

ture of four gallons of dieselene and a cup ful of 2, 4-D has been experimented with by the department? I have reason to believe that it is giving good results in some parts of the heavily infested agricultural areas.

Mr. Tonkin: What brand? The Government uses only one brand, you know.

Vote put and passed.

Progress

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr. Tonkin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition).

BILLS (3): RETURNED

1. The Midland Railway Company of Western Australia Limited Acquisition Agreement Bill.
2. Public Service Act Amendment Bill.
3. Milk Act Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 12.34 a.m.
(Thursday)

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 5th December, 1963

CONTENTS		Page
ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE:		
SPECIAL		3708
BILLS—		
Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill—		
Assembly's Message		3687
Administration Act Amendment Bill—		
2r.		3702
Com. ; Report ; 3r.		3703
Alumina Refinery Agreement Act Amendment Bill—		
2r.		3696
Com. ; Report ; 3r.		3699
Constitution Acts Amendment Bill (No. 2)—		
2r.		3681
Com. ; Report ; 3r.		3686
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment Bill—		
Order Discharged		3703
Mining Act Amendment Bill (No. 3)—		
2r.		3699
Com. ; Report ; 3r.		3700
Native Welfare Bill—Assembly's Message		3700
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill—		
Receipt ; 1r.		3687
2r.		3687
		3703

MOTIONS—

- Fishing Industry Select Committee—Appointment to Vacancy 3681
- Prospecting Industry—Inquiry by Select Committee 3687

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—

- Iwankiw Case—Payment of Constable Marshall's Costs 3680
- Water Supplies—Laverton Dam : Cleaning, and Commencement of Work 3681

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

IWANKIW CASE

Payment of Constable Marshall's Costs

1. The Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Justice:

As the Auditor-General's report contains no reference to amounts paid to cover costs and damages incurred by Constable V. S. Marshall for injuries he inflicted upon Mr. Roman Iwankiw—

- (a) what was the amount assessed by the Taxing Master of the Supreme Court?
- (b) what was the portion of that figure covered by—
 - (i) Marshall's legal and Court costs;
 - (ii) Iwankiw's legal and Court costs;
 - (iii) damages awarded to Iwankiw; and
 - (iv) any other costs?
- (c) was Marshall called upon to personally contribute any amount of the above costs and damages for injuries he maliciously inflicted upon his victim by viciously kicking him, subsequently necessitating an emergency operation?
- (d) if Marshall contributed nothing, did the Crown pay the full amount involved?
- (e) (i) Can such lack of one's own personal control be condoned?
- (ii) Could such action be construed to be "reasonable force in effecting an arrest"?
- (f) if Marshall contributed nothing to the liability he incurred for the injuries so inflicted, could it be construed by the acceptance thereof by the Crown that he can continue with such bashings, at will, with no fear of cost to himself?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

This question should really not have been directed to me; it should have been directed to the Minister for Police. However, the information is here for the honourable member. It is as follows:—

- (a) and (b) The total amount amount paid by this department to Messrs. Kott, Wallace and Gunning, solicitors for Constable Marshall was £1,971 1s. 9d. This included the costs of Constable Marshall and costs and damages awarded to Iwankiw.

Details of the dispersement by the solicitors can only be obtained from their office and they are not available this morning.

- (c) There was no evidence at all at any stage that Constable Marshall maliciously or viciously kicked Iwankiw.

The magistrate, Mr. H. R. Smith, in convicting Iwankiw on charges of drunken and dangerous driving, and resisting arrest, stated, in the course of his written judgment, that any injuries Iwankiw received he in effect brought on himself in the course of resisting.

The decision by the civil jury in the Supreme Court in awarding damages of £100 and special damages of £314 made no reference to malice or vicious kicking.

- (d) Yes.

- (e) (i) There was no lack of personal control.

- (ii) Yes.

- (f) There was no bashing proved at any stage. Constable Marshall is certainly not this type but is a very well respected officer. This is borne out in an unsolicited testimonial on his file, signed by practically the whole population of Denmark.

LAVERTON DAM

Cleaning, and Commencement of Work

2. The Hon. D. P. DELLAR asked the Minister for Mines:

Regarding the Government dam at Laverton, which is badly in need of cleaning—

- (a) is the Minister aware that it has not been cleaned for many years?
(b) will the Minister give urgent consideration to the cleaning of this dam?
(c) if the answer to (b) is "Yes", when will this work take place?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (a) The Laverton dam has not been cleaned out since it was taken over by the department in August, 1962.
(b) It is considered that this dam is not in need of cleaning out. Some silt is in the bottom of the dam, but it is not proposed to disturb this layer in case the holding capacity of the dam is affected.

Action was taken last week to remove petrol drums thrown into the dam by unauthorised persons and also to remove wind blown turnip weed.

Arrangements have already been made to remove prickly bushes encroaching on the berm between the dam proper and the raised banks. This work will be completed by the 31st December, 1963.

General maintenance of the dam will proceed as warranted and as the water level drops.

- (c) Answered by the above.

FISHING INDUSTRY SELECT COMMITTEE

Appointment to Vacancy

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (West) [2.36 p.m.]: I move—

That The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson be elected to serve as a member of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into and report upon the Fisheries Act, 1905-1962.

The House knows the reasons for this motion, so I will not delay it by any explanation.

Question put and passed.

CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 4th December, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Justice):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North—Leader of the Opposition) [2.37 p.m.]: This Bill is the second one necessary to give effect to the proposed alterations of boundaries; alteration of provinces; alterations proposed in the franchise; and other relevant matters.

It is rather remarkable to note how, in simple verbiage, the draftsman has been able to specify very distinctly the manner in which the different stages will occur; how what appeared to be some serious difficulties will be overcome; and how proposals that were mentioned when the other Bill was introduced and dealt with will be implemented.

This measure consists of 11 clauses. Some of them are for the purpose of repealing sections of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act which, with the changes in the franchise and in the qualifications,

will not now be wanted, or will not be wanted in the future. The first proposal in the Bill makes it definite that the number of provinces will in the future be 15 and that there will be two members representing each, in lieu of 10 provinces with three members.

The clause dealing with the period required for persons to enrol has been made consistent with the requirements applying to the Legislative Assembly, and one year's residence has been specified. In addition, as will be found not only in the early clause but in a later one, the provisions of the Electoral Act are to apply as they apply for Legislative Assembly elections.

There is particular reference in clause 4 to the definite change from 30 to 21 years in the age qualification of a member to be elected to the Legislative Council. That is a change, of course, which may not be well regarded by many who have preserved a somewhat backward, or antiquated, outlook, or who wish to continue to preserve some distinctive attribute in a person of a more mature age. There is also quite a change in the requirement necessary for a person to become eligible to vote for the members of this Chamber. However, there it is. The amendment seeks to change, by the wording of clause 4, two years to a period of one year for enrolment purposes; and from 30 years to 21 years of age for a person to qualify for election as a member of the Legislative Council.

In actual practice, although the public have become used to electing youthful people—such youthful people in appearance as the Minister in charge of the House and my friend on my left, Mr. Ron Thompson—I think we will find in the future there will still be that sort of attitude in the electors' minds; namely, that if one person is 22 and another is 42, standing as candidates for a province with equal political opportunity, the man of 42 will have an advantage.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think the words "with equal political opportunity" are very important in your remarks.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think that would be the line of public thought towards electing members to this Chamber. That is, of course, my opinion, and may be it is just a guess. That could be the way the public would react even though the standard age for election to this Chamber has now been made 21 years.

Before leaving that clause I would draw the Minister's attention to an article which appeared in the Press this morning. One does not get much opportunity to read the Press with great care at present whilst one is handling several Bills every day, and reading meticulously the Bills which we handle on this side of the House. Obviously, the Premier had some time this week to write an article for publication in

the political news of *The West Australian*, because in an article under the name of David Brand, the following words dealing with this Bill and the franchise appear:—

It is worth noting that while universal franchise will apply to future Council elections, there will still be a minimum age limit of 30 on those who may be elected.

I suggest, Mr. President, that even though I may be infringing Standing Orders by reading that article, sometime later in the day, the Minister might find time to tell the Premier that there is provision in the Bill for the age to be altered from 30 to 21 years. It is most important that there should be a correction made in the Press, in any case. I am not making that remark, obviously, other than in a facetious way. Nevertheless, it could be very misleading, because a column under the name of the Premier will be read by some people and they could be misled.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am sure it will be read by many people if it is under the Premier's name.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: And they could be misled. The clause which repeals section 8 of the Constitution Act has, very effectively, arranged for the 10 members ex the 1964 period, to go on to a 1965 election, and, at the same time, in a subsequent paragraph, to arrange for five 1966 members to come back to 1965, and the other five 1966 members to go on to 1968. It is done in plain language, and it appears to have made arrangements for all contingencies that one can think of at this point. Fortunately, all the provisions necessary in the Constitution Acts Amendment Act to give a full charter to the commission to cover the needs of the Electoral Districts Act will be given effect to on the passing of this Bill.

If there are any flaws in the machinery, and in the details of the matters on which I am now speaking, there will be ample time between now and next year, before they become operative, to have any slight adjustments made. There is no worry on that score. They can be adjusted before December, and they will still be in order. It could be that some minor points have been overlooked, and very careful scrutiny will be made, I am sure, before they are put into operation. The manner in which a determination has to be made as to which members lose a year and which members gain two years is something which boils down to the fact that there must be losers and there must be winners; and from conversations, rather than by statements within the House, it is obvious that members have accepted the responsibilities which attach to their own personal positions in good faith and in good spirit realising that if this change is to be brought about, and if there is to be a levelling out, there must be someone who

is prepared to make a sacrifice at some point, and someone getting an advantage for the time being.

It could be, of course, that all these members will be unaffected, and will obtain a further full term at the first election for which they stand. So the whole scheme is not giving someone an entitlement at the expense of anybody else, which they could not successfully challenge, and effectively and successfully earn.

The outline of what is to be done under clause 7 of the Bill could have been a most difficult matter to resolve, but a very reasonable solution appears to have been found. Members of Parliament are not the best judges of election results any more than are political writers in the Press, or the ordinary men and women who constitute the Gallup poll voters. It is not an exact science. After the electoral boundaries are fixed by the commissioners under the charter given to them in the Electoral Districts Act, there will emerge 15 seats, appropriately named, I am sure. I hope they will be singularly appropriate to Western Australia. I am sure they will be, because the commissioners are responsible men.

A lot of guesswork will take place immediately as to which seats constitute the plums, the gems, or the right ones to nominate for. Although it can be said at the present time that it is wholly guesswork in most cases, and is not based on any hypothesis, there is a basis for some of them to be determined. I can name six seats and outline their components now, but I cannot pass beyond that. There will be a lot of guesswork even when the boundaries become known.

Many members will become very interested in the election returns for the Legislative Assembly elections of 1959 and 1962 to find out how the constituents voted at certain booths, so that they can make sure which provinces they will nominate for; because they are elected members of Parliament and are entitled to have a seat, as is provided in the Bill, and to have a vote in this House. It will be interesting to find out how meticulous the study will be of the Assembly election returns for the last two elections. Indeed, I would not be surprised if all sorts of fallacious premises, and mere guesswork, have been indulged in to work out some of the seats.

The Hon. H. R. Robinson: I have not worked mine out.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I suggest to the honourable member that he should not try. For myself, I would leave it to the better judgment of the commissioners. Clause 8 of the Bill seeks to repeal section 15 of the Act, and to take out of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act all the existing qualifications for electors for this House. From the qualifications which are given in some detail as specified, emanate

the offshoots, such as the E.L.A.L. qualification, which give a right to the people to have their names enrolled. That section is to be deleted and re-enacted. Under the proposed new section the qualifications for this House will be the same as the qualifications for electors of the Legislative Assembly.

It is also proposed in the Bill to repeal section 16 of the Act, which will take out the property qualifications and property entitlements where there are joint owners. Section 17 of the Act covering cases of insanity, treason, or other types of disqualification, is sought to be deleted, but those disqualifications will still remain in the Electoral Act.

The Bill tidies up the Constitution, as it affects the franchise of this Chamber; but it appears to me from an examination of the Bill made available in the last 24 hours—I have given it more than a cursory examination—that all the safeguards in the change from the existing system to the system which controls the elections of the Legislative Assembly have been provided.

Section 37 which the Bill seeks to amend has particular reference to the Constitution Acts Amendment Act. Clause 11 is quite specific in prescribing that although the Act at present states a member must qualify, and must continue to represent in Parliament only the seat to which he has been elected, that section shall apply subject to the provisions of the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Act of 1963.

I repeat, as I pointed out initially, that so far as can be ascertained at this point, it would appear that all the contingencies which we can anticipate have been very fully covered by the Parliamentary Draftsman; certainly all that are necessary to enable the commissioners under the Electoral Districts Act to operate have been provided for. If in the intervening period between now and the next session of Parliament it is found that some provision requires tidying up, there will be ample time for corrections to be made.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [2.58 p.m.]: Mr. Wise dealt very capably with this Bill in detail. However, I would like to pass a few comments of a general nature. It is the normal practice in Parliament, when legislation is introduced which meets with displeasure, to lay the blame at the door of the Minister introducing it. On this occasion it is fitting to commend Mr. Griffith for the Bills which he has brought down with regard to the redistribution of seats. Anyone who attempts to touch on matters impinging on redistribution, change of boundaries, and that sort of thing, always seems to take his life in his hands. This is an area which is extremely delicate.

Most of us know about the preparation which has gone into this Bill and the allied measure; they have caused the Minister a great deal of concern. He has not been unaware of the fact that this legislation is likely to affect the lives of members and their families in the future. The Minister has given a great deal of care and thought to the various aspects in the Bill before us, and in the one preceding this. That speaks volumes for the Minister's attitude; because in the main the legislation has been introduced in a very happy atmosphere, as is evidenced by the comments of Mr. Wise.

I am sure members will agree with me when I utter words of commendation to the Minister (The Hon. Arthur Griffith), for the way he has framed the various aspects of the legislation. He has done so with fairness and with lack of any hint of unfair treatment towards anyone, which is obvious when we read the various pieces of legislation.

THE HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [3.1 p.m.]: One matter comes to my mind after having read the Bill and heard the introductory speech of the Minister. I did not hear all that Mr. Wise said because I was not in the Chamber all the time; but one portion of his speech comes to my mind. I suppose I will be one of those persons who will be particularly affected. In the taking forward and bringing back of members to be considered for the 1965 elections, a points system is arranged to work out who shall be the person to stand first and who shall go on to 1968. We reach the situation where ten of us are already elected to 1968, and five more will go forward to 1968. That means that 15 of us will have to decide who shall take the now ten seats after redistribution to 15; and some will have to move around because only two members are required for each province.

It is obvious to me that Moore, Greenough, and Geraldton will form the Midland Province. Only two members will be required, and one will go out. I said that I would be prepared to meet the situation. But I cannot see anything in the legislation which will give a person such as myself any priority for selection for any other seat or any advantage over somebody else because of the number of points that I have. Of course, that could apply to any other member who might find himself in a similar position. Can the Minister give me any details as to what the situation might be? If a person has to come away from a position he has held for a number of years, then there should be something to give him preference over a person who has no points at all. I would like to make that inquiry.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [3.4 p.m.]: I, like other members who have spoken to this Bill, feel that this is

a very historic occasion; not so much because of what is occurring today, but because of what has occurred during the last few weeks of this Parliament. I refer to the measure, which was carried unanimously, to amend the Electoral Districts Act, and which dealt with the redistribution of seats. I refer also to the passing of that very forward-looking Bill, the Native Welfare Bill. Another historic act was the re-laying yesterday of the original foundation stone of this Parliament House; and the fourth historic occasion is the Bill that is now before us.

I am a member of the executive of the Australian Labor Party, and I have attended many party conferences since 1930. The abolition of the Legislative Council has always been the policy of the Labor Party, and as time has gone on this policy has become more prominent. At a previous conference it was decided that part of the party's fighting platform would be sustained campaign for adult franchise for the Legislative Council. That motion was carried at the 1959 conference, and I have a copy of the proceedings in front of me.

Clause 8 of this Bill provides that electors for Legislative Council elections shall have full adult franchise. I am pleased about that, as are my colleagues. I would like to pay a tribute to all concerned; to Dr. Hislop for bringing a motion before this Chamber, and to the Minister for having this measure drafted in the way that he has.

I do not think anyone, either inside or outside Parliament, would deny that the reallocation of boundaries—trying to fit 30 members into the same areas that 50 members in another place represent—was a most difficult task; and it was a most difficult decision for the Government to make, if it was to be fair to everybody concerned.

I well remember that when Dr. Hislop was placing his ideas before the House, Mr. Ron Thompson readily said that we on this side of the Chamber would agree to the proposition. Throughout these negotiations I do not think there has been anyone who has opposed the proposition put forward by the Government. I have studied the Bill and the Act because I have been interested in the subject for a long time; and we would be lacking in our duty if we did not compliment all concerned in the drafting of this measure.

There have been many Bills for adult franchise before this House, introduced by Mrs. Ruby Hutchison since she first took her seat in 1954; and clause 8 of this measure has been in all of her Bills. Since her election, Mrs. Hutchison has fought consistently and aggressively for a more democratic vote in connection with Legislative Council elections. She has fought the issue for 10 years. Now, through a

quirk of fate, she is, at the moment, in hospital. As a Labor colleague, I would like to express a few words of commendation to her for consistently fighting for the conditions that are contained in this Bill, and for future democratic voting and election of members for the Legislative Council. Mrs. Hutchison is to be congratulated for her steadfastness, courage, and determination. Her work outside Parliament House among women of all political thought has at last borne fruit, and all credit to her. I am quite sure that her feelings at the moment are that she would wish to be here to join in voting in favour of the Bill.

I visited Mrs. Hutchison this morning. She asked her doctor if he would permit her to be here for the voting, but he refused. She has asked me to convey to you, Sir, and to all members of the House her thanks for the kind thoughts and telephone messages that she has received. I support the Bill.

THE HON. S. T. J. THOMPSON (South) [3.10 p.m.]: I would like to say a few words on this Bill. I am very much in favour of it, although possibly I could find myself in a position similar to that mentioned by Mr. Jones. I realise the implications of the measure. Mr. Jack Thomson and I happen to be in the same province, and in the future one of us will have to move. I am not very much alarmed about that, however, and if members study the relevant clause in the Bill they will find that it makes some provision for that position.

There are 15 members retiring in 1968; four of those 15 are metropolitan members and two are north-west members. So it leaves nine for the agricultural and mining districts. It is obvious that one of the members in the agricultural and mining districts retiring in 1968 will have to move into the metropolitan section to fill the fifth vacancy there. That is the only way the position can be overcome.

It does not look as though there will be much difficulty about it, and I am sure we will all find a seat. Possibly it may not be for the same area we now represent. I will very much regret having to cease representing my home town, but possibly I will have to do it, and some other members may have to do likewise. However, the legislation will be for the good of this House in the years to come. I support the Bill.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [3.12 p.m.]: I would at this moment like to offer my sincere congratulations to the Minister for the Bills which he has introduced to this House, and which will ultimately alter the franchise, the method of voting, and the method of representation for this Chamber.

I have been fairly close to the Minister in the last few weeks and I know, not by any advice I have given to him, but simply from my association with him, that he has been through a tremendous mental strain in order to ensure that the Bills presented to this House did not favour any one person, would be acceptable to all, and would be in the interests generally of the Legislative Council and of the people of the State. I would say at times he must almost have been to the point of mental torment in finding a solution of some of the difficult problems with which he was confronted. I have no hesitation in saying that had it not been for his capability, his persistence, and his idealism, this Bill might not have been presented to the House.

I should also like to pay a tribute to The Hon. Frank Wise for the most courageous and courteous way that he, as Leader of the Opposition, accepted the change. He knows, as well as I do, that someone might get hurt; but we do not know who it will be. Some will be glad and some will be sad, maybe; and I trust there will be very few sad and a number glad. However, I did appreciate the manner in which he accepted the legislation and the attitude he adopted to the Minister in relation to it. I think the action of both these members makes it quite clear there is still a tremendous amount of gentlemanly behaviour, thought, and instinct in this Chamber.

I would also like to thank the members of my own party, because I am not really responsible for the motion. I knew exactly the trend of thought in my own colleagues' minds, and I suppose all I did was to accept the opportunity when it arrived and make use of it. I made use of it with the full co-operation, obviously, of the members of my own party.

Finally, it must be very pleasing to all concerned to know that with a vast change of this sort taking place in reference to this honourable Chamber there has not been one dissentient voice. I think that reflects—indeed the whole discussion does—very great credit upon the members of this distinguished House. I support the measure.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Justice) [3.15 p.m.]: I intend that my reply to the debate will be brief. Firstly, I would like to say that naturally I feel gratified that this Bill and the one to which this is complementary have received the support that they have in this Chamber, and also the support the first measure received in another place. To my colleagues who very kindly passed one or two remarks concerning my attitude to this legislation, all I can say is "Thank you".

As the Minister in charge of this particular department it was my responsibility to bring to Cabinet recommendations as

a result of the motion which was passed in this Chamber. Whilst I am grateful for the remarks that were made by one or two members, I do not want it to be thought that this proposal was generated only in my mind and was not shared by the Government. This, like every other piece of legislation introduced, has to be adopted by the Government, and whatever credit some people might very kindly like to give me should be shared by the Government. It deserves an equal share of the credit; and, of course, the Government must take all the responsibility.

My research tells me that Bills to alter the Constitution of this House have met with varied success, but never complete success, over a long period of years. No member can claim, any more than I can, that this change is purely as a result of what he has done. I think we should let the matter resolve itself on the basis that the change is being made.

So far as the Government is concerned, in the first Bill it produced a piece of legislation that it regarded as fair, equitable, and reasonable, appreciating that with every redistribution of seats it cannot and should not set out to please everybody, because that is impossible. The situation in which any member of this House will find himself as a result of the redistribution of seats legislation is the same as that in which any member finds himself when any redistribution of seats takes place. The same situation has prevailed throughout the history of the State.

Naturally there is a tendency to take a personal interest in the matter and ask, "What is going to happen to me?" But none of us knows that, and I am not going to try to predict the situation.

In preparation of the Bill, once I had instructions from the Government in respect of the principle of the legislation, the draftsman set about—and I believe he did a good job—working out how the transition would take place.

In respect of the point raised by Mr. Jones, one of the most difficult things was to decide how the process of the change-over would occur. It was obvious that at some point of time we had to change from one set of conditions to another; and there could have been all sorts of ways in which this could have been presented to Parliament. Many of them may not have been acceptable; some of them may have been acceptable. After taking this small volume of the Standing Orders home at the weekend, and going through the drafts of what might be done, I referred to the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, and found the basis on which an original change was made.

So I said to myself: This is the basis that has stood the test of time since 1889, and what better basis could I ask Parliament to agree to? Accordingly I suggested

this as the basis, and that has been incorporated in the Bill. After all, the fairness of a proposition of this nature is that we are not making a decision in respect of an event which may happen tomorrow; we are making a decision in respect of a series of events which happened three years ago—in 1960. Whatever the will was in those 10 provinces in 1960 is reflected in this particular clause of the Bill, in the same way as the Constitution Act, Amendment Act reflected it when the Constitution was first framed. This set of circumstances took place approximately 60 odd years ago. The result might not only affect Mr. Jones: my colleague the Minister for Local Government is not in any different situation; but because it is likely that there may be two of the 1968 members who want to move into the same province, the Bill provides that a ballot shall be taken if that set of circumstances occurs. I could not find anything fairer than that. I do not wish to say anything more in respect of this matter, except that it does not give any fairer treatment to one than it does to another.

I am sure the Premier will be very sorry, to say the least, that the article in the paper this morning is inaccurate. I am quite certain he would not subscribe to that article with the idea of misleading anybody. It was purely a mistake, and I am sure he will be sorry the mistake occurred. I am grateful the legislation has received the approval it has. It has been examined very closely, and I feel sure that after such close scrutiny it will be accepted.

Question put.

THE PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): In order that the question may be carried, it is necessary that there shall be an absolute majority. I shall divide the House.

Bells rung and House divided.

THE PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): I have assured myself that there is more than an absolute majority of members present and voting in favour of the motion. I therefore declare the question carried in the affirmative.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Justice) [3.28 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

THE PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): In order that the question may be carried, it is necessary that there shall be an absolute majority. I shall divide the House.

Bells rung and House divided.

THE PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): I have assured myself that there is more than an absolute majority of members present and voting in favour of the motion. I therefore declare the motion carried in the affirmative.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Assembly.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

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

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [3.31 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

An endeavour is being made through the introduction of this measure to raise the limits for medical and hospital expenses payable under the Act and to clarify certain other provisions in the Workers' Compensation Act.

Medical expenses may be claimed at present up to a maximum of £150 and hospital expenses up to £250. It has been found that these limits are generally adequate in the great majority of workers' compensation claims. On the other hand, there are the exceptional cases and these usually include the worst injured workers where the amounts provided in the Act are insufficient to grant equitable relief.

With a view to relieving distress of workers injured to that extent, it is proposed in this Bill to increase the amount of medical allowance to £200 and hospital allowance to £325. One of the points needing clarification has to do with the provision of appliances or artificial limbs. The Act speaks of "wheeled chairs for workers who have lost or been paralysed in both legs". Then it goes on to say "If a worker has been disabled by reason of any such accident or accidents" and so forth, he should be entitled to the supply of artificial limbs, etc.

In the literal interpretation of the Act, the inference arises that there can only be entitlement to artificial limbs subject to the qualification that a worker has lost or been paralysed in both legs. As a consequence, a strict application of the Act implies there is no provision for a pros-

thesis for a worker requiring one leg only or one or both hands. Such an interpretation was, of course, never intended when the original provisions were made and, indeed, if it were, it is high time now the position was rectified and the intention of the Act clarified. An appropriate amendment in this Bill does just that.

Another amendment replaces the reference to "Commonwealth Health Laboratory" by "State X-ray Laboratory." This is necessary because the service conducted by the Commonwealth for many years for the purpose of X-raying and examining miners for silicosis and tuberculosis has been taken over by the State Department of Health.

A further subsection provides that every employer shall, when one of its workers is injured by accident within the meaning of the Act, forthwith notify the Registrar of the Workers' Compensation Board, giving the name and address of the worker and considerable other detail. This provision has been in the Act for very many years, and before the formation of the Workers' Compensation Board, and has never been carried out or enforced in any way. The Workers' Compensation Board has now completed a comprehensive statistical coverage of industrial accidents, which is carried out without the aid of this subsection which is consequently of no use whatsoever, and its deletion is sought.

There is something of an anomaly contained in clauses appearing in the first schedule of the Act dealing with the rates of weekly payments to be made to different categories of workers. There is reference to male and female, junior and adult, and to cases where the earnings are above or below the basic wage. The case of junior workers earning not less than the basic wage appears to have been overlooked. It is suggested that this might now best be accommodated by the deletion of the word "adult" in the first lines where it appears.

Debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by The Hon. R. Thompson.

(Continued on page 3703)

ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Assembly's Message

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Council.

PROSPECTING INDUSTRY

Inquiry by Select Committee: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 4th December, on the following motion by The Hon. F. J. S. Wise (Leader of the Opposition):—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into all aspects of the prospecting industry with a view

to making recommendations which would bring about a revival in the search for gold.

THE HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [3.36 p.m.]: I desire to express my views in support of this motion. Many people and, I would think, members in the House, knowing what the goldmining industry has meant to Western Australia and to Australia, have felt for a number of years that something should be done along the lines contained in this motion. I know Ministers, both past and present, have done what they could to try to revive the prospecting system, as it was known a few years previously. Today it is a different proposition from what it was 20, 30, or 40 years ago, and while costs are as they are at the moment—having risen many times—and the fact that quite a number of the old prospectors have long since given up the game or have died, I think some new form of encouragement must be given to try to stimulate the prospecting business throughout the goldmining areas of Western Australia.

I know that many members have spoken in the House and suggested ways by which prospectors could be encouraged. After a visit through the area some four or five years ago I suggested that perhaps an older man could be sent out with a younger man, or *vice versa*, with some sort of plant. I suggested they have a good type of truck. It would be necessary to have a four-wheel drive vehicle so they could go from place to place irrespective of weather and road conditions. With a vehicle of this type they would have a chance to get through as it would have a good clearance. They would need a small compressor on the vehicle, together with some machinery which would enable them to prospect in the easy way, if there is an easy way, rather than by the old method that obtained some years previously.

This motion is one on which Mr. Heenan will give us his thoughts; and I have no doubt members representing the goldmining areas will also tell us what they feel about it. However, having been through the area, and having been a resident some years ago, I feel there is a great necessity to do something over and above what is being done at the present time. The Minister has told us, and we know this full well, that his department has made a greater contribution in recent years, has raised the remuneration of prospectors, has made some plant available, and has done what has been possible; but I feel this is certainly not enough. It is certainly not enough to encourage men with the experience and knowledge to go out into the far-flung areas on a prospecting basis.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: This is not restricted to gold.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: No. I would think that any mineral at all could be prospected for; but in the general sense gold has been the main mineral prospected for in the past, and particularly, of course, in the eastern and northern goldfields. However, it would not be restricted to gold.

I am not going to say any more, but will leave it to those who know more of the industry than I to say their piece. However, I have every intention of supporting the motion.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (West) [3.41 p.m.]: I will not keep the House long. Strangely enough, when I was a young fellow, I had the privilege on a few occasions of being present at gold rushes. I have in mind particularly a place called Christmas Flat in Mt. Monger where there was the best part of 1,000 men or more, the big majority of whom were getting gold. Therefore, from that aspect alone, I feel a few words of commendation for the motion would not be misplaced.

I feel that the old type of prospector whom I knew as a lad has changed, and perhaps if I related a story it might indicate just what a real prospector is. In the next world they were getting a little overcrowded, principally because these old prospectors were dying off. St. Peter happened to be terribly worried about the situation and did not know what he was going to do. An old prospector went to him and said, "I could fix this up for you." St. Peter said, "All right."

The old prospector gathered some of the others about him and in no time he had a crowd to whom he started to talk. In a matter of moments they had all gathered up their dry-blowers and little dolly-pots and picks, and so on, and were making their way out of heaven. St. Peter said to the prospector responsible, "What did you do?" The prospector replied, "I just told them that there were rumours of finding gold down in the other place."

However, a couple of days later the old prospector gathered up his things and made a move for the gate to get out. St. Peter stopped him and said, "What is wrong with you?" He said, "I am going too." When St. Peter asked him why, he said, "Well, there might be some truth in the rumours."

That is the attitude of the old type of prospector who, if he heard there was a possibility of a find of even a little bit of gold somewhere, would not be stopped by anything from going there. I feel that if we give the right encouragement to prospectors and provide modern amenities in transport, water supplies, and those other things which were the bugbear of prospectors in early times, there is a possibility that the reward might be very rich indeed.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The spirit of the story you told still prevails.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Good. I have always felt, as my father was one of the first on the Hannan's field in 1893, that a little of his spirit still remains in his son.

In recent years there have been the stories of minerals comparatively new to us. I refer to ilmenite and bauxite. Who among us would have dreamed, 20 years ago, of the possibility of the discovery of these minerals, their development, and what they will mean to the State? This is without mentioning iron ore which we have known for so long has existed, but which we were not in a position to use.

I just want to commend the motion to members because I feel a lot of good might come out of it.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.18 p.m.

THE HON. D. P. DELLAR (North-East) [4.18 p.m.]: It gives me great pleasure to speak to this motion. Before proceeding, I express my appreciation and thanks to Mr. Heenan for bringing it forward. He is to be congratulated on this move; because I have been a prospector and a miner for many years and, in my opinion, such a motion is long overdue.

I do not wish to be critical of the Minister for Mines and the officers of the Mines Department, because I believe that they have done all in their power, to the best of their ability, to assist and develop the mining industry generally with the finance available to them. No matter how much one tries, or how much one would like to do in any field, he is still restricted in his efforts in accordance with the amount of finance available to him. The people on the goldfields and those engaged in the mining industry, generally, are most concerned about the falling off in the number of prospectors and the decline in prospecting, generally.

This trend is mainly due to the high cost of materials, equipment, and general requirements necessary for those engaged in the mining industry. Therefore, I think the motion which Mr. Heenan has moved to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into all aspects of the prospecting industry with a view to making recommendations to bring about a revival in the search for gold will achieve beneficial results. Its investigations will not only reveal the reason for the falling off in the number of prospectors engaged in the various goldfields, but it could also be of great assistance in other directions to assist the development of the mining industry.

In regard to prospecting, I think the day has come when men have to move to new fields and open up new country. This, of course, would be beyond the resources of the average prospector. There is no doubt he has the practical know-how, and the

necessary capabilities, but he does not possess the necessary finance. I believe that if modern equipment could be made available to prospectors so that they could engage in their operations efficiently and quickly, we would achieve much better results. Those engaged in any field have to keep abreast of the times to achieve satisfactory results.

Thirty years ago, when prospecting was very prevalent, one could go into the field and stay there for months. All a prospector required to engage in his activities was a pick and shovel and other prospecting equipment, a bag of flour, tea and sugar, and a case of tinned dog—as tinned meat was referred to in those days. Apart from those requirements, a prospector more or less lived off the land. Dingoes were plentiful, and if a prospector trapped two dingoes a week, with the money that he received for the scalps—amounting to 10s. or 15s. per week—he could remain in the bush another week to fossick about.

I have no doubt that if the younger people today were asked to sit down to a meal of damper with tea poured over it, and sprinkled with sugar, they would reject it in disgust, but that used to be the usual diet of a prospector.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That was his bread and jam.

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: Yes, that was his crib. Of course, nobody wants to return to such conditions, but years ago that was how the average prospector in the bush existed. The prospector was the man, who, by living in that manner, was able to persist with his search for gold, and he paved the way towards opening up many of our existing goldfields. I feel certain that if assistance were granted to prospectors, and if they were issued with modern and efficient equipment, more fields would be discovered; because there is no doubt that there is still plenty of gold to be found. One only needs the wherewithal and the equipment to find it.

Therefore, if a Select Committee is appointed to inquire into the prospecting industry, I am certain that its investigations will prove to be of great benefit, and I hope it will lead to new fields being developed. Some few weeks ago I suggested that the basic wage be paid to prospectors, but the Minister seemed to consider my ideas were unrealistic. Nevertheless, I feel sure that provided the assistance granted to any prospector were properly administered—as I am sure it could be—it would prove to be a definite means of opening up new fields.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Have you any idea of the average age of the prospector who is receiving prospecting assistance?

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: I could only hazard a guess. I would say that the average age of the prospector who is receiving assistance would be 55. As the

Minister was not present in the Chamber when I commenced to speak, I will now repeat that I have no intention of criticising him or the officers of his department. I know that it may sound a lot when I suggest that the basic wage be paid as financial assistance to prospectors, but how many departments have we where men are paid the basic wage? I feel certain that when companies are entering this State and spending £21,000,000 on various projects, there is a responsibility on the State and the Commonwealth Governments to try to do something to assist the prospecting and goldmining industry.

If the basic wage were granted to prospectors, the right type of man would have to be selected before such assistance were granted. I am sure such men are available. I am not suggesting that any prospector who is working a hole in the ground should be granted the basic wage when he applies for it. What I mean is that applications for assistance could be submitted to the department, and it would then be the duty of the under-secretary or his officers to select the men who were considered to be most suitable to be granted assistance. When a person applies to the Mines Department for a development loan it is not granted willy-nilly. An inspector reports on the mine that is being worked, and if it is considered to be an economic proposition the loan is granted. A similar procedure could be followed when granting the basic wage to prospectors.

I conclude by saying that I am happy to see that some attempt is being made to assist those engaged in mining, and I hope the motion will be agreed to. If I can be of any assistance to the members who are appointed to this Select Committee I will only be too happy to offer my services.

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East) (4.30 p.m.): I want to make a small contribution to the debate on this motion for the appointment of a Select Committee. I congratulate Mr. Heenan for bringing forward the motion, because all the goldfields members are in one team and wear the same guernsey; and Mr. Heenan is our captain. We are asking for the appointment of a Select Committee, because we think it is warranted.

We are mindful of the assistance that is being given to prospectors in this State: the present Government and past Governments have assisted in this direction. I do not want to be critical of the Government; I only want to be helpful in speaking to this motion. In a matter such as this we should not try to make political gains.

I believe that such a Select Committee will give the gold industry a lift, and the prospect of a revival in the industry will please all the people on the goldfields. I

can assure members that such a Select Committee will have the fullest co-operation of those people.

My mind goes back to the days before the last depression. In the period from 1920 to 1930 only £2,500,000 worth of gold was produced in Western Australia; but between 1931 and 1940 £10,000,000 was produced. In the last years before the hostilities in the World War became too serious, this State produced 1,191,481 oz. of gold, worth about £14,000,000. Unfortunately the war came along, and goldmining went into the doldrums. It has not recovered fully since that time.

In the years between 1931 and 1940 there were 16,000 men employed in the goldmining industry. I cannot visualise any other industry which better serves the policy of decentralisation than the goldmining industry. There were 16,000 men working in the gold mines in Wiluna, Cue, Lancefield, Big Bell, Coolgardie, Boulder, Norseman, and other small goldmining centres. All those towns had thriving communities, and the people were provided with adequate schools, transport, and other essentials.

A great service would be rendered to decentralisation if it were possible to open up more goldmines in this State. The moment a goldmine is open, a town is established and the right type of people are attracted to it. I know that in some outback mining centres there is the itinerant type of worker, but that applies everywhere.

Before gold was discovered in Western Australia the State developed very slowly, but after the discovery of gold, it developed rapidly. Gold caused a radical change in the Australian way of life, and gold fever affected many people. Gold seekers rushed from all over Australia to this State after the rich discoveries in Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie. I only hope that today we have the Bayley's, Ford's, Hannan's, Flannagan's, and O'Shea's. It was Flannagan, Hannan, and O'Shea who discovered the Golden Mile.

In 1890 there were 45,000 people in Western Australia, but four years later, in 1894, there were 81,600. There were 60 registered mining companies taking up land, or actively exploiting the country for gold. We would like to see a return to that exciting era, under present day standards of health and housing. Unfortunately in the old days a lot of the miners and the people in the goldmining towns paid with their lives, due to the incidence of typhoid and to the lack of fresh food. Flies were also a great menace, but today we know how to handle them.

As a member representing a goldfields province I heartily endorse this move for the appointment of a Select Committee. I hope something will come of it, because I feel sure some person or organisation

will come up with a worth-while suggestion which will help the industry and bring about a revival in the search for gold.

I am mindful of the concessions which are given to the industry, but we should go much further than that. No State Government has sufficient funds to render the necessary assistance, and I believe the complete answer is through generous assistance by the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth should tackle the goldmining industry in the same spirit as it tackled the Snowy River scheme, or the Ord River scheme; and it should assist in the same way as it provided subsidies to the dairy industry and for superphosphate production. I do not begrudge one penny of the money the Commonwealth Government has made available for those purposes; I only hope it will adjust its thinking to the goldmining industry in the same way.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Commonwealth Government gives considerable assistance to the goldmining industry, such as the subsidy towards gold production, and the prospector's allowance.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I am aware of that. We think that such assistance should be given in a very big way. There are not too many full-time or weekend prospectors left, but if the right climate was produced, there would be an influx into the industry again. The real and only answer is to increase the price of gold. If it were to rise, as it did in the 1930's, the position would adjust itself. Unfortunately, I cannot see the price of gold rising. This is a pretty complex subject, and each of us has his own thoughts on it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: A rise in the price of gold would help very substantially.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: I would like to see that taking place. Unfortunately, the tragedy is that towns like Bullfinch, and the mining centres adjacent to Bullfinch, Southern Cross, and Marvel Loch, have closed down. They are ghost towns so far as gold production is concerned, but fortunately agriculture has been able to continue their existence to a certain degree. Bayley's Reward is now finished as a mine, and that was a great blow to the people of Coolgardie. The Sons of Gwalia mine is in a very shaky position; and unless something is done to assist that mine I am afraid its days are numbered.

If prospecting was stimulated, then small mines would be opened up, and in their wake would follow the larger mines. Collectively those mines would employ more men, use more stores, and add to the prosperity of this State. All goldfields members would like to see that come about. The wages, stores, and manpower which go with mining centres would help towards decentralisation.

Western Australia owes a great deal to the goldmining industry; were it not for that industry I doubt if the State would have developed as far as it has. When the railway line and water supplies were brought to Kalgoorlie, farming land along the route was taken up, and goldmining and grazing developed together. Were it not for the goldmines, many more people would be living closer to the coast.

The days of finding gold in an alluvial form are gone, because the old prospectors did a good job and left little on the surface. Now we have to go deeper to find gold. The loaming method of finding gold has been in operation for a long time. The prospector loams over the ground looking for colour in all directions; he works around until he reaches the perimeter where the colours cease. He then loams in a closer pattern until he finds the spot where the colours are strongest; that is the spot at which he usually sinks a shaft, and finds a patch of gold. I know that this is not regarded as a deep mine, but it is a start, because one does not know what is in front of the pick and shovel. We hear about this method of mining in Kalgoorlie and Norseman whenever people talk about gold.

When a prospective mine is located surveyors and geologists are needed to make an assessment. Invariably they do a very good job, and aerial surveying is often used to find anomalies in lodes and reefs, but it takes a pick and shovel to get down below the surface to look for gold.

When I was in charge of a mine we drove about 1,000 feet before an aerial survey was taken. We were driving northwards, but the survey showed an anomaly of a few hundred feet eastwards. That survey non-plussed the geologists and those engaged in the work. A second survey was undertaken, and it showed the same thing. When we drove to the particular spot indicated by the aerial survey we put down a diamond drill, and sure enough there was a reef. That was the start of a very rich mine which is still operating today.

At one stage it was an embarrassment to that mine to keep the grade down as values were so good; and it is wonderful when the grade has to be kept down, because the difficulty in these days, in a low grade mine, is to keep the grade up. Aerial reconnaissance and surveys do help to locate reefs, but the man who does the initial work is the humble prospector.

Today prospecting is quite different from what it was, and a certain standard of knowledge is required. Miners in these days earn big money, and it is difficult to induce them to go into the bush to prospect for gold, unless they have the lure for gold. The equipment is costly. One would need a Landrover or some other

sturdy vehicle. One would also need plenty of water, rations, equipment, and explosives; and sometimes a compressed air unit. One might not need compressed air at first, but eventually it would be needed. The equipment required by prospectors could cost a lot of money by today's standards.

I have a lot of faith in the young fellows of today. I think they could go out and do just as well as anyone else. A lot of people after the first World War seemed to think that young people could not do a job; but the fellows who went to the second World War did just as well, and I have a good deal of faith in the young fellows of today.

We are here to decide whether or not to appoint a Select Committee. I hope that we do appoint this Select Committee, because I feel some good will come out of it. I am sure someone will come up with an idea, and I do not think the time will be wasted. I sincerely hope that the House will agree to the appointment of a Select Committee.

THE HON. J. J. GARRIGAN (South-East) [4.47 p.m.]: I will take this opportunity of congratulating Mr. Heenan in bringing this motion before the House. I feel the time is overdue when we should have a Select Committee to inquire into the prospecting industry of Western Australia. I have always advocated, when speaking in connection with goldmining, or any other mineral, that more assistance should be given to the prospecting industry. We have to have the type of man, as a prospector, who is prepared to go out to find the small shows which develop into major mining companies. The old types of prospectors are dying out and younger ones are taking their places. The older prospectors are using the same methods that they have used for the past 30 or 40 years. To find new mineral fields we have to progress with the times. We have to have mechanisation, and to have mechanisation we must have finance.

This matter should be the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government as well as that of the State Government. The Commonwealth Government should subsidise marginal mines. It could subsidise goldmines, copper mines, and the companies mining pyrites. It could also subsidise the search for oil and water. It should be the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government, pushed along, perhaps, by the State Government, to provide more assistance for the goldmining industry of Western Australia.

Over the years prospectors have suffered from many disabilities. They have had to endure heat, droughts, and floods. They have had to face all kinds of hardships, and only those people who live in the out-back know what the conditions are like. I have not always believed in the appoint-

ment of Select Committees. I was elected to this House on the 8th May, 1954. About June, 1954, I was appointed a member of a Select Committee to inquire into the Workers' Compensation Act. As a result of the findings of that Select Committee we received a fair deal. It was an all-party committee, comprising members of both parties in this House.

If we cannot do any good from appointing this Select Committee, we cannot do any harm. We could bring before responsible authorities the necessity for finding new goldfields or new minerals in Western Australia.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I suppose you think I do not know of the necessity for that.

The Hon. J. J. GARRIGAN: I received a letter from the owner of a very small goldmine in Western Australia. With your permission, Sir, I will read the letter slowly so that it can be recorded in *Hansard*. It reads as follows:—

Costs have just about caught up with the price fixed by London and America on average ore available in our few, at present producing, big mines here in Western Australia, which produces 82 per cent. of all gold produced in Australia each year.

As you mentioned America was controlling the price of gold, this would be only because of the wartime measure—Regulation of 1914-18 and the Bretton Woods Agreement. These wartime measures debar all members of the British Commonwealth from owning, buying, selling and trading in gold, still in the year 1963. If these measures are still operating, they are apparently the cause of the hopelessness and despair which has arisen over the Gold Prices. A huge internal market in our Empire would exist only for this present tie-up and something must be done about it.

If America is an unsatisfactory market or buyer of our gold, then perhaps Red China may be a good market—they are a good buyer of our wheat at present. All these markets should be available to us in gold. All other commodities have a free right to sell in those countries, but strangely the gold marketing is a "Wall of Silence" and the public are kept in ignorance of it, and as you said, it is a "technical" matter.

One of the main points I wish you to reply on is whether the Federal Government is interested in gold now or in the future. Is it contemplated to finish with gold producing in the near future and try and do without it? If so, why not come out in the open and tell us so.

The Monetary Fund seems to be unable to operate without gold as the backbone of all financial dealings. Our currency also needs to be a golden dollar while we are about it, and our notes need some value into the pound in the shape of the words "Paid in gold on demand at the Bank", as they were before these "Wartime Measures". Our note is of a very depreciative value in most instances outside Australia and to the average citizen it does not "read right". The whole financial situation does not appear to be on sound lines, as the general community have been stripped of their right to own, trade in, and possess gold as a "World Security". People of other nations can bid in the London Market for Gold, but not Britishers. So it is easily seen the gold producers are not "getting a go".

This hand-out by the Commonwealth is not necessary if gold was free and is only necessary under "Wartime Measures" which have been taken off everything else excepting gold.

Kalgoorlie has about 30 years of ore in sight at present on a small margin of profit and may not last that long if the position is not bettered quickly.

The rest of the letter is not of interest to members. The letter points out the importance of finding new goldfields; and I think Mr. Heenan's motion should be applauded from the point of view of ensuring the permanency of our goldfields in Western Australia.

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [4.55 p.m.]: I am very grateful to my colleagues, and to other members, who have spoken to the motion. They have given the motion such support, and their remarks have been so convincing and lucid, that I feel there is little need for me to say much more. I repeat that I am very grateful indeed for the support they have given the motion. Before I proceed further I should perhaps thank Mr. Wise and Mr. Jones for looking after this motion for me yesterday morning, during my unavoidable absence.

I should also offer some explanation or apology for bringing forward the motion at this late stage of the sitting. I could mention that the matter has been in my mind for some time and I had contemplated making a move earlier. But in recent weeks I became somewhat doubtful, from the way I was feeling, as to whether I would be able to see it through.

Last week, however, I was in Kalgoorlie and I spoke to several influential citizens who are earnestly concerned about the future of the goldmining industry. I then and there decided that come what may I would proceed with my plans before the end of the session.

I am grateful to my colleagues for paying a tribute to the Minister for Mines and to the Mines Department; and I would like to add my remarks to what they have already said. This motion contains no criticism or censure of anyone. I am sure that no-one on the goldfields, or any local member, is ungrateful for the help given by the Mines Department.

We all receive the greatest consideration from the department; and I am sure I am voicing a unanimous viewpoint when I say that we regard the Mines Department as one of the best Government departments. We are also mindful of the fact that the Minister for Mines has made frequent visits to the goldfields. He has met the members of the Prospectors' Association and others, and they are an integral part of the industry. The Minister has shown a commendable interest. So I again assure him that it is not my intention, or I am sure the intention of anyone on the goldfields, that this motion is to be intended as any criticism of him.

I do not propose to speak for long, for the reasons I have already outlined, and because I feel that my colleagues and other speakers, have already submitted a case which warrants the support of all members of this House. I think the main question which the motion raises is this: Is the prospecting industry of Western Australia of sufficient value to warrant further support and encouragement for the purpose of ensuring its continuance and expansion? The answer to that question may be found in recalling a few facts concerning the goldmining industry in general; and in this connection I would firstly quote from the *Pocket Year Book of Western Australia*, 1963—

Since the first settlement in Western Australia there has been no event of greater economic significance to the State than the discovery of gold—In the Kimberleys in 1885, and of larger and more important goldfields in the Yilgarn in 1887, Pilbara in 1888, the Murchison in 1890, at Coolgardie in 1892, and Kalgoorlie in 1893.

Within a few years the State became famous as a producer of gold and concurrently the population increased fivefold. To the end of 1962, 144.6 million tons of ore had been mined and treated for a yield of 61.8 million fine ozs of gold. The total from all sources was 63.4 million fine ozs. The peak year was in 1903 when over 2 million fine ozs were produced.

Later in this little booklet it goes on to say that the production of gold in Western Australia, in relation to the Commonwealth of Australia, is 79.9 per cent.—in round figures, 80 per cent. So I would say that goldmining is almost wholly and essentially an industry which belongs to and affects this State of Western Australia.

Secondly, I would quote a brief paragraph from the *Industrial and Mining Review* of December, 1962, as follows:—

The grand total of gold production to date is of a value of £468,684,921, and the State production usually exceeds £1,000,000 every month.

Thirdly, I would mention that the gold-mining industry employs approximately 5,000 men directly, and is responsible indirectly for many thousands more. In addition, well-known towns on the gold-fields, supporting many thousands of people, are wholly dependent on the gold-mining industry.

These are a few facts which I think cause no question about an affirmative answer being given to the advisability of supporting the prospecting industry; because, as is well known, it is the prospectors who find the mines, as was pointed out by Mr. Stubbs, Mr. Garrigan, and others. These finds on the Murchison, the Pilbara, and at Yilgarn, Coolgardie, Kalgoorlie, Norseman, and countless other places, were located by prospectors—and no-one other than prospectors.

So when we learn that the prospecting industry is now at a very low ebb it surely causes great concern to those who are anxious to see the maintenance of the goldmining industry, and an expansion of it. I will just run briefly through a number of towns that were household names only yesterday—

Kanowna
Bulong
Kookynie
Morgans
Laverton
Burtville
Mt. Monger
Broad Arrow
Nannine
Cue
Widgiemoooltha
Sandstone
Youanmi
Day Dawn
Yalgoo
Malcolm
Linden
Murrin Murrin
Goongarrrie.

These towns all supported large populations, relatively, only yesterday. Now they are no longer supporting populations to any worth-while extent; and these towns are all situated in a part of Western Australia which we cannot leave unattended.

We continually read that unless we do something with the unpopulated parts of Australia we are inviting other nations to come and do something about it. We know the worth-while efforts that are now being made to populate the north; and in the north the Ord River scheme will dam up an immense quantity of water and provide, I hope, a land where farmers and graziers

will create an industry, grow crops, cattle, and sheep; and that will be all to the good.

But the country that I am talking about, so far at any rate, offers little prospect for development except in the field of gold-mining. There are lots of cattle and sheep in those places, but those industries do not open up the country and support populations. I think we have to make every endeavour possible to create new goldmines, because history has proved abundantly and conclusively that rich goldmines are found, they are worked for years, populations are supported, railways are built, and then the time comes when they are worked out.

That has been the story over the relatively small history of our State since gold was first discovered. We should be alarmed at the closing down in recent years of places like Bullfinch, where hundreds of men were employed; Lancefield; Big Bell; and a number of other centres. The communities of Leonora and Gwalia are wholly dependent on the mine which has had a marvellous life but which is now struggling for its existence. We are fraught with the dire probability that within the ensuing few years that mine may close up.

So it seems to me a proper policy, and an intelligent policy, to keep striving to replace these mines. I am no expert in this field, but there are eminent geologists and others in it who will tell us that our vast auriferous fields have not been exploited to any considerable degree in the search for gold. Who is going to say there is not another Golden Mile somewhere in this vast hinterland? Who is going to say we cannot find another mine like Big Bell or Wiluna used to be, or like Norseman is now, or even Hill 50?

Speaking of Hill 50, I have just got the company's annual report, and it is an example of what a comparatively small mine can do for a district and a community. In its report the company states that in 1962 the total income from the sale of gold was £1,384,302.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What year was that?

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: That was in 1962.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It made a profit of £600,000.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: That was the total income from the sale of gold, and out of that, mine working expenses, mostly wages and stores, amounted to close on £500,000. I notice the company is holding a reserve of £5,000 to help the community build a swimming pool; and that is a relatively small mine. If we only had some of these mines scattered about, what a good thing it would be for our State in general. I do not want it to appear that I have all the answers, or that these mines are easy to find. Gold mines are not by

any means easy to find. But history has shown us that prospectors are the ones likely to find them.

Somehow or other I think we must try to evolve a scheme by which prospectors can be got out into the field. Nowadays the position is vastly different from the days of Paddy Hannan, Bayley, or Ford, as Mr. Dellar has pointed out. The prospector today is generally a married man, with the normal married man's responsibility to his wife and family. Prospecting is a hazardous, and risky business, where the rewards are very uncertain, but the prizes when they come along are very great. They are great prizes not only for the individual prospector, but also for the State in which he resides.

I am the first one to admit that the Mines Department and its skilled officers have given this very same question the greatest consideration. I know that they are worried and concerned in facing the present outlook; and whether or not the appointment of a Select Committee can do much good, or some good, I do not know; but at least we must not give in—we people who represent the goldfields—because we do to some extent hold their destinies in our keeping. We must battle on and we must attempt to do something. Whether a Select Committee can come up with any useful ideas or not, I do not know; but I only hope that, if the House agrees to the appointment of a Select Committee, we will be able to achieve something. We could at least have a good try, and draw on all the brains and suggestions that are about the place.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think a Select Committee would discover many of the things we already know.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: That is probably so. There will certainly not be any laurels for the Select Committee, and there will not be much enjoyment for its members travelling around the goldfields trying to evolve some ideas; but I only hope that something can come out of it. At least we will be following in the traditions of the early prospectors, who did not know what was ahead of them; they just hoped for the best, and strove to achieve something, and in a number of cases they did achieve something.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I would be grateful if you could discover how to get more loan funds for me.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: That is where I have some qualms and doubts. I have great doubts as to whether the Commonwealth Government can, by virtue of its commitments to the International Monetary Fund in regard to the goldmining industry, help to any great extent. I hope I am wrong; but it looks to me as if the policy of the Commonwealth Government is merely to assist the existing mines; to help them carry on.

Are we just going to maintain the *status quo*, until one by one the mines fade out? Or are we going to draw on the vast resources of money, and scientific aid, and encouragement, which the industry needs if it is to expand?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Payment by the Commonwealth of the development money proves that surely.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I think that amounted to £500,000 in round figures last year. But, on the other hand, we have Wapet spending £20,000,000 looking for oil. This company is still spending money in millions of pounds, not merely in thousands of pounds.

Oil would certainly be a marvellous blessing for this country, but would it not be an equal blessing if we could find another Golden Mile somewhere up around Wiluna, or in one of those outback places, and thus promote decentralisation? In this afternoon's paper there is a heading which reads, "Wapet Opens Up Wilderness". Good luck to the company. I applaud the Federal Government for encouraging and subsidising it.

Are we to accept the position that the goldmining industry is incapable of doing something akin to what the discovery of oil could do? The price of gold is not alluring. I have here in the last report of the Chamber of Mines of Western Australia, comments made by Mr. C. T. Mayfield, Consul for the United States of America, when he was addressing the chamber in Kalgoorlie this year. This is what he said—

If anyone asks why we do not raise the price of gold, I am going right out of the window. It is a complex problem as you all know. It would most likely result in the devaluation of the dollar, by which so many developing countries have backed their economics. It would be, I really think, a far more disastrous result than simply raising the price of gold. There are many more facets to it, and I know you are much more interested in this subject, than I have information available to discuss with you.

I have endeavoured to study this subject of the price of gold. I have read a number of books and articles concerning it, and I am the first to admit it is a complex problem. I am not over-optimistic about a rise in the price of gold—not in the immediate future at any rate. But we cannot let that unhappy prospect prevent us from having faith in the goldmining industry, which is 80 per cent. Western Australian. It concerns us more than anyone else in Australia.

I have spoken longer than I had intended. I am not carried away with the idea of coming back to this House when it assembles next year with some definite, easy solution of this problem; but if we

could do something of a wise and practical nature to suggest ways and means whereby prospectors can be got into the field, and encouraged to keep going, I feel it might be worth while. In conclusion, therefore, I hope the House will see fit to carry the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines).

ALUMINA REFINERY AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 4th December, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North—Leader of the Opposition) (5.28 p.m.): This Bill is to provide for certain amendments to the agreement which this House passed in 1961 in connection with the Alcoa Alumina Refinery, and other matters incidental thereto. The Bill contains several provisions, and I think it highlights how important it is for Parliament to be apprised of alterations in arrangements made with key companies of such magnitude; and of the circumstances obtaining when alterations of necessity must be made between the Government and such parties.

It is, I think, pertinent to observe in this case, that the company concerned need not have commenced the refinery under the agreement until 1965. We find, however, it has reached a stage, in 1963, where the refinery is actually able to be operated; which is a striking tribute to its management, to its endeavours, and to its intentions.

It has spent £10,000,000 instead of £5,000,000 in the period since the passing by Parliament of the agreement which, again, is a very striking achievement and a tribute to the people concerned. It will be found that the company will be able to treat 210,000 tons compared with 120,000 tons which the agreement originally required, which is a remarkable step forward. Members in the Chamber will recall the controversial aspects associated with the discussions, especially those centring around the disposal of effluent, gases, and the like; and it is interesting to note the attitude of the company in taking somewhat extraordinary precautions and making very wide provisions for the conduct of its business to abate this nuisance, which was widely forecast as being of insurmountable proportions.

I well remember taking part in the discussions at that stage; and I think the way the company is trying to prepare in every way for the disposal of the effluent, long before the problem has reached a

proportion to be a nuisance at all, is something very much to its credit. This constitutes a very big undertaking in our State. Unfortunately it is only part of the operation of dealing with the product of alumina, and it seems we are destined not have the completing part of the manufacturing side, because of power deficiencies or the inability to supply power, particularly at the rate required.

One thing is very important; and I think, if the Minister has the information the House would value being advised of it. Some of the highlights and headlines published in recent months in the Press of this State, of Australia, and in a world sense, have centred around the discovery of vast quantities of bauxite in different parts of the world. A big deposit was discovered at Marchinbar Island and Gove Peninsula when I was in the Northern Territory. That area is, some nine years after, being developed by a French company.

Since that time a very big deposit has been discovered at Wyper on the Gulf of Carpentaria and within recent days, certainly within the last week or two—I think a day or two before the Federal elections—there was an announcement that a £50,000,000 project associated with ilmenite would be based at Gladstone on the coast, a little north of the centre of Queensland. Can the Minister tell us, with all these gigantic undertakings and with all those we read of in the international Press and the deposits in other parts of the world being dealt with—all of them associated with accessible cheap power—what is the scope and what are the limitations regarding this mineral and this type of industry; and whether the principals associated with the refinery—the subject of this agreement—fear there is any doubt as to the future?; because the deposits I referred to are enormous.

The Gladstone project envisages a terrific output. The deposit I referred to in Arnhemland is extremely vast. It is something the Minister would like to see situated between Bunbury and Perth.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: As close as the Darling Range.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It is right on the coast of Marchinbar Island; and at Gove Peninsula where the Air Force was based during the war and right near where the mission is situated, it is right on the surface.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I was at Gove during the war.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: With all this competition concerning this mineral, what are the world prospects? They must be sound or we would not have seen the expenditure of £10,000,000 in this State over the period when £5,000,000 was contracted to be spent, and when 210,000 tons will be treated instead of the agreed 120,000 tons.

In addition we have seen the step-up in the construction of the railway, which is not only well on time, so far as the agreement is concerned, but completed and ready for action. So there is an atmosphere of great confidence.

I am wondering if the Minister can give us some information in that connection. This is a Bill to which the House must agree. It adjusts the question of the title of the land. It deals with the temporary reserves. The temporary reserves are, by comparison with the initial ones on which the agreement was made, very minor in the aggregate area. The original ones contained thousands of square miles compared with the 473 square miles in one, and 58 square miles in another. It is wise to take this action now while the land is available and since the land has subsequently been tested.

In short, there is nothing of a mysterious character in the Bill that has been presented to us. A fresh agreement, as drawn between the Government and the company, explains all the variations in detail in the supplementary agreement. I support the Bill.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [5.40 p.m.]: I support this Bill. Prior to the suspension I spoke to the Minister for Industrial Development and told him I was going to ask some questions regarding this Bill. My discussion with the Minister was a prerequisite to a discussion with the Department of Industrial Development in regard to areas that will be acquired by the alumina company for the disposal of effluent for the next 25 years.

In order to explain why I asked this question of the Minister it will be necessary for me to go off line a little. Some three years ago there was a road known as Hope Valley Road, extending eastward from the 11 mile peg on the Rockingham Road; and 2½ miles out there is a road that bisects Anketell Road, which is the junction of Hope Valley Road and Lyon Road. Between Lyon Road and back westwards, and a road called Armstrong Road, there is a market garden and dairying area where people have no electricity.

The ex-Minister controlling the S.E.C. (Mr. Arthur Watts) made available to me a sum of £2,600 to take the power 1½ miles along this area to give a service to 16 or 17 producers. Because one dairyman later withdrew from the agreement, we were not able to go on with the financial arrangements with the S.E.C. and the power was not extended. There was a property known as Wamsley's slightly eastward of Armstrong Road, which crosses Hope Valley Road, that was taken up by a land development company. Quite a number of 10-acre blocks were sold, and before the actual titles were issued the Department of Industrial Development, through the Town Planning Department, was able to resume this property.

This meant that the blocks could not be sold and there is no possibility of the electricity extending eastward from its present point to Lyon Road in Mandogalup. I have given this explanation because, according to information supplied to me, but not by the Department of Industrial Development, it is this resumed property that the alumina company will use for the disposal of its effluent in approximately 1990; and it is uneconomic for the S.E.C. to run a line to extend the electricity.

I would like the Minister to tell me if he would ascertain from the Minister for Industrial Development whether the statement I have made in regard to the resumption of this property is correct and advise me accordingly.

Would he also see if the Department of Industrial Development would assist me in my approaches to the S.E.C. to have the extension carried out, because slightly eastward of Lyon Road there is another subdivision taking place containing a 22 ft. bitumen road? In this new subdivision, 10 or 12 lots have been disposed of, and the people concerned are negotiating with the S.E.C. to see if the power can be extended. I appreciate that the Minister cannot answer me now, but I would be pleased if he would advise me by letter either before or after Parliament rises.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [5.45 p.m.]: I think the question raised by Mr. Lavery is one which could very readily be answered for him. I do not know whether he has gone to the trouble of asking the Department of Industrial Development about this particular matter; but I feel sure that if he were to inquire from the department he would obtain a satisfactory answer. I am in no position at this stage to answer the question, but if the honourable member wishes me to make the inquiry for him, I will do so. However, I would prefer him to make it himself because he would probably get closer to the answer if he did.

I would like now to thank Mr. Wise for his support of the Bill. Some of the brief remarks I want to make could well be kept until the time when I have something to say on the appointment of a Select Committee for which Mr. Heenan has moved.

From the point of replying to the debate, let me say that the company behind this particular agreement is the sort of company we need in Western Australia—one of the old original goldmining companies which has been prepared to look into the future and to realise that a mine of any kind, no matter what sort of mineral it produces, is a diminishing asset. It is a company which has been anxious to diversify its assets—even to the mining of talc.

The search for bauxite in the Darling Range started not when I was Minister for Mines. It commenced before then.

However I am prompted to say that I am reminded—when I hear Mr. Wise say that the company is not being obligated, under the agreement, to commence its construction of the plant before the 31st March, 1965—of a man I saw on television one night. This man was waving his arms in despair because he could not find the site for the refinery. This was prior to a certain event which took place in 1962. Considering that man could not at that time find the site, great credit, as Mr. Wise said, goes to the company from that day to this, because the plant is now ready for operation. On the occasion that this gentleman could not find it, it was approximately 100 acres of flattened-out ground. The big Euclids and bulldozers had been to work and they had flattened the ground out ready for the construction to begin. It is perfectly true, as Mr. Wise said, that this company has made great progress since then; and it has moved forward, not because of an obligation to do so, but in its own interests, to a stage where, long before the time by which it was obligated under the agreement, the refinery is ready for production.

The production and sale of alumina is a competitive field, because of the discovery of bauxite on the other side of the continent in Queensland and in the north at Gove Peninsular. I know a little bit about Gove Peninsular because I sweated there for a few months during the war. The early success of this project depends entirely upon the economic use of the mineral from time to time. I would be quite satisfied to leave this mineral in the hands of people like Alcoa of America, and the Western Mining Corporation, with which the company is in partnership.

Alcoa of America—of course, one of the leading producers of alumina in that country—is, I feel quite sure, on top of what is happening in respect of not only alumina, but aluminium, and the uses of the metal, which are becoming much more diversified as time goes on. There is a break-through period, I feel sure. At the moment it is not extensively used, but in the near future it may become far more extensively used.

We see the minerals now being used in industrial buildings. One of the neatest constructions I have seen in which this metal is used is the building of Alcoa itself at Kwinana. The huge building is sheeted with corrugated aluminium sheets. It has certain advantages over other metals because of its qualities in respect of lack of corrosion and its strength, and those sorts of things. We have only to see how one day the components of a machine are made of one metal and then tomorrow they are made of another metal, to realise what terrific changes can take place.

While I do not profess to have a great knowledge of this situation, I am satisfied that the people who are running this com-

pany have had world-wide experience in their field of manufacturing; and I feel that the treatment of this mineral will be to their own advantage and that of Western Australia.

The bauxite in the Darling Range is easy of treatment in comparison with the bauxite deposits in certain other parts of the world—and, for that matter, in other parts of Australia. The closeness of these deposits to the refinery is another distinct advantage.

The one advantage which we lack, as Mr. Wise said, is the type of power, at the price that is needed, to treat this particular mineral. That is why I regret to say the actual production of aluminium, as distinct from alumina, is being done in Victoria and not in Western Australia. But who knows whether, in future years, the availability of some other source of power and a change in the type of treatment might be such that this mineral might be able to be treated from the ground to the metal stage in Western Australia.

I do not think there is need for me to say much more, except to repeat that I think this is the sort of exercise that Western Australia could do with; a type of exercise in which we get the influx of capital that we need to build up an industry of this nature—an industry bringing with it, as it does, the technical, engineering, geological, and other types of experience necessary in an operation of this nature; and this industry will be working alongside Western Australian interests in a happy partnership. In view of all this, it must be to the advantage of us all.

It is an excellent thing to be able to relate that this company set a target date by which it was obligated to do certain things; and not only has it beaten its target date by a considerable length of time, but it has doubled its capital expenditure and its output.

I venture to suggest that the amount of money that will be spent ultimately on the integrated iron and steel industry at Kwinana will not be limited to £40,000,000. I also suggest that the amount of steel that the company is under an obligation to produce under its agreement will not be limited to the amount specified in the agreement. I am sure the amount will be greater than was originally anticipated. It is a good thing for these companies to think a little conservatively in the first instance, knowing full well that as they progress they are likely to think bigger rather than smaller; and the bigger they think the more employment will be available for our people to the ultimate benefit of Western Australia.

I hope the balance sheet of this company, and of any other company in Western Australia, will be in a healthy position. A

healthy company means healthy employment, which provides security for the people. We would then have a happy combination of secure jobs, healthy people, and a healthy State. The progress of this company is a good example of what should take place; and I hope we get many more such companies.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban)
[5.58 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West)
[5.59 p.m.]: I do not want to hold up the Bill, but I feel I must rise in protest against the reply given by the Minister to our leader. I feel that in this session of Parliament our leader has been most gracious in his remarks to all Bills which have come before this House, particularly in connection with anything concerning the betterment of our secondary industries. It ill-became the Minister, I thought, to draw the picture of an election caption, as he did, from what was a most gracious speech made by my leader.

I think the Minister lowered his dignity somewhat, and I am rather surprised that a man so well versed as the Minister should have done what he did. There has been a very high standard of debate during this session, and I am sorry for what the Minister did.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [6.1 p.m.]: I am not going to bother to reply. The remarks I made were not said to Mr. Wise but were made in the spirit of the circumstances that prevailed at the time.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: You never miss a trick.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: When you give, you have to be prepared to receive; and I get it both ways. I related the set of circumstances in good humour, and I do not think there was any harm in what I did.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I certainly was not the principal actor involved.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member certainly was not.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time, and passed.

Sitting suspended from 6.2 to 7.33 p.m.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 4th December, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North)
[7.33 p.m.]: This piece of legislation is complementary to the Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill which this House recently passed. Therefore, as we on this side spoke at length on that Bill I do not think there would be any great purpose served by reiterating the arguments we outlined then. In fact, this Bill is so closely akin to its complementary measure that they will both be proclaimed on the same day.

The Bill contains only five clauses, each one consequential upon the others, to enable any industrial disputes in the coal-mining industry of this State, or any awards which are made in that industry, and which previously were taken before the Arbitration Court, to be heard by the industrial commission in the future. The personnel of the coal industry tribunal, which was referred to by the Minister in his speech when introducing this Bill, will not be altered. The amending legislation will merely mean that the tribunal will make its determinations under the new proposal, as a result of the passing of the Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill.

I do not know that I can do anything more at this stage than hope that any future deliberations of this tribunal, consequent upon the decisions made by the industrial commission, will be treated as efficiently and as expeditiously as the Arbitration Court has done over the past few years. I can only hope that an industry such as the coalmining industry—wherein sometimes delicate situations are created—will not be subject to any disability as a result of the passing of this new law, because it will be a tragedy if it is. The whole arbitration system as applying to the Collie coalmining industry, and as it applies, in fact, to all industries in Western Australia, is now more or less in the melting pot.

It is up to the Government to prove that the new principles which it has seen fit to embody both in this piece of legislation and the one preceding it, and which are being offered to the workers of this State, will prove to be practicable, efficient, and just for the benefit of all those engaged in industry. Until this new legislation has gone through the process of trial and error, and has proved itself one way or the other, I can only reserve the decision which I arrived at previously; namely, that if there is any failure or breakdown in the new arbitration system, and should

there be any disability occasioned to the parties on either side in the future, there can be only one answer, and that is to ask the people for a mandate to revert to the system of arbitration that has been in operation in this State for the past 40 years.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and passed.

NATIVE WELFARE BILL

Assembly's Message

Message from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Council, subject to a further amendment, now considered.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment made by the Council is as follows:—

Clause 20.

Page 11, line 25—Insert after the word "Department" the passage, "or a member of either House of the Federal or State Parliaments".

The further amendment made by the Assembly is as follows:—

Substitute for the words, "the Federal or State Parliaments", the passage, "Parliament of this State, or any senator or member elected to represent this State in the Parliament of the Commonwealth".

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I move—

That the further amendment made by the Legislative Assembly be agreed to.

Members will recall that the amendment moved by Mr. Strickland made it possible for both State and Commonwealth members of Parliament to have the right to enter a native reserve. The Minister for Native Welfare, by this amendment, has now suggested that it be restricted to State members of Parliament, and those Commonwealth members of Parliament who represent electorates in this State. However, this will still not prevent any Commonwealth member of Parliament who represents an Eastern States' electorate from entering any native reserve if he holds the necessary permit.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: The situation which will be created by this further amendment from the Legislative Assembly needs further thought. It would be an indignity of the highest order if the Prime Minister came to Western Australia on an official visit, and during the course of a conducted tour, on expressing a wish to visit a native reserve, was told he would first have to produce a permit before being allowed to enter such reserve. That would apply not only to the Prime Minister, but also to his deputy; and, in fact, the amendment would embrace all members in the Commonwealth Parliament who represent electorates outside Western Australia.

A principle is involved, it being that members of Parliament should have the right to enter native reserves because of the office they hold. It is an indignity to a Federal member of Parliament, who is able to walk into any of the world-wide companies without challenge, and speak with aplomb before the United Nations, and who is accepted as a world authority on issues connected with the British Empire, that he should be prevented from entering a native reserve in Western Australia if he does not have a permit. Such a member of Parliament would be the present Prime Minister.

Members of all Parliaments of Australia should have an unfettered right to enter our native reserves to enable them to observe and examine conditions for themselves, or to enlarge their knowledge. With the Constitution of Australia being as it is, who should have a greater right to enter the native reserves in Western Australia than members of the Federal Cabinet? These people should be welcomed in this State, and should be given an unrestricted right to enter our native reserves, if they wish to do so, for the purpose of assisting this State in dealing with the native question. For that reason the amendment should be insisted on.

The Hon. J. MURRAY: When Mr. Strickland moved the amendment originally I was in some doubt as to the necessity for it. I thought it was a trivial amendment to an important Bill, but subsequently the amendment was agreed to by this Chamber, and the matter took on a different aspect. This House has decided that all members of Parliament in Australia should have the right to enter the native reserves in Western Australia.

The Minister in charge of the Bill in another place seeks to prune the amendment, and to restrict the right of entry to State or Federal members of Parliament representing electorates or provinces in Western Australia, thereby excluding the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister and other Federal Cabinet Ministers. For that reason this Chamber should insist on the amendment.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Quite a number of missions are established on native reserves. If all members of Parliament in

Australia are to have the right of entry without a permit, the position will be left wide open, because there are hundreds of members of Parliament in this country. They could all go on to native reserves without the need to obtain a permit, and without the knowledge of the department.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is not quite the position.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The amendment made by us would have that effect, because it would enable all members of Parliament in Australia to enter our native reserves, without a permit. In the past, not even the Prime Minister has been permitted to enter a native reserve without obtaining a permit.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: He should be welcome.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Under the Act he has no right to enter without a permit.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: That is a disgrace.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not think it is. I am sure no officer in this State would prevent the Prime Minister from entering a native reserve; but not all members of Parliament are Prime Ministers or Leaders of the Opposition. The further amendment made by the Assembly is designed to protect the native population living on reserves.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: In my opinion no member of Parliament should be fettered in his search for knowledge, and for that reason they should have the right to enter our native reserves without restriction.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They could obtain a permit.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: A member of Parliament does not have to obtain a permit in other similar cases. Earlier this year when I was in Wyndham, a Federal member of Parliament (Mr. Wentworth) arrived in town. He went on to the native reserve nearby, but I am sure he did not have a permit. Nobody should deny him the opportunity to do that, because he went there to seek information. He should not be required to seek a permit before entering. Members of Parliament should be given the right to see the conditions in their raw state. They should be able to enter of their own accord, and not on conducted tours.

We should not deny members of Parliament from the other States this right, otherwise they would think we had something to hide. The amendment was made by the Council in complete unanimity; and it was made in the best interests of democracy, and on the basis of goodwill, for the public's edification. For those reasons I hope members will insist on the amendment.

The Minister in another place appears to be supersensitive on this issue and he seeks to discriminate between members of Parliament representing electorates of Western Australia, and those representing electorates in the other States.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I would like the Minister to inform me if there are places in Western Australia into which the Prime Minister cannot go without a permit?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That has been the law for a long time.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That is a fact. There are such places.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I am truly amazed at the situation.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Can the Minister give me some information about the visit to Western Australia of the Select Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament which inquired into native welfare? I understand the members of that committee visited the native reserves and missions in Queensland, the Northern Territory, and Western Australia. I know personally that those members did enter the native reserves in the south-west of this State. I would like the Minister to tell me whether they had to obtain permits for that purpose. If they did not obtain permits, was it right for them to do so?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The amendment made by the Council will not result in a mad rush by hundreds of people to visit the native reserves in this State. The amendment proposes to give a right of entry to people who have an interest in the welfare of this country and in the betterment of the native population.

In actual fact, this amendment will not give an unrestricted right of entry. I would assume that notice would be sent to the mission or to the authority in charge of the native reserve, where some particular feature is to be examined and investigated by a member of Parliament who proposes to enter the reserve. No doubt he would set out a convenient date, and that is the normal approach in such a matter when a person has a right of entry. He might desire to visit the Lombadina Mission south of Cape Leveque; or the Beagle Bay Mission, where the altar of the church is made of pearl shell; or Kununurra, where the Trappist monks have done such a remarkable job; or Forest River; or any other mission. There may be different tribes, different aspects, or different features; but those people who are interested will make the approach in the right and decent fashion, just as they would if they were visiting an area of a reserve in the south-west.

If this is passed, members are not going to crowd into the south-west or on to a native reserve out of curiosity. If they wish to see a particular feature, they

will first ask the member for the district. I do not agree with the Minister, and I hope we will insist on the amendment as it left the Chamber.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: When the Federal Select Committee was set up, the Federal Government wrote to the Native Welfare Department in Western Australia. However, I am sure that a Select Committee of the Federal Government would have the right to go in, anyway. I appreciated, in the first instance, that there was merit in Mr. Strickland's amendment. However, another place decided on certain things, and it is my job, as Minister, to convey its decision. It is the department's intention to make sure that none of the natives are exploited. There could be instances where exploitation could take place as a result of parties of people visiting these areas. The department would like to ensure that any member of the Federal Parliament, or of the Parliaments of other States, should first obtain a permit before they entered these areas.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I am quite sure that the department would know, through its representatives, who was entering a particular area. If a party arrived by plane in a small township—even if the party consisted of humble back-benchers of a State Parliament—its arrival would be known by virtue of the arrangements which had been made for that party. Its arrival would be known to the police and to the protector who, in most cases, is stationed within the precincts of a native area. In 99 cases out of 100 he would be there to welcome the political identities who were visiting his area.

The probability of a political party visiting an area and inducing something bad among the population of a reserve is so completely negligible as to be hardly worth mentioning. The visitors would be on a conducted tour; they would not be walking around on their own. They would be conducted around by the resident officer of the area. We could observe all the courtesies necessary to the Government officer in charge, but it is the prerogative and right of a member of Parliament of Western Australia, of another State, or of the Commonwealth Parliament, to walk on to these areas with complete freedom.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: The only merit I can see in the further amendment made by the Legislative Assembly is that it points out that we were rather inelegant in our drafting of the amendments. In any Statute the Parliament of the Commonwealth is referred to as such; but we have referred to it as being the Federal Parliament. The wording of the Assembly's amendment is more correct than ours; but so far as the principle is concerned, I agree with the amendment made by the Council.

Question put and negatived; the Assembly's further amendment not agreed to.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I move—

That the Council's amendment be insisted upon.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment insisted upon.

Report, etc.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

A committee consisting of the The Hon. W. F. Willesee, The Hon. H. K. Watson, and The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) drew up reasons for not agreeing to the Assembly's further amendment.

Reasons adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

ADMINISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East)
[8.42 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This is a very short Bill, which proposes to amend sections 55 and 57 of the Administration Act. Section 55 provides—

In all cases where a person dies leaving property not exceeding one thousand and five hundred pounds in value, application for probate or administration may be made direct to the Master; or if the fixed abode of the deceased at the time of his death has been more than fifty miles from Perth, then to the district agent for the Master nearest to such place of abode.

The intention of that section is to assist the beneficiaries of small estates; to assist, in the majority of cases, the widow whose husband has died leaving a relatively small estate.

In such cases the widow, instead of going through the ordinary routine of consulting a solicitor, or dealing with the application for probate, or letters of administration herself, can hand the matter direct to the Master or, if she resides more than 50 miles from Perth, to the clerk of courts. It is proposed to increase the amount to £2,500.

I think members will appreciate the fact that monetary values have altered in recent years, and that a house which some years ago was worth only £1,500 is now, in the majority of cases, worth considerably more.

The proposal in the Bill, therefore, is to alter that figure of £1,500 to £2,500. Its sole purpose is to assist the poorer class of person who normally should be assisted to avoid heavy expense in connection with such application. The amendment to section 57 is consequential.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Justice) [8.46 p.m.]: Having heard the explanation, I concur.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. E. M. Heenan, and passed.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Order Discharged

Order discharged from the notice paper, on motion by The Hon. N. E. Baxter.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from an earlier stage of the sitting, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (West) [8.49 p.m.]: I do not think anybody could be happy with this Bill. I think it is a damp squib. That is about the only way I can adequately describe it. Over the years the Labor Party has attempted to amend the Workers' Compensation Act in order to bring about a bit of justice to the workers so that they would be in line with workers in the other States of Australia. However, this small Bill has practically nothing in it. There are several consequential amendments in the measure which do not alter the position at all; and the only portions that are of any consequence are those dealing with medical and hospital fees, where there will be very small increases afforded to the injured party.

It has been the object of my party over the years to have these sums of money completely eliminated from the first schedule of the Workers' Compensation Act so that the workers can have the necessary medical treatment that befits the accident they have suffered in the course of their employment. As the Minister said in his speech to the House, this measure raises one amount from £150 to £200, and the other from £250 to £325.

In the main, those amounts are adequate to meet individual cases, but we run up against the abnormal or the extreme case where a person is seriously injured. I am dealing with one of those cases at the present time, where a man has been in hospital for eleven months and this small

increase in fees will not meet his medical fees by a long way. His bill will run into thousands of pounds; and even when he is discharged from hospital he will be only 50 per cent. well. That would be the maximum. He will be just alive and that is all. It is quite evident that this is the maximum the Government is prepared to offer.

The Government will be giving nothing away. Insurance companies build multi-storied buildings at the expense of the employers who pay the premiums to cover their workers. If this amount were lifted, it would mean an increased charge on the insurance companies, and there would be no increase on individual employers. We would then have a situation where a person could have his full hospitalisation; and any compensation awarded to him would not be subject to an excess of hospital expenses, as provided in the Act. As I previously mentioned—and I could go back many years—in 1960 in another place, Mr. W. Hegney moved a motion which I will read to the House, because to follow up my argument it will be necessary for members to have cognisance of it and the events that followed. On page 1124 of *Hansard* dated the 14th September, 1960, Mr. Craig, the then member for Toodyay, spoke on the following motion which had been moved by Mr. W. Hegney:—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should introduce during the present session of Parliament appropriate and necessary amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act, including among others, the following:—

- (1) Removal of limit on hospital and medical expenses.
- (2) Removal of restriction of three years in the matter of claiming compensation for industrial diseases.
- (3) Insurance cover to be provided for workers travelling to and from place of residence and place of employment.
- (4) Substantial increases in compensation and other payments referred to in the Act (including schedules).
- (5) The provision of more reasonable treatment for incapacitated workers in certain circumstances.

This motion caused quite a lot of debate in the House; and, as a result of that debate, Mr. Craig, who is now the Minister for Police, I would say acting on behalf of the Government, moved an amendment to that motion. The amendment reads as follows:—

This House notes with satisfaction the Government's intention to introduce important amendments to the

Workers' Compensation Act with the object of providing improved conditions for workers injured by accident (as defined by the Act) arising out of or in the course of their employment, without imposing excessive costs upon industry.

That amendment was carried by the House.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What was the date of it, please?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It was the 14th September, on page 1125 of the 1960 *Hansard*, volume 1. During the following session of Parliament the Government brought down amendments dealing with the mining industry. These gave some relief to people suffering from silicosis, but they were not as comprehensive as we would have liked. However, they went part of the way.

I am now going to refer back to the 12th September, 1962, page 959 of *Hansard*, volume 1, when Mr. W. Hegney again introduced the same motion dealing with workers' compensation. In reply to this particular debate, Mr. Wild, the Minister responsible for the Workers' Compensation Act, among other things said this—

I draw the attention of the House to two points which he made: One is the increase in medical benefits, and the other is the payment of compensation to the worker who is injured when travelling to and from work. Both those points require a considerable amount of thought, and I can assure the honourable member and the House that it is my intention to do something. It is no good the member for Maylands muttering under his breath.

It then goes on to deal with whatever they were muttering under their breaths. On the same page of *Hansard*. Mr. Wild continued—

Mr. WILD: I want to assure the member for Bayswater—irrespective of what he may or may not have been saying—and the House that it is my intention to go into this matter very carefully, and those two particular points are going to be reviewed. I can assure the honourable member that whilst I am not going to do anything about the matter this session, one of the earliest Bills to be introduced into this Parliament next session will be the Workers' Compensation Bill, after I have given consideration to lifting in some way the medical expenses which are now allowed, and to the question of the to-and-from-work provision.

We know that the last one I mentioned has been banded all over the place. We hear of the man who does not go straight home from work, but who calls in at the tiddley house, and

has a few. He deviates instead of taking a direct route home I would say that there is every possibility that when I introduce a measure during the next session of Parliament some consideration will be given to both points which he raised.

Those are the Minister's own words. He said that one of the first Bills to be introduced this session would deal with workers' compensation; and we are getting it on the second last day of the session. He has carried out half of his promise. He has given consideration to medical expenses and hospital expenses; but there is no coverage for the worker who meets with an accident while he proceeds to or from his home and his place of work in a direct line.

That insurance safeguard is given to a worker and to his family in the majority of the States of Australia, and why should Western Australia be completely out of line? We hear a lot about how much we appreciate the worker, but when we come down to hard facts as to what the worker is entitled to, then we hear very little. The argument might be put up that the worker should take out his own policy. A lot of money is paid out annually in subsidies; and a lot of that money has come from the workers by way of direct or indirect taxation. Subsidies are paid to people in agricultural, pastoral, and primary industries, but when it comes down to a question of safeguarding the worker and his family, we do little or nothing. If the employers are too mean to do anything about the matter, why does not the Government subsidise it and give every person adequate coverage?

I would have to be convinced that this is the responsibility of the worker. If it is the responsibility of the worker to take out an insurance policy, then why has that line of action not been followed by the other States? We are the only State out of line. I have circulated amendments to give effect to the worker being covered by insurance to and from his place of employment. Another amendment which has been circulated is one to provide that when a person goes on compensation he will be entitled to 66½ per cent. of his wages. A worker could be incapacitated for life. If he loses his life, his widow could claim the full amount; but a worker could be physically wrecked, or crippled, or—if I could use an extravagant word—become a burden on his wife and family. He might have become incapacitated through no fault of his own, yet he cannot receive the full amount.

I support the Bill with little pleasure. It would be ridiculous for us not to clutch at any straw that is offered. Over the years any easement which has come before the House in connection with workers' compensation has either been heavily reduced or thrown out of the window.

I feel sure that these amending clauses will go through, meagre as they are. But is it a reflection on the Government when, on the 12th September, 1962, we had a promise that one of the first Bills to be introduced this year would be a workers' compensation Bill, and we get that Bill on the second last day of the session.

I support the measure, but I sincerely trust that the Minister will give consideration to my proposed amendments. I knew that Parliament would not finish today, and that I could place my amendments on the notice paper. But in order to give the Minister time to consider the amendments, I had them circulated so that I would not be accused of pulling something out of the hat at the last moment. I support the Bill very reluctantly.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am not complaining about your amendments being placed before me in the way that they have.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [9.8 p.m.]: This Bill contains only short passages, but there are one or two matters about which I wish to speak. There is a possible loophole in the schedule to the Act which I think should be closed. The following appears in the schedule:—

... if a worker has been disabled by reason of any such accident or accidents and any surgical appliance or artificial limb can be procured to relieve such disablement he shall be entitled to the cost of such appliance or artificial limb. Provided that any artificial limb shall be in accordance with the standards laid down by the Commonwealth artificial limb factory.

There should be some provision for the replacement of a limb. If a man loses a leg and he has an artificial limb, he does not keep that one prosthesis for the rest of his life. It appears that provision is made for a limb to be provided at the time of the accident; but I think it is possible that a man might want a second prosthesis at some time. There are always changes that occur. A stump may alter. Also, the first artificial limb does not always fit properly. I think there should be an assurance that when an artificial limb is fitted, the limb should fit properly and be replaced later on by another limb, if necessary, on the advice of an orthopaedic surgeon. I do not think the provision makes it clear that a man can have an artificial limb replaced.

I have seen some of those people who have lost limbs in motor accidents; and I have seen men who have lost their limbs as a result of diseased arteries. Artificial limbs always require a great deal of fitting, and it is quite possible that one would have to produce a second limb before the fitting was finalised, in order to allow the man normal means of progress. I think we

should have a complete look at this question of prosthesis. It might be necessary to look into the matter of artificial teeth and artificial eyes. None of us who have to have artificial teeth are satisfied to have one plate for an indefinite period of years. Our mouths alter, our gums shrink, and we sometimes lose weight. If a person were injured and his teeth had to be extracted and replaced with an artificial set, then I think he should be covered.

I would remind the Minister of my attempt a few years ago to insert certain words in paragraph (c) on page 78. My amendments concerned medical and hospital costs. In some cases when the money available for medical care ran out, the persons concerned were admitted to Royal Perth Hospital. But this hospital still continues to render an account to those persons, and I do not know whether that comes out of the total amount paid by way of compensation. This question could be reviewed, and I think the Minister could take into his confidence those members who are acquainted with this particular problem of workers' compensation.

The Hon. R. Thompson: You have hit the nail on the head; that has been lacking in the past.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I support the Bill, but I still cling to the idea that the payment of compensation in a lump sum is not an adequate means of compensation. We will have to get the motor vehicle insurance trust, workers' compensation, and other organisations which pay lump sums down to a common basis.

It seems extraordinary that an individual who is badly hurt or badly affected in a motor vehicle accident can draw anything up to £25,000 and can then virtually live on the interest from that money. He and his family are often very much better off because the breadwinner was injured. I do not think that was ever intended, but that situation is creeping on us in cases where large payments are made in a lump sum. I do not begrudge for one moment the individuals concerned, but I think it would be much better to pay a pension. As I said previously, I think contributions should be made by the Government, the employers, and the employees. There could be a fund which could even look after the family and see that the children of the injured worker, or deceased worker, were given such education as they were capable of receiving. I feel a full inquiry into the method of compensation is long overdue. We should try to get national insurance, but that would be like previous attempts to alter the franchise of this House. There should be a full scale inquiry, not only on this Bill, but on all Bills which provide compensation for injured persons.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I agree with your views.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: That is the only way it can be handled. I cannot imagine for one moment that £3,400 would adequately compensate a widow for the loss of her husband.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The same woman could get up to £25,000 if her husband was injured in a motorcar accident.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: That is right. If the man was killed by a motorcar it would be a very different story. The whole thing is out of proportion, and the Government should have another look at it.

I am in favour of this Bill passing at the moment, because I believe that injured workers require this additional money to meet the rising costs of hospitals. I do not think one can get a hospital bed very much under £3 3s. or £4 4s. a day. The average price is about £20 a week at St. John of God Hospital. An injured worker receives benefits for 26 weeks only and it is essential that he get this extra amount.

I still do not think that we compensate people in the correct manner, and if I am still here next year I will try to introduce into this House a measure whereby thought can be given to this matter of compensation.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [9.20 p.m.]: As has already been said, this is a small Bill which we must accept. While on this matter of workers' compensation I wish to say that I agree with Dr. Hislop that the matter needs looking into very deeply. The whole concept of insurance paid to injured workers should be examined. As Dr. Hislop has said, under workers' compensation when a man is killed his wife receives £3,400, but if the man is killed in a motor vehicle accident his wife could receive up to £25,000. That is a ridiculous position, and I think every member in this House will agree with me.

A small matter which we may be able to deal with next year, and one which I suggest the Government should investigate, relates to a worker who is injured and after receiving treatment is discharged and told to seek a light job. Such a worker may have been a labourer engaged in heavy industry and he has to try to find a suitable light job. His compensation payments cease—except in cases where a lump sum may have been granted. However, that sum may be only £125 or £150. The worker might be of the opinion that he is entitled to a larger lump sum for compensation and he has to make an appeal. While the appeal is pending the worker has to try to find a job in light industry.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Have you ever seen a light job?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: A man of the type I have mentioned is not suited to a light job and the result is that he is very often out of work indefinitely. As

Dr. Hislop said, "Have you ever seen a light job?" There are very few light jobs suitable for a man with a back injury.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Very few.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Yet that man could be told by his doctor that he is not suitable for heavy work and has to get a light job. Even though the man may have been granted £125 or £150 compensation for his injury, he does not receive any of that money if he appeals. He cannot get a penny until such time as the appeal has been heard and concluded. In the meantime he and his family have to live. I believe that in cases such as this, provision should be made for the man to receive payments, at least until the £125 or £150 has been exhausted. No-one will lose and by this means many families could be assisted. I know of these cases where people have not a penny. Consideration should be given to this matter early in the next session of Parliament.

THE HON. D. P. DELLAR (North-East) [9.24 p.m.]: I rise because I am—

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Very unhappy.

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: —very disappointed. Unhappy, as Mr. Lavery interjected, is not the right word. I am disappointed that we should have a Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Act brought before us during the last few days of the session. This Bill will affect the working people right throughout Western Australia.

This is my first session in this House, and I have heard quoted many times what is happening in other States. Yet when we have a Bill relating to compensation for working people in Western Australia, there is no mention of other States. There is no mention of keeping in line and doing what they do. The workers' compensation in other States is far different from ours, and I think that the promises which were made in this Parliament at the end of last session, in another place, should have been fulfilled. As Mr. Ron Thompson has said, the Minister has met some of his promises, but very few. This Bill deals with hospital and medical allowances. I think that if a worker sells his labour, he is entitled to full compensation—full hospital and medical benefits whilst injured, and compensation while recovering from his injury.

Before becoming a member of Parliament, I was a foreman on the mines. I know of a man who was working there who had all the courage which a man could possibly possess. This man had an unfortunate accident which injured his leg. As he had six kiddies he just could not afford to stay in hospital and be properly treated. He could not get in a fit condition to return to work, only because his medical and hospital allowances had cut out. For two years that man kept

returning to work but ending up back in hospital with recurrences of his injury. Eventually, he lost his leg. I say that if this man has been in the position of having all his expenses met, he could have received the right treatment from the start and he would still have had his leg. I am not reflecting on the medical profession. It was purely and simply that the man had six kiddies to look after, and could not afford to stay in hospital. I repeat: Any man who sells his labour should be fully compensated whilst off work suffering from an injury.

I was very interested in the remarks of Dr. Hislop this evening and I hope he will be with us next session and will be able to carry out his ideas.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: He has been bringing them forward for several years, but has not been getting any support.

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: If a man is seriously injured in his work and loses his life, his life is worth only £3,400, yet if he walks across the road and is knocked over and killed, his life is worth up to £25,000. I think that is out of proportion, and, in some cases, ridiculous. Under present day conditions, how long could a widow rear a family and keep a home on £3,400?

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Two years at the maximum.

The Hon. D. P. DELLAR: I agree it is not always wise to pay a lump sum entitlement to a widow, whether it be £3,400, or £20,000. I think the pension system, an annuity, or some similar method of payment for the education of the children would be more satisfactory. Time and time again, without any exaggeration, during my past employment as a foreman on the mines, I have had men approach me with a certificate from the doctor certifying that they were only suitable for light work. I can assure the members of this House that there is very little light work available for an unskilled man who works with his hands.

If such a worker were paid sufficient compensation to enable him to be off work for a time in order to regain his health and strength, it would be more satisfactory to everyone concerned. However, we must be thankful for the small mercies in this Bill, and although I am greatly disappointed with the measure, I will have to support it. I can only hope that we will be dealing with a Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Act next session which will be more far reaching in its effect than this one. I hope it will be a measure which will allow a widow and her children to exist without any threat of starvation. I support the Bill.

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) (9.33 p.m.): In my estimation the Workers' Compensation Act is among the most important of our Statutes. There have been

very few amendments to this Act in recent years. By that I mean there have been no amendments of any consequence or of any worth-while character, or amendments that tend to depart from the existing system as a result of present day trends.

Like other members, I am greatly disappointed with the contents of this brief, almost inconsequential, proposal. I wish that Dr. Hislop would, tonight or tomorrow, move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, and that perhaps some recommendations could be made to the Government, because it seems to be quite infertile of any bright ideas on this all-important matter. The Minister who compiled the Bill must have been extremely busy throughout the year when he brings forth such disappointing and brief proposals as are contained in these two amendments, which will have the effect of only increasing the amount payable to a worker for medical expenses from £150 to £200, and the payment to a worker for hospital expenses from £250 to £325.

The first schedule is most important because it prescribes the amounts of compensation which are awarded in the most serious cases. That is, it provides the amount of compensation to be paid to a widow upon the death of a worker, or to a worker who has been seriously injured. I do not know what actuated the Minister who compiled this Bill in submitting the alterations which it contains. Obviously, he has been forced to come to the conclusion that the £150 which now applies is no longer adequate and should be increased to £200; likewise that the other item of £200 is inadequate and should now be increased to £325.

If that is the reasoning he intended to apply, it seems remarkable to me that he has not amended the figure of £3,000 awarded to the widow of a worker who was fatally injured. That figure still remains in the Act and no alteration to it is proposed in this Bill. On a *pro rata* basis, and in all fairness, it likewise should have been increased in the same manner as the medical and hospital expenses are to be increased.

For years past, as other speakers have pointed out, in several of the Eastern States, what we call the to-and-from clause has been adopted as a principle of workers' compensation legislation, and apparently that provision is working satisfactorily. It is a real benefit to workers and their dependants.

If a worker is injured while working on a mine he receives compensation. If, unfortunately, he is killed by working on a mine, his widow and dependants receive compensation. But if a worker is injured on his way home from his place of employment, through no fault of his own, he is not entitled to any compensation and if he is killed on his way home from his work his widow and children receive nothing. The position is that if

he were killed his widow would still have to continue to pay the rent for the house she occupies and pay for the food and clothing required for the children. Yet those in charge of the Workers' Compensation Act do nothing about this state of affairs. I do not think that is sensible in the year 1963. By no means do I think it is just and reasonable, and it is high time, as Dr. Hislop has pointed out, that we had a good look at this Act to have it completely overhauled and make it more in keeping with present day standards of justice and fair treatment.

It is disappointing to goldfields' members that apparently the committee which the Minister appointed to investigate and report on all aspects of miners' silicosis and pneumoconiosis has not been able to submit its report in time so that amendments could be incorporated in this Bill in line with its findings. I am not critical of the Minister in that regard, because I am sure that the delay in the submission of this report is entirely beyond his control; and we goldfields' members are grateful that he had this committee appointed. I am sure, when its report is submitted, it will receive sympathetic consideration by him.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I have not received the report as yet.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: No, and I was hoping that we could have done something about it in this session of Parliament, but apparently the Minister cannot make any move as a result of its findings until next year. At least we have done our best. I am extremely disappointed over this small measure. I do not think it is in keeping with what this House would have liked the Government to submit. Most of us in this House would have liked the Government to submit a more comprehensive and far reaching proposal than that which is contained in this Bill. My present intention is to express my disapproval by voting against the second reading of this Bill, although I might be misunderstood if I do that. The handout proposed by the Bill is so little and so inconsequential it could almost be refused in the hope of expressing, in a forthright manner, our disappointment over such a minor proposal.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I know a number of workers who would disagree with you.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I doubt whether they would. It would be a gesture of disapproval at the inadequacy of the measure; and the fact that, perhaps, I was pilloried for voting against the proposal would highlight my views. However, I will give that a second thought. Nevertheless, I hope that Mr. Ron Thompson or Dr. Hislop may, perhaps, do something towards moving for a Select Committee to inquire into this question.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Shortly we will have Select Committees for all sorts of things.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: It looks as if the Government is not prepared to give this matter much consideration. If this measure is the best proposition the Government can bring forward to amend the Workers' Compensation Act, then it is about time members set out to make amendments themselves. The inadequacy of this measure would justify such a step.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [9.45 p.m.]: I propose that the Committee stage of this Bill be taken at the next sitting of the House. With that in view I ask that the Bill be read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [9.46 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 2.30 p.m. tomorrow (Friday).

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.47 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 5th December, 1963

FIRST SITTING

(See page 3741 for Second Sitting)

CONTENTS

	Page
ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE	3741
ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL	3741
ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1963-64— Committee of Supply— Votes and Items Discussed	3719
BILLS— Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill—Council's Amendments	3719
Constitution Acts Amendment Bill (No. 2)—Receipt; 1r.	3741
MOTION— Metropolitan Region Development—Swan River Foreshore Reclamation— Motion	3717
Ruled Out	3718