anonymous, our most widespread application of group technique. And AA's national records show that 75 per cent. of its members achieve their group goal of reform.)

The penultimate paragraph has this to say—

Such is the remarkable work being done in New Jersey prisons. Groups are now in operation at Bordentown, Rahway and Anandale, and some progress has been made in the women's

prison at Clinton Farms. Beginnings have also been made in the federal-prison system and at San Quentin and other California prisons. The program so far concentrates on the young, who are most malleable, offer best chance of reform—and commit nearly two thirds of all violent crimes.

The final paragraph of this article in *Human Relations* finishes up in this manner—

Penologists agree that criminals won't be "cured" in prisons by groups or anything else. Steps must be taken, too, outside prisons wall-towards improved parole systems, towards removal of the stigma attached to ex-convicts, towards community understanding. We cannot expect an ex-criminal to "go it alone" in a hostile society more successfully than the rest of us could.

As Mr. Bates said the other day, "Return of the Prodigal Son was only half of that famous Bible story. The other half followed when his community welcomed him home."

So I think that while we are on such an important subject I should try to bring the Minister and the Government up to date with thinking in other parts of the world. I could, without making any apology to the House, read information about what is going on in Great Britain regarding reform of people in prison. I could read a number of paragraphs from the 1963 edition of the official British handbook. In that particular country the authorities are dealing with juveniles, aged from 16 to 21, who are in institutions other than gaols.

As a member of the Opposition I would have appreciated it if the Minister who introduced the Bill had told us the results of some of these reforms which are being introduced. I do not think we as an Opposition, or Parliament as a whole, should willy-nilly accept this Bill just because something has been done in Victoria. We want to be sure that that system is proving itself, and we want to know whether we can improve on it. I think our main job is to improve on something that has been done elsewhere; and if we can analyse the reports from other countries, and other places, and find that we can improve on what they are doing we should do so.

Even the Acting Inspector-General of Mental Health Services in Western Australia had something to say about prison inmates in part VIII of his last report, which is on the files at Parliament House. I shall not weary the House by reading that part of the report, except to say it shows that 46 cases have been dealt with by that section of the Government's activities. The department has its difficulties with mental cases, and that raises another

point. Should we not be considering whether we should have a gaol, apart altogether from our other gaols, for mental defectives—people who are temporarily insane?

At present those people have to go to Fremantle and associate with hardened criminals. Now, the first time one of these hardened criminals sees one of these mental defectives in Hay Street, or in a hotel, he walks up to him and reminds him of the time they spent together in Fremantle gaol in cell 13 or cell 14. All these aspects could have been dealt with by the Minister when he introduced the legislation which, in his own words, is the type of legislation that stays on the Statute book for 30 or 40 years.

I would remind the House that this Bill proposes to do away with the Indeterminate Sentences Board and set up a different type of board to control the parole of prisoners, and to put prisoners on probation. Under this Bill parole officers will be appointed, and for distances beyond 50 miles from Perth this work will be carried out in an honorary capacity. I do not know whether the Minister has gone into the pros and cons of this aspect of the problem, but do the clerks of courts in Kalgoorlie, Geraldton, Northam, Bunbury, Albany, or Esperance, want to act as honorary probation officers?

Is not this legislation going to place a lot more work and responsibility on the shoulders of men who in many cases are overworked at present? Somebody might say parole officers are not overworked. I do not want to weary the House, but I could quote reports showing some of the defects that have been brought about as a result of the Victorian legislation. Parole officers over there are overworked because the numbers are insufficient. The authorities are clamouring for more parole officers.

This could be a costly experiment for the Government. I suppose that at Riverbank, which is almost at my back door, there are 10 to 15 officers to control about 30 inmates. All these matters should be mentioned when we are dealing with this type of legislation.

There is another angle to it, too. This legislation will bring about a departure from established practice inasmuch as in the future, if the Bill is agreed to, people who are convicted will have to pay damages. That is an entirely new departure. They will also have to pay compensation, and I thought the Minister might have developed that theme further and told us whether in cases of accidental damage the person concerned would have to pay. All the Bill says is that damages can be claimed from the convicted person, and also that compensation can be claimed.

There are so many angles to this legislation that we should go into it as fully as possible so that all members will know what the legislation intends to cover. There

are other aspects, such as the length of parole and so on. Convicted persons can lose their parole under certain circumstances, and also they can lose their probation; and they can be recommitted to Fremantle and lose all the benefits of their probation under certain circumstances. They are subject to certain conditions in regard to accepting probation, and they must fully understand what their probation means when they are released. They must agree to those conditions in order that they may be made responsible while they are on parole.

Even habitual criminals, under this legislation, can be wholly discharged after serving certain terms on parole. I think that in the main I have covered the principal provisions in the Bill; but having regard for its importance to the community, the length of time it is likely to remain on the Statute book, and the difficulties we have in Western Australia compared with other parts of Australia, I think a Select Committee should be appointed to go into all facets of the legislation so that we will know, when we do pass it, that it will be acceptable to the majority of the people.

As I said before, I would have been pleased to hear the Minister say that a board would be established to inquire into the matter and tell us why over 40,000 cases of crime occurred in Western Australia. After all, we know that gambling causes a lot of crime. Yet last week, in *The West Australian*, there was a full-page advertisement advising people to buy *The Punter's Guide*. *The West Australian* is not a Sunday paper, or a weekend family paper; it is a daily publication that goes into every home.

Mr. Hall: It is a trap for young players.

Mr. BRADY: I think it is time the Government had some inquiry into that sort of advertising; and it is certainly time there was an inquiry into all aspects of hire-purchase agreements, and into the number of people who are becoming criminals as a result of hire-purchase agreements. This session I have had members telling me of certain constituents of theirs who have been committed to prison because of a weakness in regard to hire-purchase agreements.

Mr. J. Hegney: I had one only a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. BRADY: There were two in my electorate in the last six months. One man went home from work one night and found a "For Sale" notice on his front door. His house was for sale because he could not fulfil the terms of the mortgage. He was a new Australian and he did not understand the terms set out in the mortgage, and so his house was put up for sale. Consequently he had to obtain finance quickly, and the only place from which he thought he could obtain it was from one of these

credit firms. That firm certainly imposed some extortionate terms, including a fee of £9 merely to inspect his house. As a matter of fact, I have a bill in my bag at the moment from one of these credit firms which shows that it charged one of my constituents £9 to inspect his house, following which it refused to lend him any money.

Two or three nights ago a man came to my house and told me he had to give up his job at the Midland Junction Abattoir. He had found it necessary to go to Wittenoom Gorge to earn some big money in a hurry. In fact, he had to earn £200 in a fairly short time because a man held a *fi fa* warrant against him, and he had to pay the money owing or lose his house. I think, therefore, there should be an investigation into hire-purchase agreements and some of the methods used by these lending firms.

In view of the experience I have had with the people I have enumerated, and the difficult circumstances into which they and their families are getting, I think we should investigate these matters before passing this legislation, because it is not something we can put through the House in five minutes. It is legislation that will govern the lives of people for the next 50 years. A determination cannot be made in five minutes. I therefore hope the Minister, even at this late stage, will consider all the aspects of the situation and make some investigations into the activities of those people in our community who are encouraging crime.

I could continue by quoting some of the articles published in the *Financial Review* on the thousands and thousands of pills that are being sold to women to prevent pregnancy. All or any of these acts lead to crime. As a lad, I can remember seeing a picture that I should not have seen because I was under the age of 16. The title of the picture was, "Where are my children?" Some of the older members of the House may remember that picture. Is it any wonder that we have criminal acts?

Now we have the Government bringing down a Bill such as this. As responsible members of Parliament our duty should be to prevent crime and not to be legislating to cure it. This is the place to air our sentiments and voice our thoughts, and that is what I am doing. So I hope the Minister in charge of the Bill in this House will have a further look at it and consider some of the remarks I have made. I think even he will agree that some of these acts are the cause of many of our crimes. We should make some endeavour to cut away some of this deadwood which produces criminals.

I conclude by saying that I would like to see the Bill put in the hands of a Select Committee so that an exhaustive inquiry could be made into its ramifications, and so that all sections of the community would be able to express their views on

how to prevent crime, and how, overnight, we can agree to a system that will produce more hardened criminals in our community. Before the Bill is finally agreed to, I think we should obtain the views of 200 or 300 witnesses, in much the same way as views were expressed by those witnesses who appeared before the juvenile delinquency committee.

Among the 238 witnesses appearing before that committee were Sir Albert Wolff, the Chief Justice; Mr. Justice D'Arcy; Mr. Justice Virtue; and Mr. Justice Jackson. Those top-ranking citizens gave evidence before the committee and undoubtedly it would prove to be of great advantage if those men were to give evidence before a Select Committee appointed by this Parliament to investigate the situation, at this late stage in 1963, in an endeavour to remove from the community the many sources of crime.

For example, we have certain newspapers playing on the fact that teenagers should be allowed to drink; not one newspaper, but two of them. They have published articles, accompanied by photographs of girls of 16 and 17 making statements that they should be entitled to drink intoxicating liquor. Newspapers have their representatives going around interviewing men in various youth movements with the object of obtaining their views on whether teenagers should be entitled to drink. The Government should investigate all these aspects and angles before asking us to accept legislation of this kind. If that were done we would know where we are going and be able to determine what we are seeking and what will be the consequences if we agree to this legislation. I may be off the track, but I do not think I am.

If the Government deems it advisable to establish the Karnet Rehabilitation Centre mainly for alcoholics, it should be good enough for the Government to establish a separate institution for juvenile delinquents, a separate institution for aborigines, and a separate institution for females. I will conclude on that note.

I will support the second reading of the Bill in the hope that at the Committee stage we may be successful in having it referred to a Select Committee so that all angles can be investigated to enable us to know where we are going and where we will finish up with this legislation.

MR. GUTHRIE (Subiaco) [9.47 p.m.]: I listened with great interest to what the Minister and the member for Swan had to say on this measure. With all due respect to the member for Swan I think that, in dealing with this measure, he has introduced into the debate something that is not really before the House. It is quite true, as the member for Swan has said, that there is the problem of preventing crime. That is certainly one problem

confronting us. But the Bill is directed at those people who have already been convicted by the courts for crimes they have committed; and, in the main, they have been serious crimes. Perhaps they are criminals as a result of the mistakes we have made in the past.

However, we have to accept the fact that, even though we may create a new society or a new aspect on life, we will still have these people with us for a long time. The member for Swan also stated that this law might be with us for 50 years. It might be with us for 50 minutes or 50 weeks. He does not know, and I do not know. It is for Parliament to amend the Act from time to time as it thinks fit as a result of the experience gained from this experiment. The fact that 45 years have elapsed since the last major piece of legislation on this subject was introduced to Parliament is no reason why we should believe that we will have to wait another 45 years before making a further step forward.

I have said before, and I say again, that we are going through changing times in regard to our approach to criminals. I foresee the day—probably not in my lifetime, or in the lifetime of any member in this House tonight—when courts will not impose sentences on criminals. The time may come when courts will merely have as their function the deciding of the guilt and some other body will make a decision on the term or sentence to be imposed on the convicted person.

During the life of the previous Parliament amendments were made to the Child Welfare Act in regard to dealing with children. Unfortunately I did not bring with me tonight a white paper which I obtained some years ago when the amendments to the Child Welfare Act were before this House. It is a white paper that was published in London by the Secretary of State for Home Affairs, The Right Hon. Mr. Butler, which deals with this aspect and which shows that the tendency of modern English thinking is towards more and more reform. That line of thought can even be found in the report of the Royal Commission on Capital Punishment.

I would also point out to the House—this is something which the member for Swan seems to have overlooked—that there are safeguards in this Bill: some strong safeguards. Nobody can be released on probation or on parole unless it is in accordance with certain decisions made by the court which sentences the particular person. Before I come to that point, I would remind the House that the parole system is not new. The first parole system I can remember reading about is the one introduced in Port Jackson shortly after its establishment as a convict colony, where even those people sent out from

England and sentenced to transportation for life were released on parole after a short space of time.

Even in 1788 it was considered that parole was worth while as being able to do something for the poor unfortunate transgressor of the law who had come before the courts and been sentenced. At the risk of repetition I would like to read part of the Minister's speech when he was dealing with probations. The Minister said—

The courts will be empowered to call on the chief probation officer, when a person is convicted and before he is sentenced, to submit a report on the convicted person and his background. This will be helpful in enabling a decision to be made as to whether the issuance of a probation order is desirable. In the event of a person being convicted by a court of any offence punishable by a term of imprisonment, otherwise than in default of payment of a fine, the court may, having regard to all the circumstances, the nature of the offence, the character and personal history of the offender, his home surroundings and other environment, order him to be put on probation if such course is deemed expedient rather than a prison sentence.

Those are the only circumstances in which a person can be released on probation, as distinct from parole. He is released on probation if the trial judge, having had a report from the chief probation officer, thinks it is desirable.

The provisions in the Bill which are mentioned in the portion of the Minister's speech to which I referred are contained in clause 9 of the Bill, which makes quite clear the circumstances under which a probation order can be made.

There is another provision which says that if a court is considering releasing a person on recognisance, it is required to consider before it does so whether a probation period would be preferable. At the present time—this Bill of course not being law—when a person is arraigned before our criminal court the judge, once the man has been convicted, has three alternatives, and three alternatives only. He can imprison the man; he can, in some cases where the Criminal Code makes specific provision for it, fine him; and that only applies to certain crimes; or thirdly release him on bond. Assuming the judge has no power to fine, and he feels it is wrong to send the man to gaol, but that he should have some corrective treatment, he is then in a quandary; he can only send him to gaol or release him on a bond. He cannot release him on probation. This Bill will give such power to the court. This power can only be exercised if the court sees fit to do it. If the

trial judge is not prepared to do it, and if a court of appeal is not prepared to upset his decision, there is no probation.

So it is not a question of some backroom boys sitting in an office in the Chief Secretary's building merely deciding these things. They cannot alter the decision of the court so far as probation is concerned. They can supervise the probationee—if I might coin a word—once he is let out. The court is empowered to call on the chief probation officer, and it hears the case for and against the man in the various reports from the police and the probation officer dealing with his antecedents and so on, after which it makes its decision.

On the subject of parole I do not propose to deal at all with the case of people who are already sentenced and in gaol—because they will only be a passing phase; that is, only there for a short while—but to deal with the cases of parole which will arise in the future; in other words, persons who will after the passage of this measure if it is passed or alternatively convicted prior to it but not sentenced until after its passage. The court having decided that the offender shall be sentenced to say five years' imprisonment is then required to consider as part of its decision whether or not it will impose or specify a minimum period before which the offender can be released on parole.

In other words the judge has made up his mind on a five-year gaol sentence. He then starts to think as to what period he will specify as the minimum period before the man can be released on parole; that is, he has to say what is the minimum period of sentence which the man will serve.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: He does not have to be given a minimum.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I will come to that in a moment. If the judge is so minded he says, "All right, I will say three years is the minimum period before parole can be made." In other words the judge then says in effect, "The man is to serve a minimum period of three years' gaol and a maximum of five years' gaol." His parole is then determined by the parole board after the minimum period has been served.

As the Minister has reminded me, if the judge is satisfied from the report he gets that it is not desirable at all to have a minimum period for parole, the judge does not fix any minimum period and the construction of the Bill will be quite clear. The judge has in effect said, "Five years' gaol and five years the sentence will be. There will be no minimum period." If in certain circumstances where the judge has not fixed a minimum period—and the Minister can correct me if I am wrong on this—if I remember the provisions of the Bill, the Comptroller-General can bring it to the Court of Criminal Appeal if it is the

Supreme Court, and make an application to the Supreme Court if it is a decision of a lower court to reconsider the case and then insert into the sentence a minimum period if that appeal court thinks fit; but if that appeal court does not think fit, it still remains a sentence without a minimum period before release.

I do suggest to the House that this measure is not as revolutionary as some people would have us believe. It still preserves to our courts the decision on the sentence; it still preserves to our courts the power to decide whether there shall be a probationary and a minimum period before there can be a parole.

I do say this: The granting to the courts of the power to release a person on probation is a most desirable step forward, because such power is lacking at the moment, and many a person has gone to gaol because the judge felt the mere release on a bond was not sufficient. If the judge could have released a person in those circumstances under supervision I am sure that many people who served terms in Fremantle gaol and in other prison centres in Western Australia would not have served their sentences. Of that I feel quite confident.

The member for Swan made some reference to the judges of our Supreme Court who had given evidence before a certain committee. I would remind him that it is the self-same judges named this evening who are going to implement this measure, and without that implementation by those judges the people affected by the measures in the Bill cannot be inflicted on the community.

I commend the measure to the House. I do so because it is a step in the right direction and is in keeping with modern thinking. I do not reject some of the matters mentioned by the member for Swan, such as the desirability of preventing crime; but I do suggest to the honourable member that is another subject, and one which I agree should be looked into.

This Bill deals with people who have transgressed; but the subject of the prevention of crime is a different one, and starts almost at the cradle and is related to youth delinquency. Crime prevention is a totally different subject; and with due respect to the member for Swan, if the House debates that topic we will be drawing red herrings across the path of a measure which, I think, is very worthy of support.

In any event, if the legislation does not work out, reports will be made to the Minister in the future. I am quite certain that if any Government knew the judges had found it was not working out, or was not working as it was intended to work, and that the legislation required amendment, it would be amended by Parliament. I would be amazed if, in the

event of its not working out, we had to wait another forty years for amendments to be made.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [10.3 p.m.]: Where I took extreme opposition to the previous measure, I can see merit in the one before us. I do not disagree radically with what my colleague, the member for Swan, said; but I do see the prisons from a different point of view. I have to live in the area in which the Fremantle gaol is situated, because it is in my electorate, and is right under my nose all the time. That institution presents a very objectionable sight.

Since my election to this House I have been very anxious to see the objection removed, but that is not possible unless there is some reduction in the number of inmates in the prison. I do sympathise with the member for Swan when he says that our social order is a contributing factor to the imprisonment of many of those who are in gaol. I heartily agree with his view, and we on this side of the House attempt to seek redress, to bring about some change in the social disorder so as to reduce the number of inmates in our gaols.

However, we have to accept the situation as it is, rather than as we would like it to be. The position being what it is, something should be done to reduce the overcrowding which exists at present. Taking this as my basic point, I would suggest to the Minister that if I did seek any amendment in the Bill it would be along these lines: I would ask that serious consideration be given to the composition of the proposed parole board, and urge that one of the nominated members be an official, or member of the Gaol Officers' Union. I do so for the reason that they know so well the behaviour of the prisoners.

When prisoners appear before the existing board—the Indeterminate Sentences Board—they are on their best behaviour for the purpose of influencing the board members. I am sure the Minister will agree with what I have said. They are on their best behaviour for that very purpose; but they do not always behave in that manner while they are under the supervision of the gaol officers. Since the gaol officers know the character, the behaviour, and the past record of the prisoners, they would not be influenced by behaviour in the presence of board members. The gaol officers know the prisoners more intimately; and as a consequence I would like to see an amendment made along the lines I have proposed. I am sure the Minister will give serious consideration to it for the reasons I have outlined. In my view, the proposed parole board is desirable, subject to the inclusion thereon of a representative of the gaol officers.

I am aware of the attitude of all, including the Mayor, the citizens, and the unions of Fremantle on this question. They are all anxious to see the numbers in the institution reduced. For the information of the House I obtained the most recent figures of the number of inmates; and at the end of last week there were 442 males and 26 females cramped into the prison. Having visited the gaol on several occasions, I have seen the situation for myself, and so have many residents in the Fremantle area.

The Minister had reservations when he said that by confining and mixing of the not-so-bad with the very bad types of prisoners some of the prisoners came out of the gaol in a worse character state than when they went in. I congratulate the Minister for having made that statement, because I believe that to be the case. In view of the overcrowding which exists in Fremantle gaol every step possible should be taken to ensure that first offenders are not sent there, if it is possible at all to keep them out; that is, subject to proper supervision.

If we accept the view that contamination occurs when first offenders are mixed with hardened criminals, then it is very desirable to keep first offenders out of gaol, and this Bill attempts to achieve that end. The alternative is to do nothing; but I think that is very undesirable, simply because the situation would remain as it is.

I would point out that the gaol regulations are already being broken, and I referred to this matter during the last session of Parliament. It is inevitable for that to happen, owing to overcrowding. There is not sufficient accommodation in the gaol; and as a result, where one inmate should be confined to a cell frequently two are confined. One can imagine what opportunity is presented for collaboration between two prisoners in a cell. A prisoner on his own does not have as much chance for sowing seeds of discontent, and for making plans for further criminal activities when he gets out.

This Bill provides that the people with whom it deals would be released into the community under supervision. Those people would have a gaol sentence hanging over their heads; and I would suggest that the shame they had brought upon themselves and their relatives would be enough to prevent them from committing a similar crime and going to gaol and so bringing further shame on their own and their families' heads. The fact that they had been caught and received resultant publicity would be punishment to them; and I would hope that under proper supervision from wise guidance officers those offenders would never see the inside of a prison again. If, after a first offence, a person were released on probation he would

say, "I have been caught once, and if I transgress again I will be put inside for an indefinite period."

I know this type of legislation exists in Tasmania and Victoria. I also know that in New South Wales a person who had committed a terrible criminal act—a killing—was released after psychologists and other people had examined him, and unfortunately, he offended again by killing once more. I suggest that that could conceivably happen here. But we have to grasp the nettle. Even if there is a case like that—I admit a killing is a frightful thing—we have to take a calculated risk; and provided we could save nine offenders by the corrective measures that I hope are inherent in this Bill, it would be worth while.

I did not take the adjournment of the debate on this measure and have not studied it to the same extent as the member for Swan. However, even if we make one mistake but correct nine other offenders, we have achieved something. If this Bill will do that, it is desirable. It is necessary to separate the good or the not-so-good from the bad or the very bad—and it would appear this Bill does attempt to achieve that.

I certainly criticise the Press, but in *The West Australian* of today's date there was a leading article which expressed a realistic view of this matter. I will not weary the House by quoting this article, but I would point out that the *Sunday Times* also contributed a leading article on the subject, which was quite a critical analysis of the Bill. I notice that the Press is able to achieve in very few words a synopsis, as it were, of a Bill which takes us quite a considerable time to cover its salient points.

I would like to quote from a book about the Federal Correctional Institution at Seagoville, Texas. I have quoted from this book before; and what I am about to read is relevant to my suggestion that the Minister should give consideration to gaol officer representation on any proposed board. I quote from page 18 of the book as follows:—

The old prison guard with the ring of keys, the traditional leer, and the heavy step has disappeared.

I will interpolate here and say that I know that to be a fact from my personal contact with the gaol officers in my electorate. Continuing—

In his place is an alert, trained, and understanding officer who works intimately with his men—

That is, the inmates—

—every day and who is interested in helping each one develop attitudes which will one day enable him to take his place in the free community as a self-supporting and self-respecting citizen. For the officers share in the

belief of the entire Seagoville personnel that a man can be taught such attitudes only when he is exposed to them.

I think that sums up the situation; and it sums up my attitude.

I made reference to that quotation for this reason: Gaol officers have expressed to me dissatisfaction with the situation as it exists at the moment. Any man who is conscientious likes to do the best job he can; and gaol officers have admitted quite frankly that they cannot do their best for the inmates at Fremantle gaol under existing circumstances. That being so, and when there is such a general consensus of opinion that something has to be done to achieve a better situation so far as the Fremantle gaol and penology generally are concerned, I commend any effort made to achieve it.

I respect the reservations the member for Swan has in regard to this matter, and I do not want to take any attitude that is diametrically opposed to any attitude he has, but I ask the Minister to give consideration to the points I have raised and say something in regard to them when he replies.

Relative to my earlier remarks about how anxious I am to see the removal of the gaol, I will read a question which I asked the Chief Secretary on the 14th August, 1962. I asked the Minister—

- (1) Will he endeavour to hasten the removal of Fremantle gaol to an adjacent market gardening area, where inmates can be healthily and gainfully engaged in the production of vegetables and other garden produce to a sufficient extent to supply gaol and charitable institutions?
- (2) Will he agree that even at this point of time certain prisoners under gaol officer supervision could be transported to and from a market gardening area to achieve the purpose above, while awaiting the building of gaol and staff quarters?

The Minister replied as follows:—

- (1) Yes; but unfortunately I cannot visualise an early removal of the prison.
- (2) No; at this point of time it is not practicable, on staffing or economic grounds.

I suggest that if we can reduce the number of inmates in the Fremantle gaol it will not be so expensive to build an alternative institution in the area I proposed in that question, where the inmates could indulge in rehabilitative activities that could be beneficial to themselves and to the State.

My knowledge of this Bill is on the sketchy side, because I have secured the adjournment of another measure which is related to this one; but I do see points in it which are along the lines I have mentioned. There may be undesirable points

as mentioned by the member for Swan that would be worth having another look at, but I support the Bill with the reservations I have expressed and with the amendments I have suggested.

MR. HALL (Albany) [10.18 p.m.]: There have been two trends of thought this evening. The member for Swan has mentioned preventive measures; and the Minister, in the Bill before the House, is introducing a parole system for offenders. Whilst we cannot hope for a 100 per cent. cure by the preventive method, we have to accept the alternative of a parole system, which is an admirable gesture to relieve pressure on the State regarding cost. Quite a lot of people are forced into circumstances which cause them to commit a crime. Sometimes it is because of adverse conditions in their domestic life, brought about by hire purchase and other commitments.

I would say that nothing could be more frustrating in a person's domestic life than to be faced with accumulated debts and unemployment; and this sometimes forces a person to commit a crime in order to find an easy way out of his problem. As a result he becomes a burden on the State, which has to provide for his family in the form of child welfare assistance until such time as the Commonwealth takes over. As a consequence, we have an accumulation of debts.

If we study the figures I obtained in answer to some questions on juvenile delinquency on the 29th August this year, we find a very interesting point. I want to associate this with the remarks of the member for Swan, because I think it demonstrates forcibly that it is better to prevent unemployment than have to put up with the incidence of crime which has occurred during the two peak unemployment periods. On the date mentioned, I asked the following questions:—

- (1) Has there been an increase in juvenile crime in the metropolitan area?
- (2) What were the respective figures for the years 1957-58, 1958-59, 1959-60, 1960-61, 1961-62, 1962-63?

The answers I received were as follows:—

- (1) From 1957-58 to 1960-61 there was an increase in juvenile crime. In 1961-62 it declined but has returned to almost the same figure as 1960-61 during the last year.
- (2) Figures of juveniles committing offences for the whole State:—

			Charges	Percentage of Popula- tion	
1957-58	1,366	children	2,171	1.12
1958-59	1,409	"	2,430	1.12
1959-60	1,547	"	2,419	1.21
1960-61	1,626	"	2,678	1.24
1961-62	1,469	"	2,288	1.09
1962-63	1,620	"	2,843
				(Est. Pop.	7-17)

I wish to emphasise the fact that in 1961-62 and 1962-63 there was a decided increase. I believe this has a bearing on the remark made by the member for Swan in that it is much better to prevent than to cure. Therefore we should watch our unemployment and make sure that people are able to maintain domestic stability and keep up their commitments and thereby be saved the frustration experienced through separation following crime. In many instances the imprisonment results in divorce.

I do believe that the measure has some commendable value but I think there is some merit in the suggestion of the member for Swan that a Select Committee be appointed to investigate the matter.

Like the member for Swan, I have not studied the Bill in its entirety, clause by clause, but I think it is necessary we should do so before we go too far. In South Australia there has been established an Adult Probation Service and the following is quoted from its annual report for the year 1958-59:—

The Probation Officers have continued throughout the past year to prepare Pre-sentence Reports for the courts on offenders, and have continued to supervise probationers released under the Offenders Probation Act, 1913-1953—

It is quite evident from that statement that there is in operation in South Australia an Act which is working admirably. To continue—

and the Prisons Act, 1936-1956, which functions have been fully described in previous reports. In addition, during this period they have had to accept greater responsibility in that the supervision of habitual criminals who have been released on licence under the provisions of section 323 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1956 has been allotted to them.

I will not weary the House by reading the full report, but another portion of it is as follows:—

The three male officers with a total of 357 male probationers between them and the one female officer with a total of 44 female probationers have worked at capacity showing zeal and altruism in the performance of their duties. Officers with approximately 70 probationers under their charge are prevented from giving the quality of supervision they would like to give as is envisaged by authorities on probation.

That is the point I would like to make. How are we going to police this legislation economically if it is passed? It certainly has some merit, but we must consider the economics of it when it goes into the Committee stage.

In this report is a section headed "A—Offenders Probation Act", portion of which reads as follows:—

The probation system provides an opportunity, in proper cases,—

I emphasise that—in proper cases—

for those convicted of crime to effect their own reformation under the guidance and authority of a sympathetic Probation Officer. If probation is to succeed there must be every intention on the part of the probationer to make it succeed, reinforced by the knowledge that punishment may follow if it does not.

Recently I had the unpleasant experience of having to try to help some young people in strife in the juvenile court, and it was very easy to sense the dilemma of the legal practitioner trying to do his best for the boys, who had committed no serious crime. The magistrate was aiding him in an endeavour to see what could be done to benefit those youths. Outside the courthouse was another group waiting to go before the same magistrate for similar crimes, and those young people were just one year older.

It is not very hard to realise that people who are occupying positions of trust are trying to do their best for juveniles who are not hardened criminals. Mostly they have merely made an error: but some of them I am sure commit these offences because, having read the Press, they feel they are heroes when they neutralise the actions of the police. I do not think publicity should be given to these matters because the police have proved they can track these offenders down, even if it takes time.

As I say, many of these young offenders feel they are heroes. They read of the publicity given to offenders in other areas and try to copy them so as to be placed in the same category.

Mr. Davies: We do not want any more of it.

Mr. HALL: That is true. As the member for Victoria Park says, we do not want any more of it; and that is why I agree with the member for Swan that it is important we get down to the cause of the trouble and prevent it rather than try to find ways and means of curing it.

However, I do believe there are commendable features in this Bill. The system has been tried in other States, and it is certainly a way of reducing the cost to the State. If these people are sentenced to imprisonment, the State has to keep them. If they were placed on parole, they would be able to continue their private lives while at the same time being given an opportunity to rehabilitate themselves, thus avoiding the frustration of being deprived of their family life. There is nothing worse than for a man to commit a

crime—often in an effort to assist his family out of difficulty—only to find he has involved them in far more debt and embarrassment.

We must study the Bill more in Committee and ascertain its deficiencies and correct them. I believe the measure has merit, but I will not say whether I will vote for it until it has passed through the Committee stage.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [10.30 p.m.]: The wheels of reform, like many other wheels, turn very slowly. Way back in September, 1953, according to *Hansard*, there was a motion passed to this effect: "That in the opinion of this House the Minister for Justice should bring down a Bill providing for the parole of prisoners similar to the Canadian Act." That was virtually the unanimous decision of this House. Now, 10 years later, we find that the action has been taken.

The matter was debated fully at the time by the Attorney-General, and past Attorney-General, who submitted their views and the views of the department, which has now put up proposals for the Minister to proceed with—proposals no doubt backed by the Government, otherwise they would not have been brought forward. At that time the main argument was that there was no need for any amending legislation; that the position was quite well handled by the Indeterminate Sentences Board, the prerogative of the Minister, and so on.

I mention this fact because we should pay far more attention to the decisions of this House when we are dealing with amending legislation. The motion to which I have referred was moved by Mr. J. B. Sleeman, the then member for Fremantle, who was always advocating prison reform. He pointed out that the parole system had been adopted and accepted in Germany in 1871; in the Netherlands in 1881; in Japan in 1882; and in the French Republic in 1885. It has since been used in Austria, Italy, and Portugal.

We seem to be a long way behind many European countries in making even a move towards penal reform. The committing of prisoners to Fremantle gaol merely confines, as the Minister indicated, undesirables of various classifications in one group, and the situation probably becomes a cesspit for future lawbreaking activities. While gaol staffs and rehabilitation officers have the best intentions, unless we have a system whereby sentences can be held in suspension, our objective is defeated. It is high time we got on with the job. We should not only take for granted the matters which are contained in the Bill, but we should also have a good look at the whole question of penal reform and should go as far as we possibly can.

Every member has had the experience of making representations, on humanitarian and other grounds, to the Minister for the release of prisoners from gaols at various times. Some members have had the misfortune of knowing that the prisoners concerned have afterwards committed other crimes. But such incidents are rare. I have heard of only one or two members who have been let down after they have made overtures to the Minister.

Some Ministers are loth to intervene, as was indicated during the course of this debate in 1953. The then Minister for Justice, Mr. Nulsen, had a good record of letting people out of prison. In comparison, Mr. Abbott, who was Attorney-General in previous years, released about six or seven prisoners. He said he thought it was a matter more for the Indeterminate Sentences Board than that he, as Attorney-General, should give consideration to such cases. However, he agreed that something should be done about the matter.

In my opinion, the onus being placed on the Minister is the wrong course. In fact, it does not always work. We are of different political persuasions; and while that should not enter into the matter, periodically it does. An approach to the Minister by one of the Minister's kinsmen on his particular side of the House would, I think, have quite a bit of bearing on whether some additional consideration should be given to a case. That does not happen in all instances.

I quote no specific case, but humans being what they are, that is often the way they work. If one associates with people of one's own family, one does more for those people than one might do for others from another family. That being so, from time to time some cases receive special consideration, whereas other worthy cases possibly do not receive the consideration they deserve, and the prisoners concerned are left to serve out their time.

I have known of some rather drastic penalties being imposed which were not justified. Ministers, whether they have been on my side of the House or on the other side of the House, have on occasions agreed that sentences have been unnecessarily harsh, and they have taken action to correct them. When first offenders have been given the key and detained at the Governor's pleasure, often it has spurred the Minister into saying that something should be done for those particular persons. On occasions they have terminated a finite sentence so that the Indeterminate Sentences Board might review a case. That has been when representations have been made through a member of the Legislature.

But for every case for which representations are made, there are quite a few hundred—possibly deserving cases—which do not receive the attention of members

of Parliament, because they are not brought to the attention of somebody who shows an interest in them, and the persons concerned have to serve out their time and put up with the consequences.

There is a point which I should like to mention to the Minister. What is going to happen about prisoners who have already been sentenced? I know there is a provision in the Act where the Comptroller-General of Prisons can apply to the court for determination of an actual sentence before consideration is given to parole. But I do not think it is clear enough. It should be stated somewhere in the Act that these people will receive some consideration.

When the old system of release is done away with, there should be some continuity, and all cases should be reviewed on the same basis. A man might be serving a sentence of seven years for the crime of embezzlement. This might not have been a great offence against humanity, but more of an offence against the man himself for being foolish enough to become involved. He might be a model prisoner. In my opinion such a man should receive fairly early consideration regarding parole.

Various systems have been in operation throughout the world. The French-Canadian system of "ticket of leave"—where a third person can apply on a prisoner's behalf to have a "ticket of leave" review—seems to have been a most favoured system in overseas countries. Over the years this system of parole has been found to be successful. Gaols in many European countries have been filled with political prisoners. Fortunately, we have not been able to acquire the taste for that situation here; otherwise I, and some members on the other side of the House, might not be present here tonight. In those countries, when persons are politically inclined violently one way or the other they are put in prison for a considerable time and are forgotten about. In those countries the petty criminal seems to receive very early consideration. I understand that in Canada only 5.2 per cent. of "ticket of leave" cases which have been considered by the Canadian courts have been really serious cases. †

So it would appear that the system is a good one. It is effective from many angles, and it is attractive from a financial standpoint. The State would not have to provide for people where they were able to make their own way and look after their own families. In many cases when a person is committed to gaol the State is not only responsible for his maintenance while he is in gaol, and for the small payment made to him for the task that he is performing, but it also has to pay a sum of money to his wife and family if the children are young.

We have to balance our budget far better than we have done in the past in this regard, and I am sure the Treasurer will appreciate the additional funds that will be made available under this new system. It will be an economic advantage to the State to have people working in industry, or in some form of commerce, rather than to have them tied up and a half a dozen of them trying to work an old letterpress machine, or something of that nature, at the Fremantle gaol. That is a most uneconomic system.

Of course, that brings us to the point that while we are dealing with one particular section of prisoners we must not forget the other section to whom I have already referred. I think that is where the legislation falls down at this juncture, and it probably should go further and an inquiry should be made into the whole of the prison and penal system of this State with a view to recommendations being made for further improvements. An open inquiry into all aspects of the problem should be undertaken, because I repeat: The departmental attitude on this matter 10 years ago was very clear. The department felt nothing further need be done and that all the legislation required was already on the statute book. Quite frankly, I do not believe that is so. I would like to see all aspects reviewed before many more years have passed.

As I said, it is a great shame that the matter was left in abeyance until 10 years after the House had made a clear determination, without opposition, that we should proceed with some system of parole and penal reform. To that end I am quite happy to support the legislation; but I do not think it goes far enough in regard to the question of reform. We should have further looks at all sorts of attitudes in regard to sentencing prisoners. After all, once the stigma of a prison sentence has been placed on a person it is a blot on his character; and if he has a reasonably high moral fibre, as many who make mistakes have, it worries him more than the fact that he has been sent to prison for a couple of months.

It is that sort of thing we have to look at, and whether it is not better to hold the sentence over offenders' heads for a time instead of sending them to prison. That is another aspect of the problem—whether the time the sentence should be held over their heads should be indefinite or only for a certain number of years. If the sentence is held over a person's head for, say, 20 years, and it was originally only a two year sentence, it would be far worse than if he had been sent to prison for two years in the first place.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It is a maximum of five years on probation.

Mr. JAMIESON: That is not so bad, but it really depends on the initial sentence. However, the legislation is a good move

and it deserves support; but there should be far more inquiry into all aspects of penal servitude than has been given to it in this State up to the present time.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Chief Secretary) [10.45 p.m.]: I think it appropriate for me to thank members for their general support of the Bill and the principles for which it stands. The Government thinks it is a good Bill; that it is worth-while legislation; and that it is legislation designed to assist in the rehabilitation of those in our community who offend against our laws.

Only one of the members who spoke to the Bill did not seem to like its provisions very much—and I refer to the member for Swan—although he finished up by saying he would support the second reading. I think the honourable member allowed himself to be led very far from the real provisions of the measure, and its prime purpose. I would like to remind the House that this is a Bill for an Act relating to the release of offenders on probation or parole; and the short title is the Offenders Probation and Parole Act, 1963. It is new legislation and it provides for those who are convicted under our laws.

The member for Subiaco, and one or two members of the same party as the member for Swan, pointed out very gently, or implied, that he had strayed a little bit from the path. The prevention of crime does not come within the purview of this legislation, although it is a most important feature of crime, punishment, and the rehabilitation of offenders. Of course, prevention is better than cure—I go right along with that—but this is a Bill to try to provide an improvement in so far as the rehabilitation of convicted persons is concerned, and it does a pretty good job towards that end.

No-one claims it is perfect legislation. Like all legislation it will have to stand a passage through both Houses; and, like all legislation, it will be amended from time to time. Last session I was successful in having passed through both Houses important legislation regarding mental health services. That measure has not yet been proclaimed because, as I told members, it will not be proclaimed for some time because a large number of regulations have to be drafted and a good deal of spade work has to be done before the law can be fully implemented. Yet already, before that legislation has been proclaimed, there are one or two sections which need amending because they do not quite cater for certain situations regarding the reform institution at Karnet.

So do not let any of us imagine that any Minister introducing a Bill provides the perfect vehicle for the implementation of the principles that the legislation is

supposed to carry out. Therefore I think the member for Swan was, perhaps unwittingly, ungenerous in his remarks.

Mr. Brady: No. I don't like you closing the stable door after the horse has gone.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The honourable member is once more bringing forward the prevention of crime, and I would remind him of the remarks I made in the initial part of my speech. At one stage even the honourable member himself said that he may have been off the track and I can go along with him on that. The whole point of the legislation is to provide for the setting up of a probation and parole system.

The object of the proposal on probation is to enable a judge to request a probation officer to ascertain the background of the man or woman who has appeared before him to avoid making a conviction which would result in the person being sent to prison. This is an admirable approach. Frequently we have had the judiciary complaining that it has no recourse but to send a man to prison. If the background of the person before the court is investigated, and it is possible for a judge or magistrate to place that person on parole or probation it will be all to the good.

It must not be thought that once a man is placed on probation he is free to do as he likes, because such will not be the case. He will be subject to strict supervision, and the probation officer entrusted with the responsibility of caring for him will keep a watch on his activities whilst he is on parole without being a millstone around the prisoner's neck. The success of this scheme depends a great deal on the judiciary and upon their judgment in selecting prisoners to be placed on probation; and, naturally enough, mistakes will be made.

Mr. Jamieson: Which judge will determine whether a prisoner is suitable to be placed on probation?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: At the moment, I cannot say which judge will be the one to decide.

Mr. Jamieson: That would have a great bearing on the matter.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I cannot tell the honourable member at this juncture who the judge will be. I was about to remark that the member for Beeloo made a point by saying it is a pity that something like this was not brought down soon after a motion was passed by this House in 1953. I am inclined to agree. Since that time the departmental officers, and certainly the Government, have agreed that a state of affairs has been reached when it is considered desirable for this legislation to be introduced. These men and women—particularly women—who are placed on probation will escape serving a short term

in prison during which time they could be infected—I do not know whether that is the correct word to use—by hardened criminals who frequently take pleasure in reducing still further the moral standards of a casual offender. It is known that this does happen.

If we can avoid that happening it will be all to the good and the community generally will benefit. I point out that it is not only the individual who benefits from being placed on probation and who is protected from the stigma of becoming a prisoner, but also the community generally; because we do not have casual offenders, perhaps, being infected by hardened criminals and then, when they are released from prison, circulating among the community to commit further offences, and, on conviction, having to serve a much longer prison term. The proposed system outlined in the Bill seeks to avoid that.

The parole system is one which has been well tried in many other communities. As I have said, there will be a board in control of it and there will be strict supervision. The member for Swan condemned the proposed system with the sweeping remark made towards the conclusion of his speech to the effect that hardened criminals would be released on to the community. That is not the object of the parole board. The object is that if a man serving a prison sentence indicates by his good behaviour that he is making an effort to rehabilitate himself, the board will take steps to terminate his incarceration.

However, this will not be done before parole officers have discussed the situation with him to ascertain whether he can be released among the community, and it will not be done before they have reviewed his domestic troubles and have, generally, made exhaustive inquiries. After all this is done the parole board will make its decision. I repeat that these men on parole will be under strict supervision.

The member for Swan also stated that this legislation should be dealt with little by little. I find it difficult to understand how we can do that. At one stage he also considered it might be desirable to place the legislation in the hands of a Select Committee. There is urgent need for this legislation now. If in the not-too-far-distant future we need to amend it, let us amend it, but first let us get it on to the Statute book.

Mr. Graham: Why is it any more urgent now than in a couple of months' time?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: No good purpose would be served by a Select Committee inquiring into the legislation at present. Let us get the Bill on to the Statute book and then, if necessary, it can be amended in the future. We have already heard other members trying to inform the

member for Balcatta that it is worth while giving it a trial on the Statute book.

Mr. Graham: A few weeks will not make any difference.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It will make a great deal of difference.

Mr. Graham: You compelled the Labor Government to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into a piece of its legislation within a week of the close of the session.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am not talking about that.

Mr. Graham: But you could have a Select Committee appointed to inquire into this Bill and still get it through this session.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: As usual, the member for Balcatta is trying to drag a red herring across the trail.

Mr. Graham: No; he is just asking you to be consistent.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Do not wag your finger at me!

Mr. Graham: Who the devil do you think you are talking to?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Would the member for Balcatta like to know?

Mr. Graham: The Speaker might intervene if you told him.

Mr. Brady: Do you think he is pointing the bone at you?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: After this little interlude created by the member for Balcatta, I will proceed.

Mr. Graham: It might be fifty-fifty.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The member for Fremantle said that he supported the Bill, but felt the composition of the parole board should include a member of the Gaol Officers' Union. Provision is made in the Bill for the appointment of five members, and at present I do not see much purpose in discussing any increase in the number of personnel. It is a question that can be dealt with in Committee, but in my view there is no necessity to have a member of the Gaol Officers' Union on this board.

The member for Beeloo asked what happens to prisoners who have been sentenced. He felt they should be included in the legislation and given the benefits of possible parole, as would prisoners sentenced subsequent to the passage of this Bill. There is provision in the Bill for this policy. Prisoners sentenced immediately before the coming into operation of the new Act will be entitled to have a term fixed by the board.

I think that covers generally the remarks that were made by members who have spoken on the legislation. I repeat this is worth-while legislation which

deserves a passage through this House, and through another place, to enable it to be placed on the Statute book fairly quickly.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Reference to Select Committee

MR. BRADY (Swan) [11.2 p.m.]: Mr. Speaker, would I be in order in moving that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee?

The **SPEAKER** (Mr. Hearman): The honourable member may so move if he wishes.

Mr. BRADY: I move—

That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Chief Secretary) [11.3 p.m.]: I oppose the motion. During his second reading speech the member for Swan said he thought it was necessary for a Select Committee to inquire into this Bill. He mainly dealt with the prevention of crime, and referred to such things as prevention being better than cure; and he said the Government was putting the cart before the horse, and so on.

Mr. Brady: I also referred to the segregation of prisoners and to prison reform.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: This is already being done. The previous Government would not spend any money at all in this matter of prison reform; whereas the present Government is attempting to do something. The attitude of the member for Swan is purely one of jealousy, prompted by the action of my Government in trying to do something by way of prison reform. It is too silly for words that the member for Swan should seek an inquiry by Select Committee into matters which are completely redundant to the purposes of the Bill before the House; and I deplore his wild effusions during his second reading speech.

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta) [11.4 p.m.]: Surely the Chief Secretary is being most unreasonable. He is using a whole spate of extravagant words.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Did you hear the member for Swan?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, I did. Because the member for Swan spoke forcefully, I do not think his efforts should be decried.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You mean that mine were extravagant words, but his were forceful words.

Mr. GRAHAM: The member for Swan moved a proposition which he foreshadowed when he was speaking earlier. He indicated that there were many factors responsible for persons being incarcerated

which rendered it necessary for legislation in this or some other form, to deal with prisoners on probation or on parole, as well as those left inside, or otherwise dealt with.

I think it was quite a constructive contribution. As the member for Swan sees it—and I agree with him—this Bill embodies the views and ideas of the Government. Those views may or may not be the complete answer. The Government of the day has available to it administrative officers of considerable experience, references, textbooks, and records; and the Minister and the Government are advised by its officers.

The members of the Opposition, and indeed private members supporting the Government, play a part in the passing of legislation. If the rank and file members were not to vote, in support we would have eight Ministers for the legislation and the rest of the members against. Surely, therefore, all of us are entitled in an important matter of public interest, such as the measure before the House, to inform our minds.

Try as he may, what opportunity has the ordinary private member in the course of a couple of days to familiarise himself not only with what the Bill seeks to do, but with the hundred and one other matters pertaining to criminology, penology, prison reform, and so on? Surely all of us on both sides of the House would be much happier if there were appointed two Liberal members, a Country Party member, and two Labor members to call in witnesses, to ask questions, to seek proof and substantiation in respect of certain points, and elucidation on difficulties encountered in other parts of the world, and so on.

If such a committee were to submit a report endorsing the Bill *in toto*, or perhaps suggesting a couple of amendments to it, then I think I can say that all members of this House, and perhaps of the Legislative Council as well, would feel they were able to support the Bill in the reasonably firm knowledge that it was an adequate measure. Is there anything unreasonable in a request which seeks to attain to that objective? As a matter of fact, in some Parliaments there is a very definite trend, as members are aware, for committees to examine measures at certain stages; and in some cases, of course, before legislation is formally introduced.

We know that in certain States, and in the Commonwealth, there are certain standing committees which have the opportunity of calling witnesses, getting information from Government departments, and the rest of it, so that the rank and file members may be better possessed of these facts when the Estimates for the year, or particular measures, are submitted to Parliament.

This request has been made by the member for Swan. It can do no damage, but it could do a great deal of good. For the life of me I am unaware of the reasons for the Minister's opposition, more especially for his getting excited in expressing that opposition.

I interjected earlier that when there was an important measure dealing with public passenger transport—something in which there was an important principle involved, and something which embraced millions of pounds of capital outlay—the then Opposition, the Liberal-Country Party—but the move came from a Liberal; the present Minister for Railways—moved that a Select Committee be held into that Bill.

Many witnesses were examined. They included not only the principals of all the private companies and that of the Government instrumentality, but also the ex-general manager of the Tramways Department, who, incidentally, was the only one to back up the Liberal Party viewpoint. I suppose that he was the greatest tragedy ever to befall the Tramways Department. Witnesses consisting of railway experts, traffic engineers, and representatives of town planning bodies and local authorities appeared before the Select Committee. In a period of approximately a week all the work that had to be done in connection with the committee was done; and I, as Minister for Transport, was a member of it.

Members have an appreciation of how busy Ministers of the Crown become especially when Parliament is sitting, and particularly towards the end of the session. Yet, without any compunction the Minister for Health, who now protests so much, supported the move made by the member for Nedlands, as he then was, for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into that matter. The Government of the day obliged and raised no opposition. It felt its case was so overwhelming that if the veils of secrecy were cast to one side, then even the Opposition members would be convinced of the necessity for taking the step which the Government was contemplating.

Therefore, to those who hold any reservations, or have uncertainties in their mind in respect of this legislation, I say: What harm can be done by allowing several members, with the majority from the Government side of the House, to make inquiries into the matter covered by the Bill before us, and to submit a report thereon? After all, we would be in charge of the Select Committee, and it would report at the time determined by us. If it did not conclude its deliberations within the specified period it would cease to exist, and we could then proceed without its advice.

A great volume of work was completed by the Select Committee to which I referred a moment ago, in the stipulated time—which was a very short period—at the dictates of those who now sit on the Government side. This is very early in the present session of Parliament, and the Select Committee proposed by the member for Swan would have a period of two whole months in which to carry out its inquiries and investigations, and subsequently to make its report to this House on a non-party basis.

I am sure you, Mr. Speaker, will appreciate there has not been a party flavour in connection with the attitude of speakers on the Opposition side, because the point of view expressed by the member for Swan was in certain respects at variance with the attitude of the member for Fremantle. On this side of the House we are not bound hand and foot to follow a fixed line, apart from specific measures. For the edification of members opposite I have given many examples; and they will be able to see shortly, in connection with the debate on which an adjournment was moved by the member for Bayswater because I was absent last Thursday for a short while, that I will be expressing a certain point of view while others on this side of the House will express a totally contrary view.

Mr. W. Hegney: But that does not apply to members opposite.

Mr. GRAHAM: I guarantee that, irrespective of the case that is made, everyone on the opposite side of the House will stick solidly to the Government—probably silently and solidly. In other words, they do not have minds of their own, and they are not able to study, think, or analyse for themselves.

Mr. I. W. Manning: We on this side appreciate loyal supporters.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is it likely there could be complete unanimity on all matters in any group? We only find that sort of thing in puppet shows, but not among the average and decent citizens of the community, and more particularly not among those who have a responsibility to many thousands of people outside.

There is nothing new or novel in a motion such as the one before us. The matter would be entirely in the hands of the Government in respect of the members of the Select Committee; naturally we would expect the Government to have a majority on it. The Government is in charge and could write its own ticket in respect of the time factor. There would be ample time left during this session for this House to proceed with the Bill in the remaining stages, and for the Legislative Council to give full consideration to it to enable the legislation—whatever be its ultimate form—to be passed.

If we have waited for ten years for specific amendment to be made to the law, which this Bill seeks to do, then another two months will not make much difference to the State or to the people directly affected, especially if we can make doubly sure that what we are doing is to go as far as we can, while doing the job effectively.

I hope that the Premier will give a little thought to the matter before us, and will suggest as kindly as he may care to the Minister for Health that the Minister be a little more reasonable in his attitude to a perfectly reasonable request made by one speaking on behalf of the Opposition.

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

Ayes—22

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Molr
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. H. May

(Teller.)

Noes—23

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Brand	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Cornell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Craig	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hart	Mr. Williams
Dr. Henn	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Hutchinson	

(Teller.)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Curran	Mr. Burt
Mr. Heal	Mr. Crommelin

Majority against—1.

Question thus negatived.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. I. W. Manning) in the Chair; Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Chief Secretary) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 20 put and passed.

Clause 21: Establishment of Parole Board—

Mr. FLETCHER: I move an amendment—

Page 19, line 10—Insert after the word "Governor" the words "one to be a member of the Gaol Officers' Union".

I outlined my reasons for this amendment in my earlier remarks. I believe the inclusion of a member of the Gaol Officers' Union on the board is justified on the

ground that members of the union are in closer contact with the prisoners than is the judge, who merely deals with the prisoner whilst he is before him, or members of the parole board who would have only a casual or cursory association with the prisoner.

The gaol officers concerned know a prisoner in all his moods. They know whether he indulges in any sort of practice that is unknown to the members of the parole board. The gaol officer, by his association with a prisoner, would be able to form an opinion as to that prisoner's character and general behaviour, and such information would be invaluable to the parole board.

The gaol officers are very anxious to see that those under their care stand some chance of rehabilitation. I am sure the Minister will admit many of them are dedicated men, and they are not satisfied with the situation that prevails. They are anxious to see there is some degree of rehabilitation. I think a gaol officer would be in a better position than any other member of the board to assess the merits or demerits of a case before such a board.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I oppose this amendment. I do not believe it is necessary to have a representative of the Gaol Officers' Union on this board. The member for Fremantle made the point that the gaol officer would know all about a prisoner. That is possible, but it could be that the gaol officer could know very little or nothing about the prisoner because he could be at another outstation.

The views of the gaol officers would be ascertained from the record sheet of the prisoner, and the board would call for this record to find out the type of person the prisoner was before it determined whether or not he should be released on parole. One of the men on the board at present is the Comptroller-General of Prisons and he could very effectively and easily obtain these reports from the prison officers. Therefore there is no need for a prison officer to be on the board.

Mr. FLETCHER: I think the Minister could give consideration to the aspect that the preponderance of prisoners is in Fremantle and the preponderance of gaol officers is there. If a prisoner had been under their charge previously and came under consideration subsequently, they would know the prisoner in all his moods. There would be points they could not convey to the senior officers or staff members, whereas the union representative on such a board could put forward the case for immediate consideration—not through any second or third person. I ask the Minister to show faith in the gaol officers and recognise their contribution to society

in their attempts at rehabilitation, by providing that a representative of the union be on the board.

Mr. HALL: Recently I asked the Chief Secretary some questions in relation to the establishment of the prisoner rehabilitation committee, the answer to one of which clears up the point raised by the member for Fremantle. The question was as follows:—

What connection has the Rehabilitation Committee with prison authorities?

The reply was—

The committee is a voluntary organisation and proposes to co-operate with departmental officers in welfare work.

I should imagine that the departmental officers would also be prison officers who would study the prisoner before his release.

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

Ayes—22

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. H. May

(Teller)

Noes—23

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Brand	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Cornell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Craig	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Graydon	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hart	Mr. Williams
Mr. Hearman	Mr. O'Neill
Dr. Henn	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Curran	Mr. Burt
Mr. Heal	Mr. Crommelin

Majority against 1.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 22 to 53 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 11.43 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 11th September, 1963

CONTENTS

	Page
ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE :	
SPECIAL	953
BILLS—	
Beekkeepers Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r.	917
Constitution Acts Amendment Bill—	
2r.	919
Defeated	933
Dog Act Amendment Bill—3r.	917
Firearms and Guns Act Amendment Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r.	918
Foreign Judgments (Reciprocal Enforce- ment) Bill—3r.	917
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment Bill—	
3r.	917
Mining Act Amendment Bill—2r.	933
Occupational Therapists Act Amendment Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r.	917
Offenders Probation and Parole Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r.	919
Unauthorised Documents Act Amendment Bill—2r.	917
MOTION—	
River Boats—Amendment of Regulations	914
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Education—	
Junior High Schools in Rural Areas :	
General Science and Language Courses	912
High School Hostels—	
Future Construction	914
Provision at Katanning	914
Harbour, Bunbury—	
Equipment of Land-backed Berths for Cargoes	913
Vesting of Port Authority	913
Health : Dental Students—	
Trainees from Country Areas	914
University Enrolments and Number Qualified	914
Hospitals : Geriatric Centres—Establish- ment in Regional Hospitals	913
Pumping Station at Chidlow—Delay in Establishment	914
Silicosis—Effect of Aluminium Therapy	913

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

1. This question was postponed.

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN RURAL AREAS

1. General Science and Language Courses
2. The Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Has consideration been given to the introduction of a general science course and a language