# Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 19th September, 1962

CONTENTS



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

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### CAR HORNS

*Sounding at Drive-in Theatres*

1. The Hon. R. THOMPSON asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Is the Minister aware of the habits of some patrons of drive-in theatres who sound their car horns in unison, causing much annoyance to nearby residents?

(2) Is this sounding of car horns an offence under the Police or Traffic Acts?

(3) Are patrons liable to prosecution?

(4) Are the managements of drive-in theatres liable to prosecution for allowing this unnecessary noise?

(5) If the answer to No. (3) or No. 4 is "Yes," what is the penalty and will the police take action against offenders?

(6) Will the Minister instruct theatre owners to warn patrons, per medium of the picture screen, of this offence?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) to (6) The disturbance to which the honourable member refers does not constitute a traffic offence and until an injunction is sought by an offended party resident nearby, the Crown would have no knowledge of its occurrence. Otherwise, remedial action lies in the hands of the management.

### VEHICLE CHECKING UNITS

*Number and Cost of Operation*

2. The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY asked the Minister for Local Government:

(1) How many units are operated by the engineering branch of the Police Traffic Department for the purpose of road checking vehicles in respect to roadworthiness?

(2) Does the Traffic Department use separate units for road checking for—

(a) roadworthiness; and

(b) overloading of transport vehicles?

(3) What is the annual cost to the Traffic Department of the operating costs of all units?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

(1) Two panel vans.

(2) Yes.

(a) Two panel vans, four constables.

(b) Four panel vans, one motorcar, one sergeant, eight constables.

(3) (a) Road checking service:

| | £ |
|---|---|
| Running costs and depreciation | 782 |
| Staff wages | 5,626 |
| | £6,408 |

(b) Heavy haulage section:

All charges for this section are met by the Department of Main Roads, and the cost for 1961-62 was £20,324.

## DAIRY IMPROVEMENT SCHEME

*Extension to Manjimup Area*

3. The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Is it the intention of the Government to extend the Dairy Improvement Scheme at present operating in the Pemberton area to any part or parts of the Manjimup area?

(2) If the answer to No. (1) is "Yes," to what part or parts of the Manjimup area is it intended to extend the scheme?

(3) When is it expected that the extension or extensions will take place?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) Extension of the scheme within the Manjimup shire is now being planned. Estimates of costs are being assessed and although no date can be indicated at present, extensions will proceed as soon as possible.

## ESPERANCE LAND AND DEVELOPMENT COMPANY

*Sale of Land and Price*

4. The Hon. G. BENNETTS asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Is it a fact that the Esperance Land Development Company is unable to sell its developed land?

(2) If so, in view of the concern being expressed by the people of Esperance, will he advise—

(a) is the price being asked by the company too high; or

(b) does the price compare favourably with the sale price of other land developed to an equivalent stage?

*Cessation of Operations*

(3) Is it true that the company intends to cease development operations after the 31st December, 1962?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) No.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) The company has advised the Lands Department that it desires to select a further 50,000 acres of land before the 31st December, 1962, and is proceeding with the development of the area already selected under the agreement between the company and the State. In a report dated the 18th September, 1962, the liaison officer (Mr. F. M. Collett) advised that the Esperance Land & Development Company's seeding is very good throughout and has produced a "copy-book" pasture establishment as a result of the initial "copy-book" preparation.

5. *This question was postponed.*

## QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

### LAW REFORM SUBCOMMITTEE

*Tabling of Report on Law of Trusts*

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN asked the Minister for Mines:

In order that members may have a better opportunity of studying the Trustees Bill and those Bills ancillary to it, will he lay on the the Table of the House a copy of the report of the Law Reform Subcommittee on the Law of Trusts?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The report to which the honourable member refers is not a document of mine; it is one belonging to the Law Reform Society. I have made a copy available to the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly and also to the Leader of the Opposition in this House. I feel that before I could make it a public document and lay it on the Table of the House, I should have an opportunity of consulting with the Law Reform Committee upon the point. The document was handed to the Leader of the Opposition and also to Mr. Wise in an effort to assist in an understanding of the Bill, and not I trust on the basis that during the course of the debate it will be used against me, but rather to assist me.

## PAINTERS' REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Further Report*

Further report of Committee adopted.

## COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Recommittal*

Bill recommitted, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Justice), for the further consideration of clause 17.

*In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Justice), in charge of the Bill.

**Clause 17: Section 162 amended—**

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move an amendment—

Page 10—Delete the following passage:—

> Section one hundred and sixty-two of the principal Act is amended—
>
> (a) by substituting for the word, "was" in the last line of subsection (15) the word, "were"; and
>
> (b) by adding after subsection (15) the following subsection:—
>
> (16) In respect to any annual general meeting held before the first day of January one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three it shall be lawful for a company to conduct proceedings and produce accounts in a manner as if this Act had not come into operation.

inserted at a previous Committee and reinstate the following original passage deleted at a previous Committee:—

> Subsection (15) of section one hundred and sixty-two of the principal Act is amended by substituting for the word, "was" in the last line of the subsection, the word, "were."

I am going to ask the Committee to reconsider the decision it made last Wednesday evening when Mr. Watson successfully moved that the clause now in the Bill should, in fact, be in the Bill. I do not propose to repeat the explanation given by the honourable member when he asked that clause 17 as it appeared in the Bill be taken out and replaced in accordance with his proposed amendment. However, I have certain information which I was not able to obtain during the course of the debate which took place on the amendment moved by Mr. Watson.

In moving his amendment the honourable member laid great emphasis on the fact that he thought many companies were not ready to act on the projected date, the 1st October; that the proclamation of the Act on that date would, in fact, cause great inconvenience to various people. He thought it would be a good idea if some companies, at least those that had not been able to arrange their annual general meetings by the 1st October, were to conduct their proceedings and produce their accounts in the same manner as if this Act had not come into operation.

It will be remembered that during the course of the debate I mentioned one particular section of the 1961 Act which I thought may be affected. It was the section concerning the age of directors. It was an insignificant and unimportant part of the argument, but it was one that came to mind at the time. I said that I felt sure we would find on closer examination that there were other sections of the Act which would be affected if the amendment were agreed to.

Commerce has known that it was intended to proclaim the Act on the 1st October. An article appeared in the Press on the 7th March, 1962, in which I said that the Act would probably be proclaimed on the 1st October. In addition to that, I drew attention at the time—and I do so again—to this memorandum which was prepared by the Law Society, the Institute of Chartered Accountants, the Australian Society of Accountants, and the Chartered Institute of Secretaries. The principal people who would be involved in legislation of this nature met and proposed this document.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: In consultation with the registrar.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: What is wrong with that? I am glad of that interjection, because it further proves the point that all these people knew that the Act was coming into operation on the 1st October; and this memorandum says so.

Having mentioned the matter last night, I would think there would have been sufficient opportunity between then and this moment for somebody to communicate with me or to telephone me—and goodness knows I receive enough telephone calls of one kind or another—to ask what is going to happen. However, there has been no outcry and no upsurge for a change in the date. As a matter of fact, the people concerned in the city are already geared, as it has been suggested before, to accept the date as being the 1st October.

Last night Mr. Mattiske was good enough to say that he did not really think it would make any difference whether the date was the 1st October or the 1st January for the proclamation of the Act. I have had a competent person in the Companies Office go through the Act to see what sections would be affected if the amendment moved by Mr. Watson and agreed to at this point of time was in fact permitted.

Members may be surprised to know that there is a foolscap page and a half of principal reforms in the 1961 Act which will be directly affected by the motion moved by the honourable member; despite the fact that he said it would be a simple matter, that companies would be able to hold their annual meetings and conduct their proceedings under the old Act, and that I would be able to proclaim the Act as it was on the 1st October, 1961.

It is a much more serious matter than that. The sections that will be affected are as follows:—

Section 118: Appointment of directors to be voted on individually.

Section 120: Removal of directors.

Section 121: Age limit for directors.

Section 125 (2): Loans to directors.

That section may possibly be affected. To continue—

Section 126 (8): Register of directors, shareholders, etc.

The production of reports at annual general meetings will be affected—

Section 129, subsections (1) to (5): Payments to director for loss of office, etc.

That section may possibly be affected. Continuing—

Section 136: Annual general meeting.

Section 139: Articles as to right to demand a poll.

Section 140: Quorum, chairman, voting, etc. at meetings.

Section 141: Appointment of proxies.

Section 143: Circulation of members' resolutions, etc.

Section 144: Special resolutions as to numbers of days notice.

Section 145: Resolution requiring special notice.

Sections 161 to 164: Form of accounts.

Section 165 (2): Appointment of auditors.

Section 165 (12): Election of replacement auditor.

Section 165 (13) and (14): Notice of nomination of person as auditor.

Section 165 (15): Fixing fees and expenses of auditor.

Section 167: Form of auditor's report.

Those are all reform provisions accepted by this Chamber last year, and they will all be affected by the honourable member's amendment.

I would remind members that Mr. Watson said there would be only minor differences in relation to the preparation of accounts and the holding of general meetings in respect of the year ended the 30th June, 1962. However, I think I have demonstrated that the amendment will have much more effect than probably the honourable member thought it would have when he moved it. I do not want unduly to labour this point, but I repeat that everyone who has had anything to do with this legislation has been aware through Press publicity and the close association that these professional people have that the 1st October is the date that this legislation should come into force.

Last night when Mr. Watson was introducing another Bill, about which I cannot and have no desire to speak at this time, if my memory serves me correctly he used words to the effect that the law should be straight forward. He said there should be no question of uncertainty; and I should like to compliment the honourable member on the preparation of the Bill which he introduced. It is a complete contrast to the amendment which has been moved and accepted in regard to clause 17; because that certainly will not provide for the law being straight forward and it certainly will not relieve any degree of uncertainty he thinks there might be. On the other hand it will create uncertainty because we will have two Acts of Parliament, one the 1961 Act, and one the 1943 Act, and some companies will be operating under one Act and some under the other. Is that making the law certain? I think it is making the law most uncertain.

For those reasons I hope the Committee will give further consideration to the matter and will allow the 1961 Act and this amending Bill to come into operation on the date which has been foreshadowed for so long, namely, the 1st October, 1962.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I listened very carefully to the Minister, and I have looked up the foolscap sheet of sections which he says will be affected by my amendment; but notwithstanding all that, it simply boils down to the fact—and this is all my amendment proposes—that in respect of the year ended the 30th June, 1962, some companies which have already held their annual meetings, and others which will be holding their annual meetings between now and the 30th of this month, will be preparing their accounts without regard for the 50 or 60 sections to which the Minister just referred. They will prepare their accounts in conformity with the existing Act. All my amendment proposes is that the balance of the companies that have not yet held their annual meetings for the year ended the 30th June, 1962, shall be entitled to do precisely the same thing. I cannot imagine a more logical and reasonable proposition.

My amendment would not have been necessary if in this State we had done what is clearly contemplated in other States—that is, picked a half-yearly date as the commencing date of the Act. The Minister told us last night that Tasmania proposes to commence its Act on the 1st January, and that South Australia proposes to commence its Act on the 1st July. Nothing could be more logical than that, but the Minister wants our Act to be proclaimed in the middle of the period when companies are presenting their accounts. That to my mind is most confusing.

The sections mentioned by the Minister in the main are only matters of routine —matters that someone could easily overlook or in respect of which they could

make a mistake. The Minister also produced a document which had been prepared by various persons and which was issued and circulated before this present Bill made its appearance. That document purports to be a copy of the Companies Act of 1961—a copy of all the requirements which company directors and secretaries will be required to observe upon the proclamation of the Act. But on reading it one finds that although it was published and circulated before this Bill made its appearance it contains and purports to put forward as the accepted law everything that is in this Bill—the whole 17 pages of it.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: That is right.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: To my mind it is the nearest thing to contempt of Parliament that has come within my experience. It is not within the province of any man to tell us what the law is going to be. It is time enough when both Houses of Parliament have dealt with the Bill for the public to know what the law is. On the merits of the case I express the hope that the Committee will not agree to the Minister's amendment.

But there is another ground. To every member of the Committee—regardless of whether he voted for or against my amendment last Wednesday—I would say the Committee did decide the matter then after a very full debate. Having made our decision public—because it has appeared in the Press, and so on—the Committee should not stultify itself by reversing its decision. This is not like the America's Cup. It is not a question of four out of seven. Having determined the matter last Wednesday, both on the merits and on the larger principle of the Committee not reversing its own decision, it should not accept the amendment moved by the Minister.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I hope the Committee will not agree to the suggestion by the Minister to withdraw the amendment inserted on Wednesday last. The reasons then were fully debated and have been repeated by Mr. Watson. The new subject matter introduced by the Minister now is not of sufficient consequence to warrant our changing the decision we made last Wednesday. It is only reasonable to permit those who will be responsible for operating under the new Bill a certain amount of latitude so they can perform their duties as company secretaries efficiently. I say efficiently, because our previous legislation is quite good legislation, and it is only reasonable to give these people a breathing space, as it were, from the 1st October to the 31st December.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I have listened with interest to the debate, and it seems strange to me that the date set originally for the proclamation of this Act should be the 1st October, the start of the second quarterly period. We have heard a lot about uniformity; that this Act is to be uniform throughout Australia. The insistence in this Chamber has been to keep the legislation uniform; that we should not accept any amendment.

But what about the uniformity of the date? There is none. The Minister here sets the 1st October as the date, while the Minister in Tasmania sets the date as the 1st January, and the Minister in South Australia sets it at the 1st July next.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What date did New South Wales set?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Possibly a different date; and that is where the question of uniformity has fallen down. If it is to be uniform let it be uniform from a specific date. The argument of the Minister in respect of Mr. Watson's amendment is very poor. What about the companies that have held their meetings under the 1943 Act since the 30th June? There will be other companies holding their annual general meetings from the 1st October. So how uniform will this be over the next period of years? I cannot understand the objection to it. Are those clauses referred to by the Minister as being affected so colossal as to throw everything out of gear?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Can you tell me anything about any one of them?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I do not want to tell the Minister about any one of them.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You cannot.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The Minister said he was approached by a man who had prepared his accounts under the new Act. So what? He will not be affected by the amendment, which says it shall not be unlawful for the annual general meeting to conduct proceedings and produce accounts in a manner as if this Act had not been put into operation. So if any company held its annual general meeting under the Act on the 1st October it has nothing to worry about. I cannot support the move to defeat the amendment.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I have tried as much as possible to keep in mind the shareholders who constitute the numerous companies operating throughout Australia. That has been my main concern throughout this debate. I am not concerned about the directors, who can usually look after themselves. As a practising solicitor in Perth I know that for months past it has been generally known that the anticipated and expected date for the commencement of the new Companies Bill would be the 1st October.

On a former occasion I said that the office with which I am associated does not have a wide practice in company law. In spite of that we have known, and solicitors have spoken about it—and anyone interested to whom I have spoken has anticipated for some time—that the 1st October is to be the date. Whenever a

date is fixed there are usually latecomers—people who through pressure of work and for other good reasons are behind when the date comes along. But there is truth in the Minister's statement that generally the commercial community is ready for this measure, and has anticipated it. That there is no public outcry seems to give strong credence to that statement. The shareholders are worth a lot of consideration. Only a couple of weeks ago I had a case of a woman who is on a pension, and who put £1,000 into the Latec company.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: About which we will be able to do nothing.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: She had saved that £1,000 and it looks as though it is gone. This morning I met a man who said, "I will be glad when company law is more stringent. A friend of mine is owed £300 by a company—though I will not mention its name—operating here in Perth. He has supplied materials to this company and cannot be paid, because someone else has security over all its assets." Last year there was the case of a printing firm in Perth which did a lot of work for a particular company and could not get paid. The company then blissfully went into liquidation, and it was discovered that some friend had security over its assets. Those are just a few instances; and they are the aspects of company affairs which compel me strongly to support the Minister on this occasion. I wish the Bill could be proclaimed tomorrow.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There are one or two matters I wish to correct. I take strong objection to Mr. Watson's statement that this document from which I quoted purports to be a copy of the Act. Had the honourable member bought it and looked at it he would have realised that his statement was not correct. Neither is it an affront to Parliament—on the contrary. In case the honourable member has not read the foreword, I would like to read it to him.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: I have read it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is as follows:—

> To make this memorandum more complete these provisions which are necessary for conformity and which have yet to be considered by Parliament, have been included in the text. It has been the intention that contingent upon the early enactment of the supplementary Bill, the Act will commence on the 1st October. No attempt has been made in this memorandum to epitomise all of the provisions of the new Act.

So how can it be a copy?

The Hon. H. K. Watson: It purports to show its main contents.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is better. To continue—

> But it has been the objective of the committee only to emphasise the major changes which the new company laws will bring to Western Australia.

Has it occurred to the honourable member that uniformity exists in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, and the Australian Capital Territory, and that all this information on a uniform basis is available; and that Mr. McFarlane, the Registrar of Companies, who is a member of the society of accountants, has been pulled in to supply whatever information he can on this document? The document was prepared in good faith as a guide to people who would expect this legislation to come into operation on the 1st October. I believe things should be put fairly and squarely, and no red herrings should be drawn across the trail.

While Mr. Baxter reduced my ego by saying that the argument I put up was a very poor one, I am afraid I did not reduce his ego. He suggests I do not know anything about the matter. The point is, when Mr. Watson was moving his amendment, he convinced the majority of us that there would be little or no effect on companies which would publish their accounts and follow their procedures by the acceptance of his amendment. Since then I have tried to demonstrate that all those sections will be amended. The argument has now turned the other way, because we have proved that all these sections will be amended.

It proves undoubtedly that the argument on the one hand had to be altered because it could be seen there would be considerable effect on those companies which were holding their meetings after the 1st October and before the 1st January; they will not have to subscribe to these quite major reforms as intended in the uniform Bill.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: What about the companies which have held their meetings?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not saying anything about those companies which have held their meetings. After the 1st January all companies will hold their meetings under the same law. It is impossible to get uniformity in respect of the date of proclamation. In the first place, State Parliaments sit at different times of the year and therefore it would be impossible to get uniformity even if we wanted to do so. If we did wait for a uniform date, we would wait for ever.

I have endeavoured to make the points clear. It is unfair and untrue to say that this is an affront to Parliament, because that is not what was intended and it does not reveal itself that way. Until a few days ago everyone fully expected that the legislation would be proclaimed on the 1st October.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: I have listened with some interest to the debate today and that of last week, and I must say that I was a little confused last Wednesday because of the diversity of opinions put forward. However, after giving this matter some consideration I came to the conclusion last Thursday that the amendment inserted on the previous day did nothing other than give all companies the opportunity of holding their annual meetings under one set of rules. After all, that is what it boils down to. Admittedly it does give companies now an opportunity of appointing an odd director here and there on a smaller percentage than would have been possible under the old Act. But surely that is the prerogative of the shareholders!

For the life of me I cannot see the importance of this three-month period. It must be possible for all companies to hold their annual meetings for 1961-62 under one set of rules; and taking that point into consideration I am going to vote contrary to the way I voted last Wednesday.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: As members know, I have not much knowledge of finance.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You know how to hang on to it when you get it.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: There is one point on which I would like some advice. I have noticed that since the Companies Act has been accepted in the Eastern States there have been more investigations into companies' affairs than for many years past. Therefore it looks as if under the new Act it is possible for any discrepancies which might occur in a company's activities to be more easily revealed. If we would hold up the investigation of a company such as Latec until the 1st January, I will vote with the Minister; but my sympathies have for a long time been with Mr. Watson's amendment because all those who have approached me on the subject have expressed gratitude that they will have a breathing space until the 1st January.

If the Minister will tell me that by agreeing to what he is doing, we will make it possible for a company such as Latec to have its affairs fully investigated in the State, then I will vote with him. However, if it makes no difference to these companies whether the legislation is proclaimed on the 1st October or the 1st January I feel inclined to give a breathing space to those who require it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am advised that the Latec company is not a company incorporated in this State and it is therefore a foreign company registered in Western Australia. It certainly would have been affected if we had passed the amendment with which we were dealing last night. However, I am advised that this amendment will make no difference to the speeding up of any investigation so far as Latec is concerned. I agree with Dr. Hislop that the investigation of companies' activities has been speeded up by the uniform legislation in the other States. The accounts of these firms should be published for the benefit of those people who require to know what has been going on.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I am still not clear. If we hold up the proclamation of this legislation until the 1st January, will that mean that no revelation of the activities of a company which might be doubtful will take place in the State?

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: This amendment will not affect the date of proclamation at all.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon): I would remind members that this is a Committee debate. Each member may rise to make his speech in turn.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: That is all I was wanting to know. If we postpone the proclamation until the 1st January will that prevent any action being taken to investigate the affairs of a company in this State?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I apologise if I have in any way misled the Committee. This amendment does not affect the proclamation date. We will not get the accounts of this firm until next year because—correct me if I am wrong—this Act will not come into operation until later on.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: The Minister talked of red herrings being introduced into this debate. There have certainly been a few introduced in the last five minutes, Dr. Hislop having unintentionally introduced one a few moments ago. The position is clearly this: The amendment relates only to the holding of general meetings and the production of accounts. If it was desired to investigate Latec, it could be done tomorrow morning under our existing Act. There is such power contained in it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Where?

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I cannot give the Minister the exact section at the moment but it will be found under "Inspections". With reference to what Mr. Heenan and Dr. Hislop have said, I should be sorry to think that anyone would believe that this legislation is going to be the be-all and end-all in preventing unfortunate investors being parted from their money by sharpshooting company promoters.

It must be remembered that the new Act has been in operation in New South Wales for twelve months, and yet what do we know with regard to Latec? Even under the new Act it has been found that when it was discovered by the company that it was down the drain for £3,000,000,

it sat on the information for quite a time while one of the directors unloaded 100,000 shares on the market. Therefore members must not believe that this Act will stop such practices. The widow will still be parted from her money.

This amendment, as I have said, does not affect the proclamation of the Act. If the Act were to be proclaimed on the 1st October, its full powers would be operative. All that will happen, as Mr. Syd Thompson has said, will be that for the purposes of holding general meetings and preparing accounts, the same procedure as at present will be adopted.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. Watson said that the 1943 Act provides the necessary machinery to investigate the activities of a company. Is not the 1943 Act limited to a company incorporated in Western Australia only?

The. Hon. H. K. Watson: I would think it would be a company operating in Western Australia.

**Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—**

Ayes—7.

| | |
|---|---|
| Hon. C. R. Abbey | Hon. H. R. Robinson |
| Hon. A. F. Griffith | Hon. F. D. Willmott |
| Hon. E. M. Heenan | Hon. J. Murray |
| Hon. L. A. Logan | *(Teller.)* |

Noes—18.

| | |
|---|---|
| Hon. N. E. Baxter | Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs |
| Hon. G. Bennetts | Hon. J. D. Teahan |
| Hon. E. M. Davies | Hon. R. Thompson |
| Hon. J. J. Garrigan | Hon. S. T. J. Thompson |
| Hon. J. G. Hislop | Hon. J. M. Thomson |
| Hon. R. F. Hutchison | Hon. H. K. Watson |
| Hon. F. R. H. Lavery | Hon. W. F. Willesee |
| Hon. A. L. Loton | Hon. F. J. S. Wise |
| Hon. R. C. Mattiske | Hon. W. R. Hall |
| | *(Teller.)* |

Pair

| Aye | No |
|---|---|
| Hon. C. H. Simpson | Hon. H. C. Strickland |

**Majority against—11.**

**Amendment thus negatived.**

*Further Report*

**Bill again reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.**

## BILLS (3): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Metropolitan Market Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) read a first time.

2. Bush Fires Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), read a first time.

3. Judges' Salaries and Pensions Act Amendment Bill.

   Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Justice), read a first time.

## MENTAL HEALTH BILL

*Second Reading*

**THE HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Midland—Minister for Local Government): [5.35 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill, the subject of message No. 36, which indicates the measure has been passed in another place, comes to the Legislative Council for review. The purpose of the Bill is to consolidate in one single measure procedures which are directed towards the better mental health of the community, but presently contained in outdated form within the provisions of a group of several Acts.

The passing of this measure will enable the repeal of the Lunacy Act of 1903 and its amendments; the Inebriates Act of 1912 and its 1919 amendment; the Mental Treatment Acts of 1917 and 1927 as amended; and also the Mental Treatment (War Service Patients) Act of 1941. While all the main provisions covering mental care appear in this Bill, it is supported by three other Bills, the purposes of which are to facilitate the carrying out of certain necessary procedures through amendment to the Public Trustee Act, the Criminal Code, and the Prisons Act. Those measures are to be shortly explained.

Members will recall that towards the close of last session the Government introduced the Mental Health Bill of 1961 in order that following upon its explanation in another place every person in the community who was concerned would have an opportunity of studying that measure, examining its contents, and making known their wishes in regard to it.

It is not proposed, therefore, at this point of time to enumerate the intentions of each and every clause in this Bill, for it is very similar to the one introduced last year.

It is the same in essence and implication, but with one important drafting improvement in that there has been taken from the structure of its schedule the amendments to the supporting measures now being dealt with as specific amending Bills; and that is considered a much more acceptable procedure in all respects.

As a result of the examination which has been made of the initial measure, and the advice which the Minister for Health has sought and acted upon, several modifications have been made which, in the opinion of medical and legal experts, improve its provisions considerably; and, furthermore, a new part has been added for the purpose of dealing with the estates of incapable persons.

It is possible that not everyone in the community who is interested has been enabled to study the original measure or make an estimation of its value or the

background of advanced medical opinion which sought and sponsored its introduction. It is accordingly desirable to repeat at this stage that the Minister for Health, when introducing the measure last year, said its provisions reflected modern thought and medical practice.

In addition to the findings of the much publicised United Kingdom Royal Commission, legislation of other States and of New Zealand and elsewhere has been reviewed. Also a special committee of senior departmental medical officers and representatives of the Psychiatrists' Association have examined the propositions in detail; and when introducing this measure this year the Minister, having given full credit to a number of honorary organisations for the good work done on behalf of those suffering mental illness, said, "Besides the good work of actually caring for and helping to provide valuable assistance to those suffering with mental disorder, the great-hearted people of these organisations have done much more; and I refer to the fact that they have played an important role in helping to condition the public mind to a reasonable and sensible approach to mental illness and in helping to remove the stigma associated with it."

It might be added that a great deal of the inspiration behind the preparation of this measure has been with a view to removing the stigma associated with mental illness; and there is no question but that a healthy public outlook in that regard will not only assist the prospect of curative processes, but will lessen the incidence of mental disorders in the community by throwing into its proper perspective the impact of such diseases in the minds of those likely to be afflicted.

Such expressions as "lunacy," "insanity," "asylums," "inmates," "certified patients," and so forth impose, through their colloquial use, an almost insurmountable impact upon the will of such a person otherwise desirous of hope. The drafting of this measure has been done with a view to its application removing such unpleasant associations through the use of such alternatives as "incapable person" "approved hospital," "mental disorder," and "referral"; and the last one means the written submission of a medical practitioner in the prescribed form that a person be admitted to an approved hospital.

So we see that the need for certification will be dispensed with; and where compulsion is necessary it will be on the basis of a medical report and the authority of a justice for the conveyance of the patient to, and not admission to, a hospital. The final question of admission will rest with the superintendent of the hospital.

It follows that the final responsibility for accepting an incapable person into an approved hospital will rest on the superintendent—probably a psychiatrist—instead of two justices proceeding in all respects as if such person were brought before them at a court of petty sessions and certified "insane or an idiot" by two medical practitioners, which course was prescribed under the provisions of the Lunacy Act.

While conceivably it might be argued that the provisions of this measure facilitate admission procedure into a mental institution as compared with the rather cumbersome processes of the past, it should not be overlooked that this proposed legislation reflects new trends which emphasise the rehabilitation of the mentally afflicted and make practical provision for services aimed at prevention wherever possible. There is the further advantage that the new idea removes the certification procedures and with them the stigma associated with mental illness.

The modern outlook on mental treatment favours approved hospitals similar to general hospitals, but with sufficient necessary safeguards in respect of patients admitted compulsorily.

While some reference has been made to the Lunacy Act, some of the provisions of which are rather fearsome, it must not be overlooked that our own Mental Treatment Act of 1927 is recognised as being one of the most advanced pieces of legislation in the Commonwealth, and many of its features are retained in this measure. The Bill provides stronger safeguards against improper admission and detention, and places special emphasis on the undesirability of unduly long detention. Existing distinction between hospitals and between classes of mental disorders such as mental illness, mental deficiency, and inebriacy, are to be cast aside.

There are adequate provisions for the transfer of the criminally mentally disordered to hospital from prison and return to prison where necessary. Present formalities in respect of patients requiring transfer between hospitals will give way to arrangements which will be made between the superintendents of the hospitals and based on their clinical judgment.

The intention of repealing the Inebriates Act dealing with convicted alcholics is that appropriate provision will be made in one of the supporting measures which amends the Criminal Code; and it might be mentioned here that that Bill will empower the court to order a person convicted of an offence of which drunkenness is an element or a contributing cause to be placed in an institution established for the reception of convicted inebriates for a period of up to twelve months—that necessitates amendment to the Prisons Act to provide for their reception.

New provisions regarding the management of the estates of those incapable of dealing with their affairs are covered in

one of the supporting Bills. Trustee companies are to be appointed managers of such estates.

One of the important measures upon which high hopes for rehabilitation could rest is that dealing with children under the age of eighteen. At present, even babies may be certified. In future all will be admitted informally. To cover the rare occurrence of a parent or guardian neglecting responsibilities in the matter, provision is being made in the Bill to deal with the situation by invoking the Child Welfare Act; and also there are powers existing under the Education Act in respect of those needing special training or care.

Of great significance are the safeguards which will be made to cater for the existing situation as affecting patients now in hospital by compulsion. Their *status quo* will be maintained only over the transitional period during which their future can be assessed.

The new transitional provisions have been inserted as a schedule because the original Bill did not make sufficient provision for the changed position of persons presently subject to the repealed Acts. There shall be a board of visitors for every approved hospital. Each will be an independent body directly responsible to the Minister and with wide powers to investigate and report on all matters regarding the rights and welfare of patients in hospital. It should be mentioned there is statutory provision that existing arrangements or agreements between the Commonwealth and the State for the care and treatment of war-caused ailments—as for instance those suffered by patients in Lemnos—will not be varied or affected in any way.

This Bill and the group of supporting Bills are directed towards reducing the feeling of dread of treatment which, in itself, can become an aggravation of the distressed mind to the extent of discouraging prospective patients from seeking, and their relatives encouraging, treatment, so increasing their suffering and reducing their prospect of improvement.

The lessening of the formalities to be endured prior to, and in association with, treatment, particularly in respect of those genuinely seeking assistance, together with the new safeguards against unduly long compulsory detention and supervision, deserves public support.

**Debate adjourned until Tuesday, the 25th September, on motion by The Hon. R. F. Hutchison.**

## PUBLIC TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Second Reading*

**THE HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [5.45 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Part XI of the Lunacy Act deals at length with the administration and management of the estates of insane persons, and gives to the Master of the Supreme Court, the jurisdiction of the court in those matters. The Mental Health Bill of 1962, which repeals that Act, makes provision for such estates to be managed in accordance with the Public Trustee Act. That is in part VI of the Bill. The purpose of this measure is to facilitate those provisions.

Though it is apparent the Bill has few clauses, the amendments appearing in clause 5 are quite lengthy, re-enacting as they do division 4 of part II of the Act. Though that division contains no less than eleven proposed new sections, there is little change in all of those, excepting proposed sections 30 and 31. Such alterations as have been made in the others were suggested by the Law Reform Committee of the Law Society, included among the members of which are the Public Trustee and the Master of the Supreme Court. Their tidying up is desirable and necessary to encompass the provisions contained in part VI of the Mental Health Bill.

The two clauses particularly mentioned are strongly supported by the Public Trustee and his opposite numbers in the other States. Their inclusion is sought for the proper handling of assets in other States of incapable patients who might be in our hospitals, and *vice versa*. The methods proposed are considered to be quite convenient, obviating as they do unnecessary expense or complicated procedures.

Special reference might nevertheless be made to proposed new section 34 covering requirements of the transitional period. Here we have repeated a preference, and in this case a necessary preference because of the new definitions in the Mental Health Act—a preference for the term "incapable patients" as against "insane patients". The import of proposed section 34 is that a person's affairs remain in the hands of the Public Trustee for a period of three months after the coming into operation of the Act and for a longer period if the superintendent of the approved hospital in which the patient is being treated maintains the patient is still incapable of managing his affairs.

This is quite important, representing as it does a complete breakaway from the Lunacy Act under which a person automatically becomes an insane patient on admission to Claremont Mental Hospital and so is considered incapable of managing his affairs; and that has apparently been a pretty permanent state of affairs. That position will not necessarily continue under the provisions of the new Mental Health Bill. So we see that every patient will, in future, need to be examined again to see whether his affairs should remain in the hands of the Public Trustee.

**Debate adjourned until Tuesday, the 25th September, on motion by The Hon. R. F. Hutchison.**

## CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

*Second Reading*

**THE HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [5.48 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The amendments in this Bill are complementary to the provisions of the Mental Health Bill and come within the ambit of the over-all legislation introduced in the interests of incapable persons. The amendments come about through the repeal of the Inebriates Acts. The hospital care and treatment of inebriates will, in future, be dealt with in accordance with the voluntary provisions of the Mental Health Bill.

On the other hand, such of those persons as would be subject to court proceedings will be dealt with under similar provisions to those existing in the Inebriates Acts to be repealed; and the purpose of this Bill is to transfer those provisions to the Criminal Code. To be more explicit, the main purpose of the Bill is to transfer the provisions of section 7 of the existing Inebriates Act of 1912 to the Criminal Code, together with those parts of section 6 concerning the requirements which the court must undertake to ensure the proper assessment of the inebriate before his committal.

Other minor amendments tidy up existing sections to conform to present-day terminology and that now adopted in the Mental Health Bill.

**Debate adjourned until Tuesday, the 25th September, *on motion* by The Hon. R. F. Hutchison.**

## PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Second Reading*

**THE HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [5.50 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is the last of the four bills, the passing of which may well be regarded as the greatest advance made throughout Australia—and perhaps even further afield—in the direction of the detention of the mentally afflicted, together with their proper care and rehabilitation. When explaining the provisions of the proposed amendments to the Criminal Code, reference was made to court proceedings against inebriates.

The proposed new section 669A of the Criminal Code provides that where a person is convicted summarily by a court comprising a stipendiary magistrate on an indictment of an offence, and drunkenness is an element or a contributing cause of the offence, the court, if satisfied that the offender is an inebriate, may, in its discretion, order the offender to be placed for a period not exceeding twelve months in an institution established for the reception of convicted inebriates; and there is a further provision that that period may be extended by a judge for a further period not exceeding twelve months.

This Bill, which is a complementary measure to the three preceding Bills, might well be described in relation to the Criminal Code Amendment Bill, as an accommodating measure, for it provides that the Governor may, by proclamation, set apart any suitable place—whether part of a prison or not—to be an institution for the reception of convicted inebriates.

The provision of such a centre is considered to be a most deserving cause; and, because its erection will fill a much-felt need, the Government has even now, under construction at Karnet an appropriate institution at a cost of approximately £200,000. The site for this institution was chosen by a committee comprising representatives of the Public Works, the Forests, and the Agriculture Departments, and officers of the Prisons Department. It comprises approximately 683 acres, 400 of these being arable. The site is situated 6.6 miles from the 36-mile peg on the South Western Highway, being entirely surrounded by State forest.

Seventy acres of land have already been cleared, a water supply established, a telephone line constructed. An extension of S.E.C. power is under way, and it is expected that the contractors will complete the buildings for handing over next March. Applicants for the position of farm manager will shortly be interviewed, and selection of suitable staff is receiving attention.

This institution, which will be known as the Karnet Rehabilitation Centre, will be under prison management and will be a modern penal establishment wherein inmates may be trained and employed at remunerative labour, but under strict discipline and supervision. The new system of training to be provided will encourage self-respect in prisoners and personal responsibility as part of a rehabilitation programme for social adjustment.

Though under prison management, it is hoped that the rehabilitation to be made available at this centre will realise the hopes of this first constructive attempt—imprisonment having been found to have no curative value—to incorporate successfully an alcoholic institution for convicted alcoholics. Accommodation at Karnet will be equally divided between normally convicted prisoners and convicted alcoholics, with accommodation for 60 of each. It is hoped that in the future this establishment will provide sufficient fruit and vegetables to meet the needs of Fremantle Gaol, Barton's Mill and later, perhaps, other Government institutions. There are plans

for the subsequent establishment of a dairy and beef herd to meet Karnet's beef requirements.

Turning again to the Bill, we note further evidence in clause 3 of the discarding of such terms as "hospital for the insane" and the use instead of the term "an approved hospital." In so far as the inebriate is concerned, it may be summed up that the new legislation provides for voluntary or compulsory medical treatment in hospital; court proceedings in respect of the inebriate criminal; and his subsequent reception, care and rehabilitation, in accordance with present-day penal practices.

**Debate adjourned until Tuesday, the 25th September, on motion by The Hon. R. F. Hutchison.**

## WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed, from the 13th September, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (Suburban —Minister for Mines) [5.55 p.m.]: Many members spoke on the second reading of this Bill and the one who dealt with it in the greatest detail was Mr. Ron Thompson. Since the Bill was last before the House I have gone through the principal points of that honourable member's speech so far as I have been able, and under the headings that I have made on those points I would like to make some comments for his information.

In the first place the honourable member said that that part of the Bill which deals with the mooring of boats is a good provision provided it is to be kept within limits. The portion of the Bill referring to mooring areas is only legalising a practice which has been in vogue in this State for 36 years, but which was recently ruled to be illegal by the Crown Law Department. It does not interfere with the rights of the general public in mooring their boats, but allows an area to be set aside for yacht clubs, which everyone will agree is a necessity for any yacht club in order that it may function.

However, with the passing of this amendment, approval must still be obtained from the Swan River Conservation Board for a license to be granted for such areas on the Swan and Canning Rivers. Mr. Ron Thompson then said that the House had no knowledge of the regulations which were envisaged, and that we were giving a blank cheque to the Minister. Of course on many occasions we have no knowledge of regulations that are made. They are framed and laid upon the Table of the House, and it is then that members of Parliament become aware of them; and, if they do not agree with them, they have the right to act accordingly.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: The general public does not always know of the regulations.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The public generally does know about matters of this importance. So far as I am concerned, anyway, I like to make statements which acquaint the general public with the activities of my departments and the determinations of Parliament.

The proposed amendment to the Act dealing with private pleasure boats grants power to the department only to register such craft. There is already power in existence to regulate the use of all craft on the river, and regulations are in existence known as the Navigable Waters Regulations. There is no blank cheque issued to the Minister, because as I have said, all regulations must be laid upon the Table of the House, and any member can move for their disallowance if he does not approve of them.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: They can be enforced before Parliament meets.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member is quite right; they can be enforced before Parliament meets, and it has been ever thus. I venture to suggest that if the Minister was not granted the power to make regulations, he would be unable to administer his departments. He would find himself in a completely impossible position if he had to wait for Parliament to meet before framing and enforcing a regulation that was considered necessary.

Mr. Ron Thompson said that he did not think the amendment would be acceptable to the general public and particularly to those people who own boats. However, it is correct to say that most people support this amendment and, in fact, many have asked for it. It is supported by residents, local authorities, the Aquatic Council representing all water sports, and even the firms which sell these power boats. Mr. Thompson went on to say that as far as he could ascertain there are only 12 boats on the Swan River which could be classified as speedboats, and that only about 8 per cent. are used for water-skiing.

I am told that in the existing regulation a speedboat is described as a boat designed for and capable of a speed in excess of 12 knots. Such craft today can run into hundreds on the Swan River, and not 12, as stated.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You could say then the *Islander* is a speedboat.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will deal with the *Islander* a little later on in these remarks. These boats are powered with outboard engines ranging from 10 h.p. to 100 h.p., some with twin 80 h.p. engines as well as powerful inboard engines. The

great majority of them are used for skiing —a very much larger percentage than the 8 per cent. mentioned.

On the question of boats of over 12 h.p., the honourable member said he thought they would be restricted to a 5 knot limit. There is no suggestion or intention of restricting boats over 12 h.p. to a 5 knot limit. Regulations already exist to restrict the speed of all powerboats to 5 knots in certain restricted areas on the river where it would be dangerous to allow power vessels to travel faster; but there is no general restriction on speed, nor is there any intention to impose one.

Mr. Ron Thompson also said that with legislation of this kind we will penalise one class of people. Later he said we should remove the provision dealing with powerboats and pleasure boats, and we should have a completely new Bill drafted for that purpose. That was the general tone of the comment made by the honourable member.

The amendment seeking power to register pleasure craft follows the precedent set by Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria, as well as many overseas countries, including the U.S.A., in all of which registration applies only to boats propelled by other than sail or oars. All powerboats, irrespective of by whom they are owned, will be registered. The *Islander* will not come within the scope of this Bill, because it, and all other vessels plying for hire, are already licensed and are subject to much stricter regulations than any applying to private pleasure boats. Legislation which exists in the States and the countries I have mentioned is far more severe than any in existence, or contemplated, in this State.

In Western Australia we have had few accidents, as compared with the other States and overseas countries where the major cause has been powerboats. As the number of powerboats grows in this State, so will the incidence of accidents. The department does not claim that this legislation will prevent accidents, but it does claim with justification that it will help to minimise accidents.

The proposed amendment to give power to register pleasure craft will also assist others to enjoy their sport and recreation, without annoyance and interference from one section. On the notice paper appear two amendments in the name of Mr. Ron Thompson. No doubt he will tell us about them in the Committee stage.

It was claimed by Mr. Lavery that this Bill was not all that was desired, but that perhaps some measure of control would be achieved. Later he asked what was the meaning of new paragraph (ia) contained in clause 3 of the Bill. The Water Ski Association was represented on the committee which investigated this matter and which made recommendations to the Minister resulting in this legislation. The passing of the Bill will do just what the honourable member desires; that is, it will bring commonsense to the few, and allow others to participate in their particular sport with a minimum of interference. As we all know, in matters of this nature it is generally the few who make a nuisance of themselves to the detriment of the great majority.

As previously mentioned, this Bill only gives power to register private pleasure boats. Regulations already exist to control the use of navigable waters, and any other regulations which may be required in future must lie upon the Table of the House.

A query was raised by Mr. Jones as to who was to police the new regulations. The policing of the provisions in the Bill will lie with the Harbour and Light Department and its officers, as does the policing of the existing legislation on this matter. To date, such policing has been extremely difficult owing to the lack of power to control—a power now being sought. This has brought much adverse criticism upon the Legislature and the department. All that is sought is to give the department a little more power without unnecessarily interfering with the pleasures of the people.

Mr. Baxter charged the Minister with either putting up this Bill hastily or introducing it for the purpose of confusing the people. That is far from the intention, and I would ask the honourable member to reflect on his statement. No Government introduces legislation with the idea of confusing the people, and if this House thinks the Government has introduced this Bill with that idea in mind it will be a good thing if the Bill is not passed. But the Bill has not been introduced for that purpose.

Despite the allegation of the honourable member about the small amount of work that had been put into the preparation of the Bill, I want to assure him that a good deal of hard work and research has been undertaken not only by the officers of the department, but also by the representatives of the bodies concerned, who appreciate the real difficulties that are being encountered. There is a genuine desire by the Minister and by the users of the river to ascertain whether conditions can be improved. I do not think such an attempt can be justifiably interpreted as being an attempt to confuse the people. If the provisions in the Bill and the existing legislation were as severe as the American, or even the other States' Legislation covering powerboats, much greater opposition would be received from all concerned.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: You would not know how severe it could be until the regulations were introduced.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If this House accepts that comment as a reason for opposing the Bill I will be surprised.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I did not suggest it was a reason for opposing the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In many cases it is only natural that we do not know that the regulations will be, and it becomes necessary from time to time to alter regulations or introduce new ones.

*Sitting suspended from 6.9 to 7.30 p.m.*

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Before the tea suspension I had practically concluded the remarks I wished to make; and I do conclude on this note: I hope the Bill will be accepted by the House. It is at least a move forward in an effort to resolve some of the difficulties of the people who enjoy the river in regard to water sports. I know, as Mr. Baxter pointed out, of the difficulties that may be encountered in respect of regulations, but I think a House of Parliament has to rely to a considerable extent on the wisdom of Ministers of the Crown when regulations are prepared.

It is a practice that is generally accepted. Under the existing legislation there has been for some time a regulating power. I think the practice of bringing down regulations and laying them on the Table of the House has stood the test of time; and when a regulation is tabled that does not meet with the approval of an honourable member, if he wishes he can test the situation before the House. As we know, the fate of some regulations at the present time is in the balance. No doubt, the fate of a lot of other regulations will be in the same sort of balance in the years to come.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: While Parliament lasts.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: And I hope Parliament will always last. I am of the opinion that the criticisms put forward, and the questions asked, by members in connection with this particular measure have been well meant and have not been made with the idea of opposing the Bill. Therefore, I think it is safe for me to say that we will proceed to the Committee stage and deal with objections as we go from clause to clause.

**Question put and passed.**

**Bill read a second time.**

*In Committee*

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

**Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.**

**Clause 3: Section 207 amended—**

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I wish to make it clear to the Committee that at no stage did I raise any opposition to this Bill, nor have I wanted to see it defeated. I did say that I considered that this Bill was foreign to the Marine Act—and I still hold that view. My reason is that the control of the river will automatically come under the Harbour and Light Department which, at the present time, has not sufficient inspectors to carry out the work with which it is charged.

That can be realised by any person who has a look at the crayfishing industry at the present time. An officer of the Harbour and Light Department surveys a boat and on that boat there may be a borrowed compass, a borrowed fire extinguisher, or borrowed life-saving equipment. The moment the survey is over and a certificate is issued, that equipment is taken back to its rightful owner. We have seen some tragedies in the last 12 months. An unfortunate illustration was the fate of the *Carol Lee* which sank. If this Bill becomes law the Harbour and Light Department, with an insufficiency of staff, will have to police the river.

It is not easy for a private member to repeal legislation once it is on our statute book. The Minister said it is the privilege of every member to attempt, if he wishes, to have regulations disallowed. However, this might also be difficult for him to do once the regulations have been put into effect. The amendment I propose to move will tighten up the Bill so that any person who indulges in either speedboat racing or skiing will have to be registered, irrespective of whether the boat is of 6 h.p., 10 h.p., or 80 h.p. This amendment, if accepted, will help keep the hooligans off the river. It is not the ordinary person who causes the trouble, it is the erratic fool who goes on the river with a new boat and wants to lair around and show off as much as possible. I think this amendment will assist the Bill.

It is still my considered opinion that this matter should not be covered by the Marine Act. I have a further amendment on the notice paper which it is my intention to move, and I do not care whether the year stated is 1963, 1964, or 1965. The growth of water sport throughout the world demonstrates that it will be necessary for us to have a complete Act to cover river craft; and I think the control should be taken from the Harbour and Light Department and given to the Police Department. Perhaps the water police could be put on duty on the weekends in order to police the legislation. At the present time the Harbour and Light Department has not a representative at Beryl Place or Deep Water Point. It is the local policeman at Canning Bridge who receives the complaints, not the Harbour and Light Department. It is the job of the local policeman to try to bring order on to the river.

I would like to see a measure on our statute book to govern all types of craft that need to be controlled—from yachts down to dinghies, if necessary. I do not mean they should be licensed, but let us promulgate regulations that will be effective. If my second amendment is carried, it could well mean that the regulations made during the life of the present Act would possibly become portion of a new Act.

To give an idea of the growth of this sport in America, I point out that in 1949 there were 2,643,000 boats powered by outboard motors. In 1959 that number had risen to 5,845,000. Our climate is very similar to that of some of the American States, and it is easy to see that this is something which will catch on with regard to the Swan River, the Murray River, the Canning River, and a few of our lakes.

Therefore, let us have a complete Act so that we will know where we are going. I would even be prepared to move for a Select Committee for the purpose of gathering information if that were the wish of the Committee. I will do everything to assist; and it was never my intention to try to wreck this legislation. However, let us put the matter in its correct perspective, and have something decent and sensible to work on. I move an amendment—

> Page 2, lines 23 and 24—Delete the words ", or any class of, pleasure boat" and substitute the words "boat used for the purpose of skiing or competitive racing".

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would like to better understand what the honourable member is seeking to do. I understood him to say that if the Committee accepted his amendment it would tighten up the situation. I think it will tighten up the situation, but I am not sure in what direction.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It will tighten up the Bill in connection with offenders. This Bill is aimed at offenders.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Bill refers to the registration of any class of pleasure boat. If the honourable member's amendment is accepted, the provision will apply to any boat used for the purpose of skiing or competitive racing. His amendment will mean a limitation. We should ask ourselves the question, "When is a boat used for competitive skiing, and when is it not; and is it to be used competitively all the time?" Is it not feasible that a competitive racing boat could, for 75 per cent. of the time, be a pleasure boat; or revert from a pleasure boat to a competitive boat? The proposed amendment, rather than clarifying the situation, makes it obscure and more difficult. I would like the honourable member to tell me a little more about his amendment.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Last session an all-embracing Bill was introduced in another place. However, the yachting clubs brought pressure to bear and the Bill was not proceeded with. The measure would have covered the use of yachts, and the clubs thought that yachts should not come within the framework of the proposed legislation. I venture to suggest that there are more pleasure craft and powerboats than there are yachts. Why should all pleasure craft be registered? The Bill now before us is aimed at offenders on the river. The average person who owns a powerboat may wish to go for a day's outing, or to spend a day at Rottnest. He may even wish to go on a picnic to Point Walter. The owner of such a boat would not be creating a nuisance on the river. This legislation is aimed at speedboats which are used for the purpose of towing skiers.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Aren't they pleasure craft?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Yes; but the moment such speedboats tow water skiers, they should be registered.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: They would be registered, anyway, with the all-embracing coverage which the Bill provides.

Mr. R. THOMPSON: Why should all craft have to be registered when our purpose is to control certain types of offenders on the river? My amendment would tighten up the situation. If a person is using his boat for competitive racing, it should be registered; and if a boat is being used to tow water skiers, it should be registered for such a purpose. However, if a boat is used purely as a pleasure craft for family outings, then I do not see why it should have to be registered. According to the figures supplied to me by the outboard power boat association, there are only 12 speedboats on the Swan River.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Whoever told you that is not correct.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That is merely the interpretation of the Minister's advisers.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The information passed to me is that there are many hundreds of speedboats on the river.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Almost a thousand.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: They would be boats of the plane-hull description—planing boats.

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: Don't you think they should be registered?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I do not think they should be registered unless they are creating a nuisance. The only boats which are creating a nuisance are those which tow water skiers. This legislation is aimed at controlling water skiers. The number of water skiers will increase and if an area is allotted to the water skiers' association then every boat used for the purpose of water skiing will have to be registered.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What is the difference between the following two boats, both of which can do 25 knots: one that has a hook on it and is capable of towing a water skier, and the other that has no hook on it and does not tow a water skier?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The latter one is not causing any trouble to anyone.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): The Minister will have an opportunity of addressing the Committee later.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: This is perhaps a bigger question than it may at first appear. As Mr. Ron Thompson pointed out, this Bill originated because a group of boat-users on the river were not complying with ordinary standards of decency. Several meetings were held by the Harbour and Light Department at Fremantle. Shire councils from Canning Bridge to Fremantle attended the meetings and it was agreed that certain areas should be set aside for water skiing—two of those areas were in the Canning River—and that certain areas should be set aside for the launching of boats from motortrailers. The Shire of Melville spent a good deal of money levelling off areas and putting up fences to prevent non-law-abiding citizens from using those areas. However, people who otherwise are ordinary decent citizens—I know their names and the names of their boats—pulled down these fences and threw them aside. Progress associations and the shire councils of Melville, South Perth, Mosman Park and, I think, Claremont, were brought into the picture, and as a result the present Bill is now before us.

I think that Mr. Ron Thompson's amendment will be restricted to two classes of boats. As the Minister said, there are a number of boats on the river and for part of the day they may be used to tow water skiers and at other times for picnic purposes. We have only to go to Stirling Street in Perth to see the type of boat which is for sale and which is being purchased almost at the rate that new cars are being purchased. These boats will be used on the river for short trips, such as to Mandurah. People who use the Murray River will no doubt use common sense because there is not a wide expanse of water there; but that may not be the case on the Swan and Canning Rivers. Just before noon today there were three boats on the river in the vicinity of Riverton and Mt. Pleasant. There were three young lads in the river and suddenly the boats swung in and came very close to them. The honourable member's information is not correct when he says there are only 12 speedboats on the river.

The Hon. R. Thompson: How many are there?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: During the tea suspension I telephoned the president of the Mt. Pleasant Progress Association and also the leader of the deputation that approached the Minister for something to be done to protect people who used the river. They are of the opinion that there are boats on the river which do not engage in unseemly conduct. However, when reports of incidents reach the police they may have to use their motorcycles to reach a particular area, and when the police arrive they may have to wait for an hour before boat-users reach the shore for questioning; also, many boats have no identification marks.

Mr. Ron Thompson referred to the Harbour and Light Department having insufficient inspectors. If this Bill is passed tonight the department will have to provide an inspector, if for no other purpose than to police the Act. While I will not oppose the amendment moved by Mr. Thompson, I believe, like the Minister, it will tighten up the provisions of the Act too much.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I object to the amendment because there does not appear to be any firm understanding of what constitutes a particular type of boat or a particular type of sport. There is some disagreement as to what constitutes a speedboat. I can understand the honourable member when he says there are only 12 such boats on the river. He is probably right, if one thinks of the purely technical definition of speedboats.

The same thing occurs when we talk about a racing car. Some of us may call an ordinary sports model tourer a racing car, but strictly speaking a racing car is a vehicle which is constructed in accordance with a set formula. I understand that a speedboat is a craft which does better than 20 knots; and there are a lot more than 12 of them. We are, in actual fact, talking about fast boats, not speedboats.

Another point to which I wish to refer is that of skiing. What precisely is skiing? Members probably associate skiing with the fellow who holds on to a rope and who travels over the water on two pieces of wood which are curved in front.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Some people travel over the water on the balls of their feet.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: What is it called when people use a circular piece of wood—a plane? Under the proposed amendment one could not license a planing boat. I suppose if a person is on only one board it is called skiing, but I have seen some experienced fellows on films who, once they get moving at a fair speed, throw off their skis and travel along the water on their feet. Does that constitute skiing?

All over the place we see fast boats careering around, and they do create some difficulties. There are many of them which do not, but it seemed to me that many of

the arguments put forward on this matter by Mr. Ron Thompson could with equal force apply to the registration of motorcars. There are many of us who drive motor vehicles with a low horsepower; and, using his argument, should we be exempt from the necessity to register, and should only those who own very powerful vehicles have to register their cars? It is the same sort of argument to my mind.

Any initial legislation such as this must to a degree be experimental; and to start with we want it as wide as we can get it because of the difficulties of interpretation and close description. I think the only alternative is to leave the legislation as wide as the wording of the present Bill unless we are prepared to set out pages of definitions with absolute exactitude. Therefore I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think Mr. MacKinnon's remarks have been very helpful and to the point. I would like to make it clear that in the existing regulations a speedboat is defined as a boat designed for and capable of a speed in excess of 12 knots. It can travel at one knot, but if it is designed for, or capable of, more than 12 knots then, under the existing regulations, it is a speedboat.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: For what purpose is it in the existing regulations?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: To classify it as a speedboat; and, apparently, the regulations are not wide enough. I have little knowledge of the subject but it was beyond my comprehension to try to understand that there are only 12 boats on the river that can be classified as speedboats.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Under the definition?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not think Mr. Ron Thompson means that they are under that definition.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That is so.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The question I tried to pose to him by way of interjection was, "What is the difference between two boats capable of travelling at 25 knots, one with a hook on the back to be used for towing some person on skis, and another one that is not so equipped?" They both travel at the same speed; and do not tell me that the man who is pulling the ski can be more dangerous than the other fellow who is not?

The Hon. R. Thompson: What is the Bill aimed at?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member has told us what it is aimed at. It is aimed at trying to resolve the difficulties and dangers that are created by the indiscriminate use of speedboats.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Then you have answered your own question.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have answered the honourable member's question. He asked it and I gave the answer. If we accept the suggestion made by the honourable member, and we say that any boat used for the purpose of skiing or competitive racing shall be licensed, surely we limit the scope of the regulation-making power! We certainly do not widen it.

A most extraordinary situation could arise. A man could buy a boat and have no intention of using it for towing waterskiers, or of racing it, although it would still be a speedboat within the existing regulations. One fine day he says to himself, "I might tow one of my children on a water ski, but I cannot do it because although it is capable of travelling at 25 knots, and I use it as a pleasure boat, I would be out of order. I have to go and get it registered." If the honourable member's amendment is agreed to, so long as he does not want to tow anybody behind it, even though he could be a menace to everybody—

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: And a lot of them are.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. I agree with what the honourable member said the other night that a boat could be a greater danger to itself and to others if it was travelling at 5 knots instead of at its cruising speed of 20 to 25 knots; because probably the person using it has less control over it at that particular speed. That is the point I understood the honourable member to make the other night, and it is probably right. However, with all the good intentions in the world I do not think Mr. Ron Thompson will improve the Bill with his amendment. In my view it will make it worse, and I am sure he does not want to do that.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I thank the Minister for his contribution because he has proved the point at which this legislation is aimed. He said that a chap who used a boat for pleasure only and who then decided to use it for towing skiers would have to register it the moment he decided to do so; and the moment he registers it he is up for a penalty if he offends, and he will also be up for a penalty if he does not register it. Therefore that will control the people that this legislation is aimed at. It is not aimed at the average person who uses the river. As the Bill is printed it says, "Any class of pleasure boat".

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Does that include a yacht, or is a yacht not a pleasure boat?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: This only concerns powerboats.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: It does not say so, and I would like to know.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I understand it is intended only to regulate the use of powerboats.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I spoke to the Minister in charge of the Bill in another place during the tea suspension, and he seemed concerned about the matter and thought I was trying to defeat the Bill. That is not my intention at all. We are aiming at one thing, and that is the control of water skiers. But the Bill at present states "the registration of any, or any class of, pleasure boat". The Minister just said he does not want—

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Does not want what?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It would not be fair to the person who used his boat probably for two or three years and then wanted to tow skiers behind it. Under this Bill he would be forced to register.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You once told me not to try to put words into your mouth. Don't try to do it to me.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): Order!

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Minister said that a person could have a powerboat and be using it for pleasure and then all of a sudden decide that he will tow his kiddie down the river on skis. The moment he does that he would have to register, and that is the only time he would have to register.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Under your amendment.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Yes; but under the Bill as it stands he would have to register the moment the legislation was promulgated, because it refers to any class of pleasure boat.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is not denied.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: But we are aiming only at the water skiers.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is what you are aiming at?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Minister can inform himself by asking the Minister in another place, if he does not think I am right. That Minister had 12 deputations concerning water skiers. The local authorities were screaming against them. The water ski association does the right and proper thing, but it is the indiscriminate skier that the amendment is aimed at, and it will bring him into line with the aims and objects of the water ski association.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think we should keep this matter in its proper perspective. We become a bit confused when we try to remember and say what the other person said. I thought I did say, in answer to an interjection, that I thought the intention of the Bill was to enable the Minister to make regulations against the indiscriminate use of boats, and to regulate to some extent those people who now put themselves and other people in danger. If we agree to the amendment, I can see very little difference—but there would be some—between two boats capable of identical speeds, one of which has the facilities to tow skiers and engage in competitive racing, and the other has not.

That is the point I was trying to make. Under the Bill as it stands both boats will have to be registered, and I cannot see why they should not be. Did Mr. Ron Thompson in his conversation with the Minister in another place ask whether his amendment is acceptable? If he can tell me that it is, I will sit down and keep quiet.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I gather from the discussion that Mr. Ron Thompson is of the opinion that this clause has been put in to control boats towing skiers. If I understood the Minister correctly he said that it is for the purpose of controlling powerboats. Yet when we read the clause it is quite general. In complete ignorance of nautical affairs I inquired whether a yacht was a pleasure boat. If it is it would seem to me that inasmuch as 90 per cent. of yachts are engaged in competitive racing, even they would not be excluded by Mr. Thompson's amendment.

The Hon. R. Thompson: They would be excluded. It is only in regard to speedboats.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: The amendment does not say that. It says, "Boats used for the purpose of skiing or competitive racing".

The Hon. R. Thompson: You cannot ski behind a yacht.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: As I understand it, 90 per cent. of the yachts are engaged in competitive racing on Saturday afternoons.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: On page 347 of the 1948 *Statutes* is the commencement of the Western Australian Marine Act, and that Act is divided into nine parts, and in part VIII there is a specific section dealing with boat licensing. It is in two divisions; and one of those divisions contains sections 183 to 204 which deal with hire boats and fishing, pearling, and whaling boats. Division 2, which takes in sections 205 to 207, deals with private pleasure boats, with which we are dealing now. In division 2 the licensing and control of pleasure boats is already provided for in section 207 (i). This Bill is merely to give the Minister the right to control a certain class of pleasure boat not defined in the measure. It is only defined as "pleasure boat." We find that "vessel" includes any ship or boat or any other description of vessel used in navigation.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If the regulation does not so prescribe, they will not have to be registered.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Without being given more information I cannot see the purpose of registration. Mr. Lavery has informed us there is a section dealing with private pleasure boats; and he has told us the meaning of "vessel," which includes any ship or boat or any other description of vessel used in navigation. In the regulations I have there is no reference at all to pleasure boats.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Is there no mention of registration?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: None that I can find. Under the Act, since 1948, there has been the power to make regulations to control pleasure boats within certain waters—both in the river and in the sea. Now we are asked to ratify the registration of pleasure boats when there are no regulations at the moment—even though there has been power to prescribe regulations. Without knowing what regulations are likely to be prescribed I cannot accept the position at all. I would like to hear further from the Minister on this matter.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is not surprising that regulations have not been promulgated previously; because boating as a hobby has been explosive in its advent.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am told that regulations do exist.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Members will have seen at the Royal Show in the last couple of years there were boats everywhere. The number of boats purchased in the last few years has been fantastic; and as Mr. Lavery says it will probably double next year. I am sure that the growth and the popularity of this sport is comparable to its popularity in America. A couple of years ago there was no agitation for regulations or registration or anything else. In Bunbury, where we have extensive waters, it is becoming a major problem, as it is everywhere else. There are people there who are using what I class as speedboats to go out fishing. They do this because it helps them get out of trouble.

Power to register must be given to help us identify the boats. I gather this is common in other parts of the world. We are not blessed with large lakes as is the case in other parts of the world, but it is becoming increasingly necessary to have some sort of registration and control over boats, and the time has come to pass this Bill.

Mr. Ron Thompson told us why he thought the Bill was brought down. So far as we are concerned it has been introduced to amend the Western Australian Marine Act. To say that a party brings down a particular Bill because of pressure from outside does not hold water, because before a Bill is presented it goes through certain stages, as is the case with Bills that are presented by other Governments. Members may have their own views as to why the Bill has been introduced, but its main purpose is to amend the Western Australian Marine Act.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: As I think Mr. Ron Thompson said, the Minister for Works has received something like 12 deputations on this matter. Last year the Bill was not acceptable and it was not proceeded with. It did not reach this Chamber, if my memory serves me aright.

I do not know how much clearer Mr. Baxter wants me to be on this point. From the information I have received the existing regulations define a speedboat as a motor boat capable of a speed in excess of 12 knots. So we must have regulations. Such craft run into hundreds on the river today. There are not only 12 as has been mentioned.

I would refer members to section 207 of the Western Australian Marine Act which is the regulation-making section. They will see that together with that section the Bill will give the Governor authority to make regulations with respect to pleasure craft. I cannot be any clearer than that. We do not know what the regulations will be but they will be consistent with the difficulties that have been encountered for a long time—difficulties mentioned by Mr. Lavery who knows so much about this matter. The members of the deputation wanted this, and I cannot explain it in any clearer terms.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: All we are trying to do at the moment is to decide whether or not we are to support the amendment moved by Mr. Ron Thompson; in other words, whether we wish to limit the application of this Bill to boats towing skiers or to boats participating in competitive racing. It will be of very little use to limit it to boats towing skiers or to those engaged in competitive racing. As the Minister said: Would not a boat capable of 20 or 25 knots cause just as much nuisance if it did not tow a ski? People who are making a nuisance of themselves—as referred to by Mr. Thompson—do just as much damage without skiers being towed behind the boats. I see no merit in limiting the provision as suggested by Mr. Thompson.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I would like the legislation to conform in some way with the American legislation. The American speedboat owners hammered their members of Parliament for a State Act of Parliament to control waterways. In reply to Mr. Willmott I would say that the people who make a nuisance of themselves are those skiers who seek spectator value. It is those boys who come sweeping into the shore who create a nuisance. The Bill is aimed at them. I would not have moved the amendment in respect of any other class of boat.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If these fellows who want to sweep into the shore are not racing or towing a ski they need not be registered?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Minister asks if it would be fair to register this class of boat. What about a yacht? Does that not come in close to the shore? Does not any other type of motorboat come in close to the shore? This Bill is aimed at power craft according to the Minister's introduction. "Power craft" is an expression usually used to describe a boat with an outboard motor; but there is available nowadays an inboard motor which makes it possible for craft to swoop in to the shore.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is your interpretation. I did not know that power craft were limited to those with outboard motors; far from it.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I could be wrong on that but that is my interpretation. Mr. Willmott said that my amendment does not alter the text of the Bill because no mention is made in the Bill that yachts will be precluded; it merely refers to any class of pleasure craft.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It does not say they will be excluded either.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That is quite correct. My amendment does not say they will be included.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Yes. Your amendment is limiting.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I hope my amendment will be carried because I think it will have the desired effect.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: The speech just made by Mr. Ron Thompson highlights what I said a moment ago that there is a great deal of extraneous matter being pushed into this debate. Whether boat-owners should or should not approach their members of Parliament to obtain special legislation to govern boats on the river has nothing to do with the amendment before the Chair. I suggest that all this amendment is doing is limiting the provisions of the Bill to boats towing skiers or boats entering into competitive racing.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I agree with Mr. Willmott, but let us be dinkum about this matter. The other night I asked the Minister to withdraw this Bill and have it redrafted in order that he might submit a Bill which we could understand. I told the Minister that I did not want to have to amend a Government Bill. All I desire is that decent legislation shall be introduced so that we may know exactly what is going to happen. However the Government is not prepared to take any action along the lines I suggested.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): Order! I am going to ask members from now on to stick strictly to the amendment before the Chair. I have allowed a certain amount of latitude—possibly too much—and there has been a great deal of tedious repetition which is not allowed under Standing Order No. 397. I ask members to limit themselves wholly and solely to the amendment.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: In conclusion I wish to say that if it were possible for members to understand what is desired under this Bill it would not be necessary for me to move the amendment.

**Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—**

Ayes—11

| | |
|---|---|
| Hon. N. E. Baxter | Hon. J. D. Teahan |
| Hon. G. Bennetts | Hon. R. Thompson |
| Hon. E. M. Davies | Hon. W. F. Willesee |
| Hon. J. J. Garrigan | Hon. F. J. S. Wise |
| Hon. E. M. Heenan | Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs |
| Hon. R. F. Hutchison | *(Teller.)* |

Noes—15

| | |
|---|---|
| Hon. C. R. Abbey | Hon. J. Murray |
| Hon. A. F. Griffith | Hon. H. R. Robinson |
| Hon. J. G. Hislop | Hon. C. H. Simpson |
| Hon. F. R. H. Lavery | Hon. J. M. Thomson |
| Hon. L. A. Logan | Hon. H. K. Watson |
| Hon. A. L. Loton | Hon. F. D. Willmott |
| Hon. G. C. MacKinnon | Hon. S. T. J. Thompson |
| Hon. R. C. Mattiske | *(Teller.)* |

**Majority against—4.**

**Amendment thus negatived.**

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not permitted to quote from *Hansard* of this year but Mr. Loton has kindly pointed out to me that the Minister in another place foreshadowed on page 799 the type of regulation which might be brought down.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): I think the Minister has gone far enough.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Have I?

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): Yes.

New clause 4—

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I move—

Page 3—Insert after clause 3 the following new clause:—

> 4. The provisions of the Western Australian Marine Act Amendment Act, 1962, shall continue in operation until the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three, and no longer.

I am moving for the insertion of this new clause because most members have complained that this is a Bill which merely provides regulation-making powers. We will not have an opportunity to review and amend those regulations. However I am easy about the amendment. As I have said previously, what we really require is a completely new Bill to control our river—a Bill something like the one from America which I have lent the Minister. However, I will not be dogmatic as far as the year is concerned and will not object if some other member would like to make it 1964 or 1965, as long as we know there will be a completely new Bill introduced.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: Mr. Ron Thompson has explained quite clearly his object in moving this amendment. However, I doubt whether constitutionally his amendment as it appears on the notice paper will achieve his objective. I think his amendment should be that paragraphs (ha) and (ia) of section 207 shall continue in force until the 31st day of December, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three, and no longer.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is not accurate, of course, to say that most members have complained about the regulation-making powers in this Bill, because a vote was taken and it was 15 to 11 in favour of going on with it. This is quite apart, of course, from the point raised by Mr. Watson. The honourable member should not have used this argument when explaining his reasons for placing a limiting clause in the Bill so that it will become inoperative after the 31st December, 1963.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I said I was easy.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I was criticised for not having regard for what the honourable member said, and for not agreeing with his suggestion that the Government should bring down a new Bill. He spoke on Thursday afternoon last, and this is the first opportunity I have had to reply. I am not prepared to concede that the Government should give this Bill away and introduce an entirely new one; and I am strengthened in my outlook by a vote of 15 to 11 in respect of the Bill.

If there is anything wrong with the Act, or the Bill, let us have a look at the legislation when it goes wrong, and let us have a look at the regulations that I have foreshadowed. The Bill is an entirely new one and I cannot see that the Government will scrap it.

I ask the Committee not to agree to the amendment but to give the legislation a fair trial. If it does not work out, we can bring down an amending Bill during the next session of Parliament; and we can do that before the 31st December, 1963.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Mr. Ron Thompson's intention—I have discussed this with him—in limiting the period of the amending Bill is to permit, in the meantime, of a Bill being drawn up completely apart from the Western Australian Marine Act. But the Government has brought this Bill before Parliament after trying for three years to find some way to deal with the position, so it is not likely that it will throw the measure aside to bring down a completely new one, unless some private member is prepared to introduce a measure. I suggest that Mr. Thompson would be happy to do it, but I am sure that the President would rule the Bill out of order because it would impose a cost on the Crown.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have just had a private word with Mr. Watson, and I understand more clearly what he was asking. The effect of the amendment will be that at the 31st December, 1963, this piece of legislation will no longer be operative. The amendment cannot become operative unless it is inserted as an integral part of section 207 of the Act. For that reason it may be out of order. Would you give us your ruling, Mr. Chairman, please?

*Chairman's Ruling*

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): I agree that an amendment as suggested by Mr. Watson would be more satisfactory than the one moved by Mr. Ron Thompson. But that does not mean that the amendment is out of order. There are precedents in this Chamber—although I cannot enumerate them at the moment—for the amendment before the Chair. I rule that the amendment is in order.

*Committee Resumed*

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It is simplicity itself to terminate the Bill at any time during the next session of Parliament if that be the wish of Parliament. The Chamber has shown itself this evening to be in full support of the Bill. I feel sure that the honourable member sponsoring this limiting amendment fully realises that if it is his wish to amend the Bill—or the parent Act itself—in any minor or major particular, the whole field will be open to him long before December, 1963.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. W. R. Hall): I have given a ruling and it has not been disagreed with, so I propose to put the new clause.

**New clause put and negatived.**

**Title put and passed.**

*Report*

**Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.**

## PHARMACY AND POISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed, from the 18th September, on the following motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**THE HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [8.58 p.m.]: We had two very able speeches on the Bill; one by Mr. Willesee and the other by Dr. Hislop. Each member had a somewhat different approach to the problems in the measure, but each stated that he intended to support the Bill, for which I thank them.

One of the main questions which Mr. Willesee raised was that the Bill would exclude country boys and girls from the opportunity that they now have to go in for pharmacy. Under the present setup an apprentice has to attend the technical college on three afternoons a week; and in the first year an apprentice receives only £3 a week. This, in itself, would debar country children from going in for pharmacy.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: They will not receive anything under this measure.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: No; but they will have the possibility of getting a scholarship, which they did not have previously.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: A Commonwealth scholarship?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: There is a Commonwealth scholarship; and my information is that 25 to 30 per cent. of the students in Victoria receive Commonwealth scholarships. In Western Australia 25 per cent. or more of the students going through academic training could receive Commonwealth scholarships, and later two post-graduate scholarships, worth £2,500 are awarded.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: For the whole of Australia.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: No; for Western Australia.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: £2,500 each?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes. I had better check that statement before I commit myself. I think Dr. Hislop is correct; they are Commonwealth scholarships which are applicable throughout Australia. Of course, the point is that if we do not adopt this system of academic training, no Western Australian pharmaceutical student will have an opportunity of winning either of those two awards.

Possibly, the principal reason for passing this legislation today is the great advance in medical science and the tremendous increase in the number of synthetic drugs which are coming into use. This makes it essential to a certain extent that we should adopt this new academic system because, under the present system, an apprentice is at a disadvantage by working in a pharmacy and trying to spend three half-days a week at the technical college and continuing his studies at night. This would prove extremely difficult for him, and the three years' academic course would be better not only for the student but for everyone else concerned.

Further, when the reciprocal provisions of the Bill are considered it is realised that Western Australia cannot be left out of the over-all scheme. Many pharmacists who have served their training in Western Australia usually take the opportunity, at the completion of their training, to travel to the Eastern States or to countries overseas. In the last eight years 177 pharmacists have left this State either for the Eastern States or for overseas. Forty-two left in 1961, and 20 have already left the State in 1962. Members will agree that that is an extremely large number.

The fortunate aspect of this trend is that most of them return to Western Australia to continue their careers as pharmacists. The very fact that pharmacists are able to leave the State to further their knowledge in pharmacy, and the fact that, no matter where they may go, they are able to avail themselves of the reciprocity that exists must improve the pharmaceutical standard in Western Australia when they return to this State to practise.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I agree with that.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I think I have referred to the main points that were raised. I would also like to mention that in the field of medicine this is possibly the only profession remaining which operates under an apprenticeship system. A medico receives his training under the academic system, as do dentists and optometrists. This is the only profession in which students are trained under the apprenticeship system.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: The only aspect that concerns me is the restriction the Bill will place on lads from the country.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Does not the honourable member think there is a restriction placed on them today in view of the expenses they have to meet whilst residing in the metropolitan area? A student from the country who earns only £3 a week in his first year and who has to attend the technical college three nights a week would be just as badly off as a student under the proposed scheme. If he obtains a job during the University recess it would help to defray the expenses.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: That is, if he is successful in obtaining a job.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I think he would earn as much during the University recesses in the three or four years of his academic training as he would under the apprenticeship system.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: That is unanswerable, too, but the point is: will he be able to obtain full employment during the periods the University is in recess?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: He will not earn very much at £3 a week.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: No; but the amount he will earn will be a big help to his father who has to bear the burden of financing his training.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not think it would be of much advantage to the lad in the country.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee. I think it is a material advantage, especially to his father.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I cannot see how it would be. I would say that the pharmacists, under the present system, are getting cheap labour to that extent. Further, we have to keep up with the times. We are living in a changing world, and this is one sphere in which tremendous changes have occurred. Other States and other countries have reciprocity, and negotiations for this State to have equal reciprocity with other States and other countries have been going on between the pharmaceutical guilds for many years. Because of the many advantages that will accrue, I hope the House will agree to the Bill.

**Question put and passed.**

**Bill read a second time.**

*In Committee*

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

**Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.**

**Clause 3: Section 21 amended—**

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: This clause is the crux of the Bill. I was unable to frame a suitable amendment to give preferential treatment to country students. I believe they could be seriously disadvantaged in regard to the opportunities offered by the Bill. I realise the advantages that can be obtained through reciprocity and academic training for students even though I think there may not be a need for academic training on the broad principle as envisaged in the Bill.

I would like to know if the Minister, in regard to the £250 scholarship, could ask the pharmaceutical council to give serious consideration to granting preference to country students. I know the Minister has said that £3 a week does not mean very much to a country student, but to a father who is desirous of doing the best he can for a son who is studying for this profession, £3 a week to be found over three years under this proposed system, is a large sum of money. Looking at the position over all, under the proposed system a student will receive nothing whilst he is studying for the first three years and then he will receive £18 a week in his fourth year; and this will be the same as his receiving £3 a week under the present system of apprenticeship.

Unfortunately, in the period from the time a student sits for his Junior or Leaving Certificate and the time he completes his training in a profession, too many brilliant students are lost to the State. In the main, the reason for that is that in many cases the parents of the students have not the necessary finance to enable their children to bridge the gap. Over the years we have produced many brilliant scholars in this State, and in the future we should give such students every opportunity to continue their studies. I realise that this Bill is an endeavour to achieve that object. However, we must not overlook the humanitarian approach to the problem which I envisage; and, therefore, we should give every encouragement to any student who is desirous of entering this profession—encouragement to the limit of the opportunities that are offering.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I deliberately refrained from speaking on the second reading of the Bill because I was anxious to hear the Minister's reply to the arguments put forward by Dr. Hislop. I am not happy with the Bill. I do not think the advantages to be gained by reciprocity should weigh very heavily with us. If a student studying in Western Australia has to attain a standard which is acceptable to pharmacists outside this State, he should be able to take advantage of all the facilities available to enable him to carry out the necessary studies to achieve that standard. Surely it would be a simple matter to make those facilities available.

For that reason alone I cannot see why we should raise the standard of pharmaceutical chemists in this State beyond a qualification level that is necessary today to fill prescriptions issued by a medical practitioner. This new system must, of course, add to the cost of medicine because the chemist's expenses, of necessity, will be increased. Those of us who have occasion to deal with chemists at frequent intervals—and unfortunately I am one—know that today many prescriptions are written by doctors who do not prescribe the necessary drugs that are used in the mixture, but merely name a proprietary line to be issued to the patient. That is, in fact, what happens.

Very often when a chemist is handed a prescription it is only a question of his shaking out some tablets from a large bottle, counting them and issuing them to the customer. Indeed, in many instances, all that happens is that a proprietary label is removed from the bottle and the chemist's label is substituted. I do not want to belittle the services that are rendered by chemists, because in many country districts today they render a great service to the local residents. Nevertheless, once this new system is put in train it must add to the cost of prescribing medicines.

If this Bill is necessary, I am surprised that we have not an accompanying Bill to prohibit the sale of medicines in stores other than chemist shops. Today one

can enter chain stores and grocery shops and purchase all kinds of proprietary lines. In fact, one can buy some medicines at Boans.

If it is necessary to increase the academic standard of chemists of the future, we can assume that the present-day drugs and aids to health have become complex and dangerous to administer. If that is so, the sale of these drugs should be restricted to chemists, and be prohibited from sale in the establishments I have mentioned. If it is desirable to elevate the status of chemists, then they should be prevented from selling plastic toys and such articles.

I cannot see any logical necessity for this Bill. The only argument in its favour is that it will bring about reciprocity, so that pharmaceutical chemists in this State will be able to work in other States and overseas countries. But this aspect can be dealt with by instituting post-graduate or extra training for those who desire to work in other countries. By adopting this method the cost of the extra training of pharmaceutical students or apprentices will not be loaded on to the price of medicines. Unless there is some far better reason for this Bill to be passed, I propose to vote against the third reading.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: I am of the same opinion as the previous speaker. I would not like to see the price of medicines increased, because already the existing level of prices is high. The cost of medicines varies from place to place, and I have personal experience of this. In Kalgoorlie a prescription cost me 6s. 6d., but a repeat of that same prescription in Perth cost me 10s. 6d.

If pharmaceutical students or apprentices want to undergo extra training to enable them to work overseas, they should undertake that training at their own expense. Mr. Willesee said that students from the country have to be taken into consideration, but many of them have relatives in the metropolitan area who can accommodate them while they are undertaking training. I intend to vote against the third reading.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I am not in favour of this Bill, although I said during the second reading that I would vote for it. I have no other alternative than to vote against the third reading, because it is not a Bill I would have introduced if I had had to decide on its introduction. The Bill seeks to bring about a level of training of pharmaceutical chemists—a standard which is not required in this State—which will enable them to become a useful scientific section of the community.

I agree with the proposal put forward by Mr. MacKinnon that some sort of post-graduate training should be instituted to enable pharmaceutical students to work overseas. I have one fear; by placing too high a standard on the training we will limit the number of students who will join the profession. If I were a young man and had to make a choice of undergoing four years' training at the technical college, where during the summer holidays I could work and keep myself, and a full course of medicine at a university lasting six years, I am sure I would prefer medicine because this training would lead me into a much wider scientific field.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I suppose every member has the right to decide to vote against the third reading, although he may have agreed to the second reading. But by doing so he places the Minister in an awkward situation. The query raised by Mr. MacKinnon has, in fact, been answered by his own comments. He referred to the standard of training of pharmaceutical apprentices. From his own words it is obvious that such apprentices cannot receive adequate training in a chemist's shop; because, according to the honourable member, all that an apprentice has to do is to take a packet of pills from the shelf, remove the label of the manufacturer, and charge what he likes for it. That being the position, how can a pharmaceutical apprentice learn his profession?

I have here the syllabus of the course of training for the degree of Bachelor of Pharmacy, prescribed by the University of Sydney. It is as follows:—

| Subject | Syllabus | Tuition Lect. | Hours Pract. |
|---|---|---|---|
| YEAR I— | | | |
| Chemistry I .... .... .... | Physical, inorganic and organic chemistry .... | 81 | 81 |
| Physics I .... .... .... | Elementary principles of mechanics, properties of matter, heat, wave motion, sound, light, magnetism and electricity .... .... .... .... | 81 | 81 |
| Zoology IB .... .... .... | General principles of zoology, with some emphasis on medical aspects.... .... .... .... .... | 54 | 54 |
| Elective Subject, e.g., Botany I .... .... .... .... | .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... | 81 | 81 |
| Year I Total | .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... | 297 | 297 |

| Subject | Syllabus | Tuition Hours Lect. | Pract. |
|---|---|---|---|
| YEAR II— | | | |
| Pharmaceutics I .... .... | Pharmaceutical calculations: elements of statistics; posology and methods of administration of drugs and methods of standardisation; compounding and dispensing; emulsification; preservation and storage of drugs .... .... .... | 90 | 162 |
| Pharmaceutical Chemistry I | General and inorganic, physical, and organic chemistry, with special reference to compounds of pharmaceutical importance .... .... .... | 90 | 162 |
| Pharmacognosy .... .... | Classification of crude drugs; sources of chemicals of pharmaceutical importance derived from drugs; methods of extraction of plants and the manufacture of pharmaceutical preparations from them; the microscopical characteristics of typical drugs; microscopical study of examples of drugs in various forms; use of stains for chemical identification of plant structures and constituents .... .... .... .... .... | 20 | 20 |
| Microbiology .... .... .... | The general physiology and morphology of bacteria; bacterial metabolism and culturation .... | 20 | 27 |
| Physiology .... .... .... | The general physiology of tissue and organs .... | 90 | 40 |
| Biochemistry .... .... | Chemistry of lipides, proteins, and carbohydrates and their metabolism; general nutrition of cells and organs; vitamins and enzymes .... .... | 60 | 27 |
| Year II Total | .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... | 370 | 438 |
| YEAR III— | | | |
| Pharmaceutics II .... .... | Methods of formation of more complex pharmaceuticals; disinfectants, antiseptics and preservatives; sterilisation and asepsis; tests for sterility; immunological preparations; the laws relating to pharmacy .... .... .... | 90 | 162 |
| Pharmaceutical Chemistry II | Advanced general and physical, and organic chemistry with special reference to topics of pharmaceutical importance .... .... .... .... | 90 | 162 |
| Pharmacology .... .... | A systematic study of the pharmacology of the drugs used in medicine .... .... .... .... | 90 | 80 |
| Year III Total | .... .... .... .... .... .... .... | 270 | 404 |
| Grand Total | .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... | 937 | 1,139 |

After those lectures, plus another 12 months in a chemist shop, we should have a trained pharmacist, who will be better than the man who works as an apprentice in a chemist shop today. Mr. MacKinnon raised issues which I will not debate at this time.

The control of the sale of medicines and pills is an entirely new subject. We are dealing with the training of future pharmacists. If the present method is not suitable it must be changed. It is the only branch of medicine where the students are not given an academic training. Why did the medical profession, the dentists, the physiotherapists, and the optometrists move away from the apprenticeship system? Obviously because they found the academic system better. These provisions have been asked for by the pharmaceutical guild. Dr. Hislop said he knew of boys who wanted to be apprenticed and could not get in. Anybody who wants to train and take an academic course may do so.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: If their parents can keep them.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: How do they keep them at the University? Under the old system they will not be entitled to Commonwealth scholarships or to Australian post-graduate bursaries.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: You are not prepared to give country people any consideration?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am prepared to take the request to the guild, because I think anyone who is eligible for an academic training, or for a scholarship, should be given the same advantage.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The curriculum read out by the Minister definitely proves that the pharmacist will be highly

qualified academically when he has finished his training. The Minister implied that I had said chemists merely dish out tablets. I want to make it clear that it is not their fault that they do so, because they only fulfil the prescriptions given by the doctors. It is the doctors' fault; because I have yet to be shown the doctor who writes out a prescription in detail, as was the case 20 years ago.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I did not say who was to blame.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Dr. Hislop told us that trained chemists are talking doctors into using certain proprietary lines. We all know that that happens. I have no doubt there are some doctors who prescribe a pinch of this and a touch of that. But can the Minister tell me what earthly value such a highly academic training is to a chemist when 99 out of 100 of the prescriptions he gets are, in effect, "Give this man a packet of Smith's pink pills"; or whatever it happens to be. That is to check the possible error by the doctor. These days there does not seem to be much more than that involved.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: Apparently the pharmaceutical guild thinks there is.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Our duty is not to a particular guild; though I have a high regard for the pharmaceutical guild; and a few years ago I worked hard in their interests on another measure. Our duty is to the public and the State, and to ensure that costs of medicines are reasonable. Nothing that has been said has convinced me that the Bill will give us better medicine; or that it will not make what medicine we do get more expensive to us as individuals, or to the State.

There is one other aspect relative to a training such as this. One can imagine the very real frustration of a man who having done a three-year course and acquired a knowledge of pathology and the rest; having covered the curriculum read out by the Minister; and having all that knowledge at his finger tips, finds when he goes to work in a chemist shop for the next few years that he gets nothing but prescriptions for the issue of a specified number of a specified proprietary line of tablets, ointment, or medicine. Just how frustrating that could be! It would be like a man who had the urge to paint and who had the necessary training and qualifications to paint masterpieces being relegated to painting numbers on seats, and so on.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: He would forget much of his learning.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes. The frustration involved is well worth thinking about. The points brought up by the Minister have only served to harden my opinion.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is obvious from the last remarks of Mr. MacKinnon that he is prepared to allow the pharmacists to be a dying race.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: That is the only conclusion I can come to.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I say the doctors are prepared to let them die out because of the way they are prescribing.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not know who is to blame. I raised the issue because the honourable member said that they are only pill-sellers, and because of that the opportunity for an apprentice to learn chemistry at a pharmacist's shop was getting smaller every day. Therefore, if we want trained pharmacists in the future they will have to be given an academic course; otherwise they will only learn to sell pills over the counter, without any knowledge of what is contained in them. That is not in the best interests of the community. Let us have our pharmacists trained in the best way possible.

I think Mr. MacKinnon should have another look at this, because we must have trained pharmacists in the future; and we are looking for a method of training that is better than the present system. There must be some merit in this new system since it has been adopted by nearly all of the other States of the Commonwealth and by England. It is apparently giving satisfaction to all concerned. Whether it will add to the cost of pills or other medicines, I do not know.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The pharmacist today can fulfil prescriptions under the present method of training.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes; but that type of training is going out, and the new type is coming in. He will be given an academic training. I come back to the point that other medical professions have changed from the old system of training and adopted the new academic form. The apprenticeship system of training is not as satisfactory as the academic one. The present system is outdated and the new system will ensure we have trained pharmacists in the future.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I understand this Bill has the full support of the pharmaceutical guild, a body of gentlemen with whom I have had no contact. However, we have the assurance from Mr. MacKinnon that they are a good body of men. I approach this subject by paying great respect to the wishes of a professional body such as that. In their wisdom these men have advocated this new method of training young chemists—a method which will give them better qualifications and more in line with those required in other parts of Australia and, apparently, other parts of the world.

Young men and women who qualify in pharmacy in Western Australia, as with other callings, have a great tendency nowadays to go overseas and obtain experience in other parts of the world. Therefore I would not like to see our State fall behind in regard to their training. I agree with a lot that has been said by Mr. MacKinnon. Those of us who contract influenza, or some other disease go to a doctor who invariably prescribes pills or tablets of some form or another. The old method whereby the chemists made up prescriptions has certainly gone by the board.

However, that does not mean the training of chemists should be neglected. I think the Minister is on sound ground when he says that the dental body has for years advocated a faculty at the University; and surely the only motive would be to raise the standard of qualified men and women for the benefit of the public.

Our doctors today specialise in various fields and are much more highly trained. They have their standard medicines and they do not treat us in the same way that doctors used to treat people in the old days. I do not think the pharmacy profession in those respects is radically different from medicine, or dentistry. Surely the public are the ones who are going to benefit if the men and women in these callings are better trained! Standards everywhere are being raised, and we might do the public a disservice if we defeated this measure. We would certainly do a disservice to the young girls and boys who are going to be trained in Western Australia in the future.

Finally I believe that the pharmaceutical guild must have had good motives for suggesting the provisions in this measure. For my part I believe they know a lot more about it than I do, and I am going to support this Bill.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The Minister said that I was prepared to allow unskilled men to hand out pills. I am not. I believe that a person should be a qualified pharmacist before he can hand them out. However, if the Minister really believes that unskilled men should not handle these pills, then logically he should prohibit all other stores from selling the drugs which they sell. One has only to go into any shop or self-service store to see the tremendous range sold by people who are not trained pharmacists.

Mr. Heenan said that he will accept this Bill because the pharmaceutical guild desires it. The pharmaceutical guild, however, also desires to prohibit stores other than pharmacies from selling drugs. Would Mr. Heenan agree to that?

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: Yes; I would agree with that.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It is logical. If it is important that drugs should be sold by only trained men, these other stores should not be permitted to sell them.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They are two different things.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: They are not two different things, because we do not know which drugs are dangerous and which are not. There is a controversy at the moment as to whether phenacetin is dangerous.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That is only according to the Press.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: It could be only according to the Press. They are the two things I want to say, and one follows logically upon the other.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: I agree with the Minister that this, shall we say, specialised education in pharmacy would benefit the country. However, I am concerned as to how it will affect the country districts. It is already quite difficult in some country areas to persuade a chemist to establish himself. As a matter of fact there are a number of districts which have no chemist at present. Despite what Mr. MacKinnon says about the availability of drugs at stores, there are quite a number of drugs which connot be procured anywhere but at a chemist's shop.

I am afraid that once we have these specialists among the chemists it will be even more difficult to obtain chemists for country districts. Is it really necessary to have such high qualifications to virtually sell drugs? From the discussion tonight it appears that most of the time of a chemist is taken up in selling proprietary lines of drugs as authorised by doctors. I would like to know whether the guild would be agreeable to relieve us from some of these restrictions in order that more drugs may be readily available from the stores. Otherwise, I can see it will be necessary for some people to travel many miles for drugs which in years gone by they have been able to obtain quite easily.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I wonder what is really in Mr. MacKinnon's mind? Is his heart bleeding so much for the chemist because he knows that other shops sell drugs? I wonder how much his heart bleeds for the shopkeeper when so many other lines such as frying-pans and radiators are sold by chemists? After all, these grocers and hardware merchants are trying to get a living out of selling this type of thing, but apparently Mr. MacKinnon would require that everything should be left for the chemist to sell.

In one chemist shop in Fremantle there are at least three stands of goods which are not chemists' lines. My idea is that

apart from the fact that he has to earn a living, a chemist's task is to cater for sick people.

I believe Mr. Heenan is right; and if it is possible to raise the standard of the dispensing chemist who deals out these medicines, we should do so. I also agree with the point raised by Mr. Willesee that the parents of those who desire to study pharmacy must be given some financial help in the early stages.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I propose to support the Minister in this matter and to vote for the clause as printed. The Legislature has a responsibility to encourage as far as possible the improvement of every important branch of skilled professions especially those which are ancillary to and indeed tied, in their importance, to other skilled professional sections of the community. That is where the pharmacists come in. It is all very well to criticise the fact—and it is a fact —that the potions of today come from the chemist shops as prepared material; but whence do they emanate? They come from the manufacturing chemists—men who have been trained in their profession; men whose goods are prepared as a result of research in their sphere; and they are applied to the different ills of mankind. As new drugs are discovered and applied to human ills, the manufacturing chemist follows his line of action. He is ready to distribute, on a doctor's prescription, an acknowledged drug in proper form. Is there anything wrong with that? And is there anything wrong with a man being trained basically in a profession which is age old?

The pestle and mortar is the emblem of pharmacists, and it has been for generations. In my view it will continue to be the emblem, as it is something which belongs to the profession and is a basic part of the teaching. Pharmacy is a subsidiary, if we might call it that, of the medical profession; and is so closely allied to it that the medical profession can give effect to the desire of pharmacists to cure human ills only if members of the profession are able to prescribe through a chemist the materials requisite to cure those ills.

What does this clause do? It provides for the basic training. Members may criticise the methods if they like; but if we take this clause out or defeat the Bill, we are going to prevent the training of people who must be skilled in an acknowledged profession and properly trained to meet the needs of today and tomorrow.

Much has been said about what is displayed and sold in chemists' shops. Surely the better training of pharmacists to handle prescriptions, or the potions which are manufactured and which are prescribed by doctors, will do away with a lot of the necessity of a chemist having to buttress his business with other lines of trade.

What do we find in the drug stores of America? We are able to get anything from bacon and eggs for breakfast to any sort of hardware which may be required in a kitchen: crystal, and—under the circumstances I can mention a thought which I could not mention a moment or two ago—goods which are manufactured by rubber companies, such as hot-water bottles, and other kinds of goods which human beings find of comfort at some time.

I think it would be wrong for us to do anything other than support a measure which will assist in the training of skilled specialists in an age-old profession who, no matter what may be said to the contrary, are required to be just as skilled—perhaps even more so—at this period as at any other period of our lives.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I regret the necessity to return to my seat. I left in anticipation that I would not have to rise again in connection with this Bill. Members will recall that I said that if other shops were requested not to sell proprietary chemical lines it would be reasonable to ask chemists not to sell some of the goods with which, to use the words of Mr. Wise, they buttress their businesses. The majority of chemists would like to be able to prescribe on the pestle-and-mortar basis which was mentioned a moment ago. They would feel they were doing a job for which they were actually trained. I know of no chemist who would not get up at three or four in the morning in order to provide service. They serve a very worth-while purpose. However, in their own interests and in the interests of the community at large I still have grave doubts about this particular Bill.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clauses 4 to 6 put and passed.**

**Title put and passed.**

*Report*

**Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.**

## PILOTS' LIMITATION OF LIABILITY BILL

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed, from the 13th September, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (Suburban —Minister for Mines) [10.3 p.m.]: In replying to the second reading debate I take this opportunity of conveying to Mr. Ron Thompson some information which he sought when he was making his second reading speech. The safest way in

which I can answer the points he raised would be for me to tell the House that I consulted the Chief Parliamentary Draftsman, as the points raised by the honourable member were a matter of law and not a matter of politics. The Chief Parliamentary Draftsman has advised as follows in connection with the Commonwealth Navigation Act of 1912-58:—

> 350. (1) No pilot shall be personally liable in pecuniary damages for any damage or loss occasioned by his neglect or want of skill.
>
> (2) The Commonwealth shall not be liable for any damage or loss occasioned by the neglect or want of skill of any pilot.

That section was contained in Part VIII of the Commonwealth Navigation Act which was never proclaimed to come into operation. By the Commonwealth Navigation Act, 1958, this section was repealed and a new section 410B inserted in the principal Act. The section quoted by Mr. Thompson therefore has no relevance to this matter.

Section 410B reads as follows:—

> 410B (1) A pilot who has the conduct of a ship is subject to the authority of the master of the ship and the master is not relieved from responsibility for the conduct and navigation of the ship by reason only of the ship being under pilotage.
>
> (2) Notwithstanding anything contained in an Act or State Act, the owner or master of a ship navigating under circumstances in which pilotage is compulsory under a law of a State or Territory of the Commonwealth is answerable for any loss or damage caused by the ship, or by a fault of the navigation of the ship, in the same manner as he would if pilotage were not compulsory.

It is considered that local pilots would have little or no protection under this section. This section applies only in relation to certain ships to which the Commonwealth Navigation Act applies, and such ships do not include ships engaged wholly in intrastate trade. Section 410B in its terms does not apply to protect pilots and the fact that the old section 350 was repealed and this new section enacted supports the view that it is not intended to deal with the liability of a pilot as between the pilot and the owner of a ship. Although the master or owner of the ship is liable notwithstanding that the pilotage was compulsory, there is nothing to prevent the owner or master in turn suing the pilot for negligence at common law.

Hon. R. Thompson: Did you say "intrastate" trade?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. The opinion continues—

> 3. If the Commonwealth, in enacting Section 410B intended to "cover the field" regarding liability of pilots under Section 109 of the Commonwealth Constitution Act, State legislation on the same subject matter would be invalid. However, it is considered that the Commonwealth has not evidenced an intention to "cover the field" and the State Act now proposed is valid, but, out of caution and so as not to invade any jurisdiction to which the Commonwealth Navigation Act may extend, the words "subject to the Navigation Act, 1912-1958 of the Parliament of the Commonwealth" have been written into this Bill. There is no judicial decision on Section 410B as far as I am aware, but dicta in some decisions on similar legislation suggests that Section 410B would not protect the pilot. It is thought therefore that this Bill is necessary and desirable.
>
> 4. The Bill was drafted as for a separate Act in lieu of amending the Fremantle Harbour Trust Act, 1902-1960, the Bunbury Harbour Board Act, 1909-1959, the Albany Harbour Board Act, 1926-1959, and the Harbours and Jetties Act, 1928-1940.

The answer to the query raised by Mr. Ron Thompson is just as simple as that. The sections that he read from the Commonwealth Navigation Act do not apply because of the repeal of section 350; and section 410B does not give the pilot the protection that he should be entitled to receive. To reduce the matter to a simple example, it would be possible for a pilot to engage himself in piloting a ship and be responsible for very heavy losses or damage to that ship. He would, by reason of the Commonwealth Navigation Act, lose his license and, at the same time, it would be impossible for him to meet the obligation that might arise as a result of the damage caused.

If it is possible for pilots to be liable for such extensive damages, realising—as this section says—that the responsibility for the conduct and navigation of the ship rests with the master of the ship, surely it is only reasonable to cover them and remove from them any liability for damages over the sum of £100. If this is not so, then a man who is under the jurisdiction of another, and the instructions of another, would be loth to take out a pilot's license; because during the course of his work he might render himself liable to be sued in common law to meet extensive damages. I think the explanation is a simple one and I trust it satisfies the point raised by the honourable member.

**Question put and passed.**

**Bill read a second time.**

*In Committee*

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. A. R. Jones) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

**Clause 1 put and passed.**

**Clause 2: Interpretation—**

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I thank the Minister for his comments. The copy I have of the Commonwealth Navigation Act does not contain the amendments mentioned by the Minister. Apparently it has not been kept up to date. There is only one point I want to raise. If it concerns intrastate trade only, should not this legislation be part of the Western Australian Marine Act, because that governs everything in Western Australian waters? As I said when I spoke to the Bill previously, we have nothing to lean on at the moment, and I still think this legislation should be part of the Western Australian Marine Act which covers intrastate trade.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I cannot win. When I deal with the Commonwealth Navigation Act I am told we should have a special Act. Now that we have a special Act I am told it should be part of the Commonwealth Navigation Act. What does the honourable member want me to do? I shall read again the Parliamentary Draftsman's views on the matter—

> It is considered that local pilots would have little or no protection under this section. This section applies only in relation to certain ships—

That is referring to section 410B. He goes on—

> —to which the Commonwealth Navigation Act applies, and such ships do not include ships engaged wholly in intrastate trade. Section 410B in its terms does not apply to protect pilots and the fact that the old section 350 was repealed and this new section enacted supports the view that it is not intended to deal with the liability of a pilot as between the pilot and the owner of a ship. Although the master or owner of the ship is liable notwithstanding that the pilotage was compulsory, there is nothing to prevent the owner or master in turn suing the pilot for negligence at common law.

I think that explains the position. It does not cover wholly intrastate ships.

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clauses 3 and 4 put and passed.**

**Title put and passed.**

*Report*

**Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.**

## HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed, from the 18th September, on the following motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East) [10.17 p.m.]: I wish to say a few words on this Bill. I might say at this stage that I am in favour of all the clauses, but I do think that some of them do not go far enough, particularly the one dealing with swimming pools; and I will elaborate more fully on that in the Committee stage.

Section 134 of the principal Act is to be amended by adding new subsection (48a). Section 134 states that local authorities may, and when the commissioner so requires shall, make by-laws with respect to certain matters. It then enumerates 53 subsections. It is proposed to insert after subsection (48) a subsection (48a), which is aimed at the prevention of pollution of any water used for bathing purposes.

The local authority, when the commissioner so requires, shall make by-laws. I think that such by-laws should be put into the Act, because I have in mind that we are dealing with swimming pools throughout the whole of Western Australia, and swimming pools can become very offensive. We all know that diseases of the bowels such as those caused by bacillus coli can be transmitted in swimming pools. We also know that dysentry diseases and other water-borne diseases are present in swimming pools. There is also the mosquito menace. A mosquito-borne disease which readily comes to my mind is dengue fever.

So the water in swimming pools should always be in a sterilised state equivalent to good drinking water, and that can only be brought about by the process of chlorination. There are several methods of chlorinating water. The owner of a small pool can do it by placing a certain amount of chlorinated lime in the pool overnight and the pool will be sterile next day. I think that that should be done in all small swimming pools, and I will enlarge on that point when we are in Committee.

I am in favour of public swimming pools being controlled because I have in mind a certain pool I am concerned with. It is a very nice pool and is well constructed; but the chlorinating plant, instead of coming through the portholes—which is the usual method—enters at one end and goes out the other end. It was found on testing that the chlorinated water leaving the pool was not of sufficient strength to kill the bacteria. Therefore the strength had to be increased where the water entered the pool so that when it left the pool it was of the correct strength to kill

bacteria. However, it was then too strong for comfort and caused sore eyes and other discomforts.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Dyed their hair and all that!

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: That is right. I am in favour of private swimming pools, but it is important from a health point of view that frequent tests be made of the water in these pools for the detection of bacillus coli. This organism is an inhabitant of the human intestine and is also found in some animals and its presence in a swimming pool is an indication that the water is contaminated with faecal matter. Such water could also contain typhoid, cholera, dysentery, and other diseases.

When I mention these diseases I want to stress the fact that we are dealing with the whole of Western Australia. There is, of course, not too much chance of these diseases—except typhoid—occurring in the lower portion of the State. But further north where the climate lends itself to the growth of bacteria, such diseases can occur; and because of faster travel in these modern times, such diseases can spread quickly. So I think it is very urgent that the pools should be controlled.

We know that there are other things that affect swimming pools, particularly dust, leaves, organic matter, even lipstick and hair oil. This can be seen by the stuff that clings to the side of the pool. Then again there is the growth of algae. If it is not controlled it accumulates on the side of the pool. Of course, copper sulphate will control algae. We also know that people can get tinea or athlete's foot from an unclean pool. That is noticeable in places where water is not sterilised by means of chlorination.

Local authorities have by-laws controlling the buildings of houses and outbuildings, and I fail to see why they cannot set certain standards for swimming pools. At the present time swimming pools can be built anywhere provided they do not affect the foundations of the residences; and on occasions sewerage mains leak and could contaminate pools constructed adjacent to them. That is another reason why I consider swimming pools should be controlled and policed by inspectors of the Public Health Department.

Another part of the Bill deals with the sale of food which is unfit for human consumption or which is not of the nature, substance, and quality demanded. I quite agree with the Minister that in many cases the real offender often escapes prosecution. A purchaser of food often takes a retailer to court and is successful in having him convicted and fined; but the trouble is that the manufacturer merely recoups the retailer for the amount of the fine and costs involved and remains free of any conviction himself. Should a similar circumstance happen a second time the unfortunate vendor is again prosecuted, his record of convictions grows, and the fine imposed becomes heavier. So I thoroughly agree with the Minister that this amendment is badly needed.

The section of the Health Act under which the health inspector usually works is that which relates to the food sold being not of good quality, and therefore he has been able to prosecute only the vendor. In view of this, I welcome this proposed amendment to the Act.

Mr. Bennetts raised a query the other evening about sausage meat and meat in saveloys. I hasten to tell him that these foods are controlled by the food and drug regulations. It is laid down that sausages shall contain 75 parts per centum of meat and not more than six parts per centum of starch. So Mr. Bennetts can rest assured that the quality of saveloys is well maintained.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Not saveloys, but "snags."

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I disagree with Dr. Hislop's remarks on the packing of milk. I consider that paper cartons are handy containers for the retailing of milk. This carton is called a tetrapack. It is a common form of packing, and I think all members have seen it. The reason why I disagree with Dr. Hislop is that this carton is specially made so that milk can be forwarded to the country. Country people are thus gaining the benefit of being able to buy milk in the tetrapack. Further, to people in Kalgoorlie, Norseman, and other distant centres the cost of freighting milk is reduced when it is consigned in tetrapacks because no freight is chargeable on the bottles returned from those centres. The pack, when finished with, is thrown away. I merely mention that in passing.

I now come to that part of the Bill which deals with carriers of disease. We all know that a carrier is a person who has a disease such as typhoid and shows no ill-effects, but can convey it to other people. As a matter of interest, the definition of a carrier is as follows:—

> A person who, without apparent symptoms of a communicable disease harbors the specific infectious agent and may serve as a source of infection. The same may apply to animal carriers. The carrier's state may occur in the incubation period or during convalescence.

During the health inspector's course a classical case is cited of a carrier of disease. This case is known as Typhoid Mary. This woman was in America; and, as a carrier, she was reputed to have communicated the disease of typhoid fever to

at least 200 people. Because she was a carrier she suffered no ill-effects, and yet she was a dangerous source of infection.

I do not thing this part of the Bill goes far enough. We all know that diptheria can be contracted as a result of contact with a carrier; and, therefore, whilst our objective is to save lives by trying to prevent the communication of disease, I would point out that in the past one of the greatest killers of children was diphtheria, and another killer was whooping cough which attacked children under five years of age. I think that some thought should be given to compulsory immunisation in the near future. After all is said and done, if it is considered important to legislate against carriers of disease, is it not logical that we should provide for compulsory immunisation to prevent disease?

In regard to immunisation, a certain religious sect is opposed to immunisation just as strongly as it is opposed to blood transfusion. I have had experience of that myself. I know of one instance where all the students of a particular school were to be immunised. I circularised the mothers to ascertain whether they had any objection to their children being immunised. We intended to give the children a course of vaccine needles against diphtheria and tetanus. One mother sent back the reply, "My child is not allowed to have polio needles." Apparently she did not know the difference. We overcame the situation by giving the child a combined injection for tetanus and diphtheria. I mention that case, in passing, as a matter of interest.

Because I have had experience of the relevant circumstances, there is one part of the Bill about which I am not very happy. This deals with the local medical health officer. I would like to know what the position would be if there were no medical officer in a particular district. Some local authorities do not employ a medical officer. In fact, sometimes there is no medical practitioner in the district. If some thought were given to that aspect, I think it would be realised that for the words "medical officer", the words "medical practitioner" should be substituted in the Bill.

Under another section of the Act, I have had the experience of a local authority being absolutely powerless to take action unless the medical officer gave his consent. If something does not suit him, the medical officer may not give his consent. As a safeguard against such a situation I think the words "medical practitioner" should be stubstituted for "medical officer."

The Hon. L. A. Logan: What clause is that?

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: The words appear in clause 4, which seeks to amend section 251. Proposed new section 338A deals with blood transfusions of children. I am completely in agreement with this clause. I have always been taught to respect people's views on religion as being their own business; and I do not want to interfere with their views in any way, but I do think they have no right to condemn a child to certain death, in effect, by not consenting to a blood transfusion when the child is critically ill. I commend the Government for including this provision in the Bill. It is high time it was brought down, and I am glad to see it done.

There is a certain sect of people who do not believe in blood transfusions. In effect, they say it is equivalent to eating blood. That, of course, is their opinion and they are entitled to it. There is another sect, however, which is just as strongly in favour of blood transfusions, and I am led to believe that they are regular donors at the blood bank. They are some of the people on whom the blood bank can depend. I earnestly believe this is a step in the right direction; it will permit the objections of parents to be overruled when blood transfusions are required. The provisions of the Child Welfare Act in this regard are cumbersome and time-consuming when an emergency exists. A certain sect has put out a booklet which has been referred to by Dr. Hislop. Under the heading "Disease Dangers" we find the following:—

> Four types of conditions have been repeatedly reported as having been transmitted by blood transfusion—syphilis, malaria, hepatitis and allergic conditions.

I know that is possible, because I have with me a book on communicable diseases which refers to infectious hepatitis and states—

> The disease may be transmitted by transfusion of whole blood, blood serum, or plasma from infected persons, and also by accidental contamination of syringes or needles with traces of blood from such persons.

I hasten to say that I do not think that would happen in Western Australia, because again I have had experience of this. I have organised blood banks in my town, and I know that on two occasions we had everything ready for blood to be taken when the epidemiologist decided he would not allow it because, as you might know, Mr. President, there was an epidemic of hepatitis which went through the town. Accordingly this permission was refused on two occasions.

On the third occasion when it was decided to take blood in our town I got in touch with Dr. Snow, the Government Epidemiologist, and he gave the all clear on the ground that the people had experienced an epidemic of hepatitis two years earlier; and accordingly the blood transfusions were carried out. But this was

watched very carefully and guarded very jealously by the Government doctor, who inquired into everybody's medical history; and I can assure members that nobody who had a recent history of hepatitis was allowed to donate blood. It is very gratifying to feel that with the people we have in charge of our blood bank in Western Australia there is very little for us to worry about, because they are so fastidious.

As a matter of interest I would like to point out that there is one person in twenty in the metropolitan area who gives blood. There are 25,000 people on the State roll. We find there is a wastage of 1,000 a year as the result of deaths and of people reaching the age of 60, after which age blood is not accepted from them. I believe the blood bank receives just about sufficient blood for the State hospitals. An interesting fact is that in a heart operation 16 pints of blood are required to prime the machine. I feel that blood donors should be given more publicity, because they are very important people.

When a rare type of blood is needed—for example it may be required for an operation on a person in a particular group—the donors come in on a Friday when they are tested and briefed, and they come in again on the Monday, because the important thing in operations of this type is that the blood must be fresh.

These people could, or would, have to pay their own fares each way; and they also stand the financial loss of perhaps being off work. So it can be seen that they are very important people, and I regret that they do not get enough favourable publicity. I believe that on the roll of Western Australia there are six donors who have given 50 pints of blood and others who have given 25 pints. When a person has given 25 pints of blood he gets a special key ring; and when he has given 50 pints of blood he is given a party where a cake, etc., is provided. I do think these people should be given much more publicity and recognition; and if there is any function to be held they should be given pride of place, as they are very important.

In the metropolitan area there are 200,000 people between the ages of 18 and 60 who could become blood donors, but there are only 10,000 who are. I will conclude my remarks on that note, because the hour is growing late. I do, however, wish to pursue the question of private swimming pools further in the Committee stage.

**Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government).**

*House adjourned at 10.43 p.m.*

# Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 19th September, 1962

CONTENTS