

Report

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Sir David Brand (Treasurer), and transmitted to the Council.

BILLS (5): RETURNED

1. Administration Act Amendment Bill.
2. Death Duties (Taxing) Act Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

3. Stock (Brands and Movement) Bill.
Bill returned from the Council with amendments.
4. Acts Amendment (Superannuation and Pensions) Bill.
5. Alumina Refinery (Bunbury) Agreement Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

**ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE:
SPECIAL**

SIR DAVID BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [12.42 a.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 11 a.m. today (Thursday).

The **SPEAKER**: Before I put the motion, I wish to make the same announcement that I made last week. Questions will not be taken until a convenient time after lunch today.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 12.43 a.m. (Thursday)

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 26th November, 1970

The **PRESIDENT** (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 11.00 a.m.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise read prayers.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE**FLORA AND FAUNA**

*Dryandra and Tuttaning Reserves:
Conservation*

The Hon. J. DOLAN, to the Minister for Mines:

With reference to the Alumina Refinery (Bunbury) Agreement—

- (1) Did the Minister for Industrial Development receive a deputation yesterday from a group of conservationists, including Dr. Ride?

- (2) Arising from their submissions did the Minister agree to negotiate discussions with the principals of Alwest Pty. Limited with a view to ensuring protection for the fauna and flora in the Dryandra and Tuttaning Reserves?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) and (2) There is in the paper this morning some brief mention of this matter.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I did not see anything in the paper.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is my understanding that the Minister for Industrial Development did meet with certain people, but I am not aware what was discussed at the meeting. As members will recall, when replying to the second reading debate last night I mentioned that the company's principals had met with Mr. MacKinnon in his capacity as Minister for physical environment. I will, however, ask the Minister for Industrial Development what took place and advise Mr. Dolan later.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Thank you.

**TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
ACT AMENDMENT BILL****Second Reading**

Debate resumed from the 25th November.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [11.07 a.m.]: It has been the stated policy of this Government to institute a town planning appeals tribunal. This has also been the policy of my own party. The measure we have before us, however, while having the image, does not possess the substance of this concept. It is for this reason I oppose the Bill.

There are two different proposals within the measure: one is for the establishment of a town planning court, and the other is for the setting up of a town planning committee. The second of these concepts is included in the provisions of the Act. There is a right of appeal to the Minister who also has the right to appoint persons to assist him.

On a previous occasion the Minister expressed his thoughts at some length in this direction. The proposals as they are embodied in the parent Act provide little scope for the court to operate. A person who wishes to approach the court must first give notice of his intention to the Minister who, within 14 days, may lodge objections to this on the ground that it might conflict with town planning principles.

If the Governor agrees with the Minister's recommendation then the appeal cannot progress in the court. It would seem, therefore, that the avenues available for people to approach the court, or even for the court to operate at all, are extremely limited.

Most people would consider that an approach to the court would be a more costly avenue to pursue and they would tend to make their appeals direct to the Minister. In this way the measure is rather half-hearted, and I even go so far as to say it is not a genuine attempt to set up a town planning tribunal. In fact, I would say the present measure seeks to deny that process and the appeals which will be made to the Minister and the town planning committee will be such that the appeal court will not be used.

We could say that this Bill brings before Parliament a conflict which exists in the Cabinet itself, and because of that I feel the correct thing has not been done. It would have been better had the introduction of the Bill been delayed until the conflict had been resolved. This position should not be made permanent within the legislation.

As I have already said, it was within the 1968 policy platform of this Government that a town planning tribunal should be set up. We know from statements which appeared in the Press after the Minister had made an overseas tour that he considered the arrangements which we already have were the best of any he had seen anywhere in the world. I would say that is probably a complacent view.

There have been serious objections to the way in which the appeal system has been operating. There was a demand for a change to be made, and that demand was recognised by the Premier when he stated that during the life of this Parliament he would bring forward a Bill to institute a tribunal. We are now in the last day of this Parliament and the measure is now before us. According to statements made in the other House it is very hastily drafted legislation, and that was admitted by the Minister handling the Bill in another place. After a period of three years, hastily drafted legislation has been brought to this House on the last day of sitting.

The Minister must believe that the decisions he makes are the best, based on sound town planning principles. Surely that should be the basis of his decisions and yet I would instance one case which occurred in my own district which was not based on sound town planning principles. The Minister made a decision which deprived the residents of Wembley Downs of their reasonable needs in relation to open space. In that case a certain party was absolved from conforming with the requirements of the Act.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: This House did not agree with the honourable member's thoughts on that matter.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: That may be so, but had there been a court of appeal, or a tribunal at that time, perhaps the decision might have been based on sound town planning principles.

I repeat: the Bill before us gives the image of what is proposed, but not the substance. New section 42 (4) (b) provides that the Minister can refuse appeal to a court. Where a person is denied the right to go to court the way is left open for the person to appeal to the Minister, but that appeal will follow a recommendation made by the Minister. That recommendation would have been that the case was against sound town planning principles. So I ask: How far would an appellant get in an appeal to the Minister in those circumstances? Will the Minister admit that the appellant was right and he was wrong on the first occasion, and that his objections were not based on sound town planning principles? Where is the substance in this procedure? If this measure is a genuine attempt to overcome the difficulties which have arisen why not let a case proceed to the court where a decision could be made based on sound town planning principles?

New section 43 (2) provides that the court is to consist of the president and two other people appointed because of their qualifications and experience in dealing with particular cases. However, one party can object to the appointee of the other party and if that objection is upheld that appointee will not be able to sit on the court. The Bill does not state how often that can be done, but I assume it can be done once only.

It seems wrong that a court should be set up in that way. Instead of building up a court which is experienced in certain matters, it will be a court which can change from case to case. We will not get a group of men with accumulated experience who will be able to judge the merits or demerits of a case which is brought forward.

In general terms, those are the grounds on which I must oppose the legislation. The provisions of the Bill will not be effective, because the ordinary person who has an objection or a complaint will feel that the court will be the more costly procedure and he will tend to appeal directly to the Minister for a decision. In the case where the appeal is made direct to the court then the Minister will have the right to object to that case proceeding in the court on the ground that it is against the public interest, or against the principles of sound town planning. In this case, persons who feel aggrieved appear to have no avenue of appeal at all. They cannot go to the court. If the Minister has already stated his objections, they

have no right of appeal at all, in effect. I hope members of this Chamber will support me in opposing this legislation.

THE HON. J. HEITMAN (Upper West) [11.21 a.m.]: I intend to support the legislation, not because I like it entirely but because I think it is a progressive step to allow an appeal to a court, as opposed to an appeal to the Minister. In the past, appeals to the Minister, especially in connection with country subdivisions, have taken a very long time. I can cite one case of two farmers near Lancelin. One of them had a peculiarly shaped farm, and he and his neighbour decided to cut a portion off that farm and square up the two farms. Permission to do this was refused by the Town Planning Board on the ground that it would not be a viable subdivision, although it had been agreed to by the two farmers concerned.

I know of someone at Gnowangerup who found himself faced with heavy probate and he decided to sell some land to an adjoining landholder. This application was held up for two years and eventually agreed to. In my opinion, the Town Planning Board should not have jurisdiction to this extent in country areas. Perhaps propositions for subdivisions are sent onto the Department of Agriculture for decision as to whether they are viable or economic subdivisions, but no-one would know this better than the farmers who want to make the subdivision and the exchange of land.

I realise that in the city town planning is very necessary from the point of view of looking far enough ahead to know whether subdivisions will coincide with the overall planning of an area, but I do not think the Town Planning Board should have the same jurisdiction over country properties.

Another friend of mine wanted to subdivide, and the Minister eventually agreed to it, with the rider that the 1,000 acres to be subdivided should never at any time be again subdivided. In this instance, the seller had to accept \$20 an acre less on 2,500 acres, which meant that he virtually lost \$50,000 on the deal because of this rider.

I think the setting up of a court of appeal from the Minister's decision is a step in the right direction. I think the Minister is too busy to give sufficient time and consideration to many of the appeals that come before him. He said that he had rejected only about 43 per cent. of the appeals, but I have met some of the people concerned, who have felt that on many occasions cases have not been looked at in the right perspective, especially as regards subdivisions in country areas.

I do not see any occasion for a town planner to have the last say on the subdivision of a farm if the purchaser and seller are agreed that it would be an

economic subdivision. I am pleased to know that steps have been taken to allow appeals to be taken to a court. I think appeal to a court is the right procedure. When a subdivision does not make one iota of difference to district or town planning, I cannot see the necessity for an academic person to make a decision which, in my opinion, should be made by practical men who know the economics of farming, and so on. I support the Bill because I think it can be improved on over the years.

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [11.27 a.m.]: I, like everybody else in Western Australia, anxiously awaited the production of this Bill which we had been assured would be forthcoming. However, it does not measure up to what I had in mind, and some violent objections to the Bill have been expressed.

Yesterday morning I received by hand a letter from the Canning Shire Council, expressing the displeasure of the council with the Bill and asking me to take certain action in regard to it. The Bill was submitted to the Canning Shire Council in the form in which it was submitted to another place. The council considered the Bill at very short notice and made several observations, some of which I agree with. The concluding paragraph of this letter reads—

The Council seeks your support to its opposition to the provisions of this Bill and requests that you use your office to lodge its objections as stated above.

This same request has been made to other members of the State Parliament representing the Shire of Canning.

I do not think you would allow me, Mr. President, to read this letter in full, because it is two foolscap pages long. However, the council's belief—with which I agree—is that this Bill should provide for the setting up of an independent tribunal consisting of persons appointed by the Governor for their knowledge and experience in matters of town planning and the law relating to town planning. The letter further stated—

It has become an important feature of the administration of town planning to maintain consistency on appeal decisions based on accepted principles and the precedent of previous decisions.

With those remarks I entirely agree. I believe a town planning court, as proposed in this Bill, will not be consistent in its decisions. It will be a committee where one individual will be sitting as a member on one occasion, and another individual will be sitting as a member on another occasion.

For the life of me I cannot see how we will get consistent recommendations from a court of that nature. I do not suggest that the members of the court, whoever they may be, would not give an honest opinion. Nevertheless, every individual has his own ideas on a particular problem. From the point of view of establishing some consistency in the decisions that are made, the court should at least be a permanent one.

I agree with the Canning Shire Council that the alternative right of appeal should be to a tribunal. However, the Minister has brought forward a Bill to set up a court and at least this will provide another avenue of appeal and, reluctantly, I am prepared to go along with that proposition. I am one of those who believe that, in the majority of instances, an appeal to the Minister would bring about a just and proper decision. I do not believe that any alternative appeal, on any of the cases decided in the past, would necessarily have produced a different answer from that which was produced. On that matter I do not adopt a dogmatic attitude such as other people have done.

However, I believe an appellant should have another avenue of appeal because of the implications that can be placed on the act of appealing to the Minister, when for some reason or other the board has rejected an application. If a person does not obtain the decision he desires, the inference could always be drawn that he has not obtained complete justice. For that reason I think an alternative method of appeal should be agreed to by the Minister. As I have said, he has agreed to a court being constituted which will be a very costly arrangement to the appellant who appears before it.

The provision that really horrifies me is the fact that the Minister could, through Cabinet, prevent the appellant from appearing before the proposed court, if he so desires. This is another provision on which the Canning Shire has asked me to put forward some suggestions. I will not quote what the shire said in its letter, because I already have my own opinions on this aspect of the matter.

I believe that if the provisions of this Bill represent justice, my ideas have been misplaced. The passing of the measure will bring forth a situation whereby a person who has the choice of appealing to the Minister, or of appearing before the court, will have to notify the Minister of his intentions, and within 30 days the Governor may take steps to prevent him from taking this course.

The aggrieved person can elect to appeal to the Minister, but let us look at what would happen in such a situation. Firstly, the Minister would advise Cabinet to make a decision that, in its opinion, the board's opinion, or in the opinion of somebody

else, the proposal was contrary to sound town planning principles, and therefore the appellant could not appear before the court. I have no doubt that Cabinet, consisting of 12 men, would come forth with a decision that was right and just based on the information supplied to them, but that information would be supplied to them by the Minister who did not want the appeal to go forward.

The man who desires to make the appeal will not be able to make representations to Cabinet to ensure, when it does reach a decision to prevent him appearing before this costly court which we propose to set up, that at least he has received justice. To me that is a lopsided arrangement. The appellant would have absolutely no chance of obtaining a favourable decision if the Minister did not so desire, because he could put forward a case to Cabinet without the appellant having any opportunity to put all his facts before it. I repeat that I am horrified to be presented with a Bill that contains a provision such as this.

I have no alternative but to accept it, because we believe an alternative method of appeal should be provided, and at least the Bill will establish the principle that an alternative method of appeal should be available. At least in the future Parliament will sit again and perhaps some further amendments will be made to the legislation. I have no alternative but to support the Bill—

The Hon. R. Thompson: You may change your mind.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You could always say "No."

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am having enough difficulty now without trying to work out what other members are saying. I have no alternative but to support the second reading of the Bill. In my opinion it establishes the principle that an alternative avenue of appeal should be provided; it does that if it does not do anything else. It is a very lopsided alternative, but nevertheless it is an alternative.

I repeat myself when I say that I do not support new section 42 which will permit the Minister to convince Cabinet that an appellant should not be given the opportunity of this alternative method of appeal. I will support the second reading, but I am horrified that the measure has been presented in this form. Nevertheless, I repeat again that at least it does establish a principle.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan) [11.40 a.m.]: After studying the Bill I can agree only with new section 39 which reads—

(1) Subject to section forty-two of this Act; an appeal may be made to the Minister or to a Court but the

commencement of an appeal to one extinguishes any right of appeal to the other.

In putting this Bill before the Chamber that is the only provision in which the Government has shown its sincerity. I do not want to be unduly critical of the Minister for Town Planning. We know he holds strong views on town planning and probably I could not criticise him for some of the decisions he has arrived at following representations I have made to him. However, to be honest, in expressing an opinion on this legislation, it offers nothing.

Any aggrieved person who considered he should appeal to the proposed court would be wasting his money. That is what this legislation means, because he would have no chance in the world of winning his appeal; that would be the opinion of anyone who has studied what goes on in regard to town planning in Western Australia.

It is preposterous that the Bill should contain a provision to grant an overriding power to the Minister on any decision that may be made by the court, as is proposed to be set up by this Bill. If the proposed court makes a decision the Minister can, in the public interest, still raise an objection before Cabinet.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You are not reading the Bill correctly.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I can only read the provisions that are contained in the measure. Let me quote one of the provisions in it so that I may be clear on what it means. On page 5 of the Bill the following provision appears:—

Where the Minister objects, under subsection (3) of this section to a Court hearing the appeal—

- (a) the appeal shall not be further maintained until at least thirty days after the Minister so objects;
- (b) the Governor may, within thirty days after the Minister so objects, make a declaration that the appeal relates to matters which, being contrary to town planning principles, in general or in respect of land the subject of the appeal, would tend to prejudice the public interest and thereupon the appeal shall not be heard or determined by a Court;
- (c) if the Governor does not, within thirty days after the Minister so objects, make a declaration under paragraph (b) of this subsection, the appeal may be heard and determined by a Court.

What, in actual fact, does that mean? In this case the Governor is a figurehead, because Cabinet, with the will of the

Minister, becomes the Governor. I have never seen a Governor yet—either the present Governor or any other—go against a decision made by Cabinet in Executive Council. I do not think any member of this Chamber can recall—in my lifetime, anyhow—a Governor upsetting a Cabinet decision. So what does this provision in the Bill mean? Is it merely inserted in the Bill to honour a promise that was made, but which, in actual fact, is offering nothing?

If we are to have an appeal court it should be unfettered and have the right of determination. To constitute a court of appeal would cost a great deal of money. If any person asked for my advice, I know what I would tell him. People should forget about the court; they would save money by going before the Minister, because they would get the same answer. If the Minister advises the Governor to disallow the appeal, the case will not be heard. I do not think we should be fooled.

I agree with what Mr. Clive Griffiths has said. I think this legislation is an insult to Parliament and to the public; it is being introduced as a result of an election promise made nearly three years ago. The legislation offers nothing.

The points raised by Mr. Heitman were quite valid. I think there are a few slow learners in the department, when it comes to the framing of policy on the principles of town planning. I do not know how many times I have stood up in this House and said that the regional planning authority should be directed to permit the subdivision of land located along main roads, where the services already exist, rather than have the land tied up until it becomes profitable for developers to move into the area.

This aspect is to be the subject of appeals to the Minister. Let us take a market garden along Rockingham Road, comprising five to 10 acres; it is probable that the son of the family is working on the property and the daughter in an office. Later, when the son and daughter get married, they might want to build on the land, because the services are already established. They might make application to subdivide the land. The minimum area that is permitted to be set aside is 2½ acres, and the subdivision is subject to the approval of the Minister.

When a person decides to build a house on such land he has to make an application and forward a fee of \$2 together with copies of the plan to the Town Planning Board; and the board must refuse this application. So there is \$2 going down the drain. The application is then forwarded to the local authority, and its time is also wasted because it cannot agree to the application as the land is classified under the Act as rural land. The applicant is then advised of the result of his

application, and generally he seeks assistance from someone to make an appeal to the Minister.

In some cases the Minister upholds the appeal, but in other cases he does not. This is one of the drawbacks in regard to town planning policy. We are depriving people of the right to use their own land, although such use does not affect the regional scheme in any shape or form. That is why appeals are bogged down and why members of the public become dissatisfied with the present method of appeals and with the Minister's decisions. They are the ones who are suffering. For those reasons I cannot support the legislation.

I feel there is only one good provision in the Bill, and I go along with it. If a person elects to go before the Minister to have his appeal dealt with, well and good; but if he elects to go before a court then the court should determine the appeal. However, I am at a loss for words to describe the appeal to the Governor. It amazes me that such a provision appears. It seems we have some botched-up form of legislation which we want to put before the public, and say, "We are providing people with a right of appeal" when in actual fact the people would be far better off without it. It is far less costly to have appeals heard by the Minister, but in going before the Minister the appellants will achieve the same negative result.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (South Metropolitan) [11.50 a.m.]: I am also in great doubt about this Bill, but perhaps I will speak on different lines. In 1968 the Premier promised that some legislation of this nature would be introduced to Parliament. The Bill before us was only introduced in this House yesterday, and this session of Parliament is expected to conclude today. With such a short space of time available to debate the Bill, I think members are being insulted.

I am also insulted because outside groups—and I have evidence of this—have exerted so much pressure on the Premier that, as has been published in *The West Australian*, dissension has been created in Cabinet. The Premier has decided to go ahead and introduce the legislation to save the face of the Minister for Town Planning. I declare here and now that the Minister does not want any saving of face. He has been genuine in his administration of his portfolio. I have had many dealings with him, and although I have been knocked back many times I have also been successful on many occasions. At all times the office of the Minister for Town Planning is open to members of Parliament, and members do not have to wait five or six days to see him—as happens in the case of another important Government department, where members of Parliament are sent to Mr. So-and-So to have

particular matters dealt with. We could all go to see Mr. So-and-So if we wanted to, but it is the Minister we want to see.

It is my belief that this legislation is the result of pressure from outside groups, and some of their actions are not as clean as I would like them to be. When I leave Parliament I would at least like people to think that I am leaving with a good character. I think the Premier has been pressurised into introducing this legislation.

I cannot do other than agree with Mr. Clive Griffiths and Mr. Ron Thompson that if there is to be an appeal to the court, then let it be an appeal to the court only. I do not think any solicitor of standing in the community will deny that when a person makes an appeal to a court that should be the end of the matter.

The type of appeals I have taken before the Minister involved people who were not financial but who desired to make an alteration to the use of their land. Mr. Ron Thompson has referred to the market gardens at Spearwood. The families who are settled on that land generally desire to remain on the land; and in many instances they want small areas to be set apart to enable them to obtain housing loans.

At all times when I have approached the Minister for Town Planning he has been of this opinion: Where he could save the persons or the families concerned some high costs he went out of the way to help them. I will not stand by and let an outside group put pressure on the Premier to introduce this legislation, because the provisions will not achieve the desired result.

It is open talk in certain quarters that the Minister for Town Planning will not retain this portfolio after Christmas. This talk is designed to put pressure on a department which is already under pressure. As far as I am concerned I am behind the Minister for Town Planning to the hilt, but I am not in favour of some of the delays that have occurred. Quite a number of the people involved in the cases which have been delayed have had to meet considerable costs.

Since Mr. Clive Griffiths has been a member of this House he has been very analytical in his contributions to debates. I cannot agree more with what he has said on this occasion. I oppose the Bill.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Town Planning) [11.56 a.m.]: Naturally a Bill of this nature must arouse some controversy and some differences of opinion, because of the different approaches of individuals. Mr. Clive Griffiths has read out a letter from the Canning Shire. The Secretary of the Local Government Association has written to all the shires and councils in the State asking

them for their views on the question of appeals. If one were to read the jumble of replies that have been received one would realise that if we delayed this Bill for 12 months we would not have a definite view.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It is a difficult Bill to understand.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am not talking about this Bill, but about the general system of appeals. The replies received from the shires and councils were so jumbled that we did not know what they wanted. Agreement to their request to delay the legislation for 12 months would not provide an answer.

I put this to Mr. Cloughton: Was he in Cabinet when the decision was made? Has any Cabinet Minister told him there was dissension in Cabinet in relation to this Bill? If he was not in Cabinet and no Minister told him there was dissension, how does he know there was any dissension? The fact is there was no dissension, and there cannot be any dissension on a Cabinet decision. It appears that some people are taking notice of what the Press tells them; and the Press is only kite flying.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I did not take notice of the Press.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The honourable member was not the one who mentioned that aspect.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Do you think the Press would give you the most favourable coverage?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: After what appeared in a recent leading article, if anyone asked me what I thought about the Press I would say this: Going back nearly 2,000 years when some people betrayed Christ and crucified him on the Cross, he said, "Forgive them, for they know not what they do." I think those words are applicable to this situation.

As far as I can gather, only one or two points are at issue. One relates to the Minister and his advice to Cabinet and to the Governor-in-Council. The appeal procedure has to be that way, if we are to have decisions by Executive Council. That is why the wording appears in that form. We do not doubt the decisions of the court, but if Cabinet decides that a particular issue should not be decided by the court then it will refuse permission for an appeal. However, there are some powers which we cannot afford to take away from Parliament, because this is the supreme body.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What chance has anyone of having an issue raised in Parliament and getting a satisfactory answer?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: This is one reason I agreed to put in this provision. If a case goes before the court it can only deal with the evidence that is presented. That is the finish.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Is not that the case with all appeals?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: A court must deal with the evidence presented to it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Because someone from the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority has forgotten something the Minister wants the final say.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am simply saying that in an appeal to a court, the court must deal with the evidence. Cabinet may decide that a case should not go to a court for the simple reason that it could be settled by the Minister. Over 12 years I have found on hundreds of occasions that there is room for negotiation, discussion, and agreement. If I were to deal with every appeal straight along the line, instead of 50 per cent. of appeals being upheld the figure would be 25 per cent. or less. This happens only because there is room for negotiation and discussion.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I gave the Minister credit for that.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: This cannot be done in a court. To say that a person will be denied the right of appeal is not quite right, because probably there could be some alternative agreed to or adjustment made after discussion. This may not always be the case but frequently it is the case.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Let us have a look at the legislation. Does the Minister think that anyone could win an appeal in a court?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I would not prejudice.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I would say that he could not.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Mr. President, members seem to have forgotten one point when reading the Bill; namely, the majority of appeals in the metropolitan area, in particular, will be heard by a panel of people on the appeal committee. I have used this system sometimes in the past, but not to the extent that I will be using it under this legislation.

The only reason that the reference to the Minister is included is that some trivial matters can be settled in five minutes and there is no need to waste the time of people by sending them around the country. This will cover the whole of the State. Fancy sending someone to Wyndham to deal with something that could be settled here without any trouble. That is the only reason.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The Minister still wants to hold onto this in his portfolio and will not allow out-of-the-way places to determine their own town planning schemes.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Parliament decided in 1928 what the position would be and it has applied ever since that time. No-one has attempted to alter it and I do not think that anyone should.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: Can the Minister—

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Mr. Clive Griffiths does not like interjections and neither do I.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: I want to ask a question. The Minister mentioned—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister must address the Chair and not ask for interjections.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am sorry, Mr. President. I think this has been the main source of controversy as far as the measure is concerned. I have given the reason and I think it is fair. I know the Bill was introduced on the 25th November, but if we look at the notice paper we see that two others were also introduced on that day.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That is right and none of them should have been.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: There must be Bills up until the last minute. How would Parliament function if nothing came in on the last day? It has been this way ever since Parliament has been Parliament.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: As long as there are none on the 27th!

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I agree with that remark. I do not think I need to say more on this measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Addition of Part V—

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: This part sets out the details under which appeals may be directed to the Minister and to the court. Section 35 of the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act also contains provision for appeals to the Minister, but no reference to that section is made in this part. A similar position exists in connection with a provision of the Town Planning and Development Act. I wonder whether the Minister could inform us why these are not included.

Section 35 of the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act refers to appeals on amendments to the scheme. It would seem to be a reasonable section to be covered by the measure before us. I cannot see the reason for its exclusion.

Included in the measure before us is reference to such things as by-laws on building lines and construction details, and the period of the interim development order. In this case it would be concerned with appeals against decisions of the Town Planning Board. Perhaps the board may refuse approval or there will be some other reason for the person to be aggrieved. Reference is also made for appeal against the costs of road construction, in particular.

Proposed section 37 (b) provides, I think, for appeals after a scheme has been adopted, although I am not quite sure on this. Proposed section 37 (c) refers to clause 33 of the metropolitan region scheme, which is concerned with the position which arises when the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority refuses approval to commence development.

The sections to which I first referred do not seem to be included. They seem to deal with slightly different aspects, but perhaps the Minister could enlighten us on the reason for not including these sections.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The section under the Town Planning and Development Act deals with subdivision in irrigation areas and it already has provision for a magistrate to hear an appeal. To my knowledge no appeal has ever been made and consequently there was no need to include this provision. Further, there have been no appeals whatsoever under section 35 of the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act and, consequently, it was pointless to include that section.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I seek your explanation Mr. Chairman. Will you deal with part V in its entirety or with the new sections individually?

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 3 is before the Committee and it includes all of part V.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I refer the Committee to proposed section 40, and to proposed subsections (1) to (3) in particular. What does the Minister envisage in connection with the committee? No number of persons is stipulated, but the Bill simply says, "Such persons as the Governor may, from time to time, appoint." Will there be one, two, or half a dozen? If members refer to proposed section 41 they will find that costs may be awarded. This has nothing to do with action in a court, but will be determined by the Minister possibly on the committee's suggestion.

When the Minister replied to the second reading he said that he had undertaken this type of investigation previously. Probably he has not awarded any costs; indeed, I do not think he has had the power to do so.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I have the power.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It is good that the Minister has, because it will now be possible to receive a clear indication of the approximate costs. I would like to know what it would cost if one person is appointed, if two are appointed, and so on. I would firstly like the Minister to tell me how many people he envisages will be appointed for any one appeal; and, secondly, what the costs will be under proposed section 41.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: In my introductory remarks I stated that initially we will appoint a panel of three. The right has always existed for the Minister to award costs if he felt it necessary. No Minister has to my knowledge and I certainly have not. I do not suppose the position would ever arise unless some particularly frivolous case was involved. This could arise, of course, and there is a necessity for the Minister to have this right.

There is a principle in having a panel of three. Some appeals are of a minor nature and, in this case, it would be much easier for one man to do the work, get all the information, and make recommendations. Some appeals may be of such a nature that it would be better to put two men onto the appeal. A panel of three will allow flexibility which will be of benefit to the individual. This is the intention.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Could you tell us what you envisage the cost of one and the cost of two will be?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is not intended in this way. As far as I am concerned costs will be paid out of Consolidated Revenue. The people will be paid a certain amount in accordance with the schedule. This will be the case unless somebody brings an appeal which will cost another person a great deal of money which it should not cost him. In this case there must be the power to award costs. However, ordinarily it will not cost anything.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Firstly, I would like to ask the Minister a question which I unsuccessfully endeavoured to ask him by way of interjection. When closing the second reading debate the Minister made reference to proposed section 42 and said, amongst other things, "When it was decided to put this back again." I ask the Minister what he meant by those words.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is not a case of putting it back. Members must appreciate that I had to leave Perth early last Thursday and did not arrive back until late Friday. I had to go to Roebourne and Port Hedland, a visit which had been booked months before. It was not until I came back that I realised the Bill, as drafted, denied the right of appeal. Implicitly, once we took it out of the court, there was no right of appeal. I

suggested then that this be written in so that the Minister could, in effect, give the appellant the opportunity to state his case.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: During the discussion earlier I gained the impression that the whole of proposed new section 42 had been removed from the Bill in another place and that somebody or other had prevailed upon that place to put it back.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Your information is wrong.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I surmised that from what the Minister said.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I referred only to the last bit.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: If the Minister had answered my earlier question I would have known what he said. As it is, we will have to read *Hansard* to see what he did say. I do not think we were talking about an amendment made in another place. This is the part of the Bill I do not like. I believe it is a most unsatisfactory provision.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I also feel that proposed new section 42 is definitely loaded and makes the Bill ineffective. I refer members to proposed new subsection (3). What will happen under that provision when someone lodges an appeal to the court, the Minister objects, and the appeal is held over? The appellant must object within 14 days.

I refer members also to proposed new subsection (4) (a). The procedure outlined there will be very costly to the appellant. Paragraph (b) states that the Governor may, within 30 days after the Minister so objects, make a declaration that upholding the appeal would be contrary to town planning principles. Why have an appeal to a constituted court in the first place? What is the purpose of the legislation?

We know that some departments are most dictatorial from time to time, and no-one will deny that. The department, in the first instance, may say that the matter is contrary to the decision of the Town Planning Board. Then the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority might say it is contrary to the Metropolitan Region Plan. So the Minister could veto the appeal without its ever going to the court. Therefore, there is no purpose whatsoever in including the proposed new subsection. This is a sham. It is botched-up legislation.

Nobody in his right mind would ever engage counsel and go before the court. A person who did would have to be stupid and wealthy if he thought he could sustain his argument and still come out with a fifty-fifty chance of winning, because the Minister becomes the Governor. We are supposed to be here making legislation in a sane way for the guidance and the protection of the public. But what are we

doing? We are merely fooling the public. I object to that, and I intend to vote against clause 3.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I do not agree that we are fooling the public. I do not think anybody would be fooled by this. I would like to ask the Minister what would be the result of deleting subsections (3) and (4) of proposed new section 42?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: My views are much the same as those expressed by Mr. Ron Thompson. I cannot see that a person who lodges an appeal to the court has any chance whatsoever if the Minister objects to it. His rights are denied, and I feel that is wrong. Even if it happens on only one occasion it would be definitely wrong. If a person lodges an appeal with the court and it is determined against him, then that is as far as it should go. I do not think he should have the right to go to the Minister and say, "I could not do any good there; will you help me?"

On the other hand, if the Minister objects to an appellant's case I think the appellant should have the chance of having his appeal properly heard in the court. At least one avenue should be available to him. Therefore, I move an amendment to proposed new subsection 39 (1)—

Page 3, line 33—Delete the word "one" and substitute the words "the Court".

If my amendment is accepted I would move to delete the word "other" in line 34 and insert the word "Minister." The proposed new subsection would then read—

... an appeal may be made to the Minister or to a Court but the commencement of an appeal to the Court extinguishes any right of appeal to the Minister.

Therefore, if a person goes to the Minister he will still have a right to appeal to the court. If my amendment is accepted I think proposed new section 42 should also be amended.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: What is the difference? This amendment will not alter the sense or the meaning. The right of appeal from one to the other will still be extinguished. This principle was included deliberately. The honourable member is trying to make the provision read in such a way that a person could go to the court and, if he did not receive satisfaction, he could go to the Minister; and, conversely, he could go to the Minister and, if he did not receive satisfaction, he could go to the court. However, it must be one way or the other and he must take his pick. He cannot have it both ways. I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I cannot agree with the Minister that the amendment does not change the situation. It provides that if a person appeals to the

Minister he still has the right of access to the court. Surely that is different. I would have liked to go further and delete the whole proposed new subsection. I do not think the Bill will work as it stands at present, and this is a step towards making it work.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Perhaps Mr. Cloughton misses the point, because proposed new section 42 was amended after the Bill was originally introduced in another place. As the Minister explained, it now provides that an appellant is automatically denied the right of appeal to the court if he decides to appeal to the Minister.

Amendment put and negatived.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Under Standing Order 330, I move—

That the Chairman do now leave the Chair.

Motion put and negatived.

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: The Minister said that the appeal committee could operate anywhere between Perth and Wyndham, or wherever the Town Planning Board thinks fit. Appeal committees will be appointed according to the will of the Governor and I mentioned previously that quite often the persons comprising such committees are academics, but not practical men. Does the Minister visualise that if a committee sat in Wyndham, one of the members of the committee would be a man with practical knowledge of the area and the subject matter of the appeal?

If, for example, the appeal related to an agricultural area, would the Minister appoint a practical man, or would it be left to the Department of Agriculture? Would the members of the committee actually look at the property involved and converse with the farmers concerned before making a decision? In the past I think we have had too many men without practical knowledge appointed to committees, and they have made decisions that are not in any way practical. I would ask the Minister to appoint a practical man who knows the local circumstances when there is an appeal in a country area.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am not too sure what Mr. Heitman is trying to get at. I said I was appointing a panel of three and, in the majority of cases in the metropolitan area, those people will handle the situation. I did say that one reason the position was left in the hands of the Minister was that it would be wrong and costly if we had to send one member of the panel to Wyndham, for instance, to hear a fairly minor case. It is not intended that this should happen and, at the moment, I think the situation as is should carry on.

The Hon. J. Heitman: What is "as is"?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Minister deals with the appeals.

The Hon. J. Heitman: He does not go up there.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Very often the Minister travels all around the country to have a look at matters connected with appeals, without any cost to the individual.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That is true.

The Hon. J. Heitman: We would like to see somebody look at every appeal, and not travel occasionally.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is not necessary to look at every appeal. A tremendous amount of information can be collated and it is not always the academics who make decisions. We have to bear in mind that the local authority, in most cases, gives a reason before a decision is made. I do not think we could have a panel running around the country dealing with appeals. If we did we would have to charge costs.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I am wondering whether during the course of the Minister's explanation he answered my question. It is difficult to hear him from where I am sitting.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: To answer Mr. Clive Griffiths' question, if we tried to take that provision out, the Bill, so far as I am concerned, would not be any good. I want the provision left in.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Is it the intention that even if a case has gone to the court and a decision has been reached, the Minister will be able to make a slight adjustment here and there so that the person concerned can still get the justice he is looking for?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Once a case has been decided by the court there is no coming back to the Minister for any adjustment.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It was suggested that that could be the position.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: No. The Minister can only hold up an appeal before the court hears it. Once the court hears an appeal that is the finish.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I gather from the Minister's answer to my question that he wants to retain the provision to which I have referred. Surely with an appeal to a court the court would take into consideration whether or not the upholding of the appeal would be in the public interest, whether it would be contrary to town planning principles, or whether it would give justice. I fail to understand how the Minister would be more competent than a court to make a decision in those circumstances.

I have already said, and I repeat it for the record, that I am not necessarily of the opinion, as some people are, that a

decision would be different had it been made by somebody other than the Minister. I have the greatest respect for the decisions the Minister has made in all cases that I have presented to him. However, I do believe that if we are accepting a principle of an alternative appeal we ought not to allow the Minister to opt out at will. For that reason I believe the provision to which I have drawn attention is an obnoxious part of the Bill.

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

Ayes—16

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. G. W. Berry	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. G. E. D. Brand	Hon. N. McNeill
Hon. V. J. Ferry	Hon. I. G. Medcalf
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. Clive Griffiths	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. J. Heitman	Hon. F. R. White
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. F. D. Willmott

(Teller)

Noes—8

Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. E. F. Hutchison	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs	Hon. R. F. Cloughton

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Hon. E. C. House	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. T. O. Perry	Hon. J. J. Garrigan

Clause thus passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Town Planning), and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)

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 (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [12.42 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

As members are aware, on Thursday, the 24th September, the Premier and Treasurer introduced the Appropriation Bill in respect of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, at the same time presenting the State Budget to Parliament.

The main purpose of this Bill is to appropriate the sums required for the services of the current financial year. These are detailed in the Estimates.

The Bill also makes provision for the grant of Supply to complete requirements for this year. Supply amounting to \$145,000,000 was granted under the Supply Act, and a further amount of \$147,677,000 is sought under the provisions of this Bill. The total sum of \$292,677,000 is required to be appropriated in the manner shown in a schedule to the Bill.

The Bill, furthermore, makes provision for the grant of further Supply of \$20,000,000 from the Public Account for advance to Treasurer. This supplements the sum of \$5,000,000 previously granted under the Supply Act.

The Bill, while authorising the provision of funds for the current year, also ratifies the amounts spent during 1969-70 in excess of the Estimates for that year. Details of those excesses are contained in the relevant schedule to the Bill.

It is necessary, under the provisions of section 41 of the Forests Act, for a scheme of expenditure from the Forests Improvement and Reforestation Fund to be submitted annually for the approval of Parliament.

This Bill makes the necessary provision for the appropriation of moneys for the current financial year in accordance with the scheme of expenditure as previously laid on the Table of the House and indexed as No. 117.

Debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the Opposition).

(Continued on page 2762)

STOCK (BRANDS AND MOVEMENT) BILL

Assembly's Message

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

Sitting suspended from 12.46 to 2.15 p.m.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

FLORA AND FAUNA

Dryandra and Tuttaning Reserves: Conservation

The HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Minister for Mines): Earlier today Mr. Dolan asked me a question without notice as follows:—

With reference to the Alumina Refinery (Bunbury) Agreement Bill—

- (1) Did the Minister for Industrial Development receive a deputation yesterday from a group of conservationists, including Dr. Ride.
- (2) Arising from their submissions did the Minister agree to initiate a discussion with the principals of Alwest Pty.

Limited with a view to ensuring protection for the fauna and flora in the Dryandra and Tuttaning Reserves.

I told the honourable member I would obtain the information and advise him accordingly. I now have the answer which is as follows:—

(1) Yes.

(2) The Minister for Industrial Development explained the procedures followed in the process of negotiations for major industries, such as this one.

He also explained the provisions of the agreement of particular significance in respect of forests. He also undertook to initiate discussions under the chairmanship of the Co-ordinator of Development between appropriate senior departmental officers and the company.

Representatives of the deputation will be invited to state their case in respect of Dryandra and Boyagin Rock but the discussions will not be restricted to these areas only.

WEST KALGOORLIE-LAKE LEFROY RAILWAY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 25th November.

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East) [2.18 p.m.]: This is a very short Bill and contains only three clauses. It will provide authority for the construction of a standard gauge railway from West Kalgoorlie to Lake Lefroy, and for the construction of two spur lines. Work will be carried out on the Lake Lefroy-Esperance line, but that line is already in existence and it is not necessary for Parliament to grant permission for additional work to be carried out.

Most of what I could have said in relation to this Bill I said when speaking to the Western Mining Corporation agreement Bill. It is necessary for the Director-General of Transport to report on this proposal, and he has made such a report which is tabled paper No. 223. Plan 63432 has also been tabled.

The Minister, in introducing the measure, said that the agreement provides that the State will obtain the authority of Parliament to construct a standard gauge railway line from Kalgoorlie to Lake Lefroy, and two spur lines—one to the smelter, and the other to the plant at Kambalda. The 3ft. 6in. line between Lake Lefroy and Esperance will be reconstructed and converted to 4ft. 8½in. The Government must be confident that it will be able to raise the money because I passed through the

area yesterday and a terrific amount of work has been done since I was last there 10 days ago.

The Western Mining Corporation will contribute \$9,000,000 towards the construction of the railway, and the Lake Lefroy salt company—Norseman Gold Mines—will contribute \$3,400,000. A balance of \$6,380,000 will probably be obtained from Commonwealth sources. As I said, the Government must have confidence in receiving the money for the project, the total cost of which will be \$18,780,000. The report of the Director-General of Transport also says—

There is one important capital offset which has not been taken into account in assessing cost charges or capital requirements. Upon completion of standardisation between West Kalgoorlie and Esperance a significant volume of 3' 6" rolling stock will become available for use on the remainder of the 3' 6" gauge system. I estimate the present value of the future cost of replacing this rolling stock at \$1,510,000. This does not imply, however, that this capital is immediately available.

The director-general comments upon the agreement. There is nothing significant in his comments. It is pleasing to note that he considers the number of men who will be employed at the smelter and in the town, with their families, will increase the population by 1,000. In addition, other people will move into the town in order to service the increased population, so that the total increase in population will probably be between 1,500 and 2,000.

The director-general also makes the comment that the treatment of the ore in the smelter at Kalgoorlie will make the Ora Banda deposits more viable and will enable the stockpile of magnetic concentrates that are now produced at Kambalda to be used. I do not know whether or not they will be put through with the Ora Banda laterites, but in New Caledonia gypsum is imported in order to treat the laterites and extract the sulphur content from the gypsum in the smelting process. Under the method proposed for Kalgoorlie, that will be achieved by utilising the magnetic tailings. I hope that in the future Western Australia will become self-sufficient as regards the sulphur required for superphosphate manufacture. I am completely in agreement with the Bill and I support it.

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.

MONEY LENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 25th November.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [2.27 p.m.]: In introducing this Bill the Minister stated that the purpose of it was to remove an anomaly as between the Money Lenders Act and the Stamp Act in relation to interest and stamp duty. I point out that there is a great number of differences between those two Acts, and this is just one of them. The Stamp Act specifically excludes all pawnbrokers from its provisions, and it contains a definition of "interest" which the Minister seeks to add to the Money Lenders Act. The definition of "loan" is also different in the two Acts. Is that another anomaly that should be brought into line? Or is it that the two Acts deal with two different classes of conditions and there is no necessity to bring them into line?

The Minister pointed out that hire-purchase agreements were not affected by the Money Lenders Act. That Act deals with loans which are let out at a rate of interest exceeding 12½ per cent. but not exceeding 15 per cent., which is the limit at present prescribed in the Act. There is provision for the limit to be varied but, as far as I know, the figure of 15 per cent. has not as yet been altered.

So we will have to look for another reason for including this definition of "interest" in the Money Lenders Act. I find it a little difficult to understand its purpose.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You mean a different reason from the one I gave?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The reason the Minister gave is not a reason at all. There are definitions in the Stamp Act and in the Money Lenders Act but they deal with different situations. Because in the Stamp Act there is a definition of "interest" it does not necessarily mean that the same definition should appear in the Act we are now seeking to amend. In fact, the Minister said, to use his own words, it is very confusing that those amounts should be regarded as interest. I do not see how the confusion occurs. A court decision has made it quite clear that these amounts are included in the definition of "interest." The Minister quoted part of the definition to us and I will quote that part of it once again. The

definition appears in section 2 of the Act, and the part to which I refer reads as follows:—

"Interest" includes discount, premium, bonus, commission, deduction, fine, penalty, renewal, charge, fees, costs, charges and expenses, whether preliminary or otherwise or any money or moneys worth or any consideration whatever, . . .

I do not think there is any confusion in that definition, and the court, in making its decision, was not confused. It was quite certain that those words should be included in the definition of "interest."

We do not know what the amounts are likely to be in the future. If it is a small amount it hardly seems worth while to amend the Act, but if the amount is significant, we are entitled to know what burden we will place on people who are obliged to borrow money from this class of lender. The Act places a limit on the interest rate to be charged by the money lender and this includes all his costs and overheads, and I would assume stamp duty would be one of those costs. He includes that within the rate of interest which is his payment for the service he provides. He can charge any rate of interest from 12½ to 15 per cent., and therefore I cannot see that he is unable to obtain a reasonable return for the money he advances.

The effect of the amendment would be that he could increase his rate of interest above 15 per cent., but we do not know how far above. So I must oppose the measure before us. There are all sorts of charges and fees that could be dealt with in a similar way. In the past it was considered that the amount that was returned to him should be included in the definition of "interest." If we agree to the exception provided in the Bill are we to make further exceptions so that other charges and costs may be excluded from the rate of interest? The money lender can still obtain the same amount of interest, but he can also recover other costs from his client and so, in effect, increase the rate of interest he obtains.

I do not think the principle contained in the Bill is a good one, because it could be applied to other situations. Take the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, for instance. If the road haulier prepared two accounts; one to recover his costs and margins, and another to recover his road maintenance tax, this would certainly have the effect of showing the source of the tax, but I do not think this is a principle we should adopt, generally. I think that covers the main points I wish to make.

As I have said, I do not think the Minister has given any reason for including in the Money Lenders Act the definition that appears in the Stamp Act, and the fact that these definitions are included in

Money Lenders Acts in other States is surely no reason why we should do the same.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: They are not included in other Acts, they are excluded.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The definition, shall I say, is included in the Acts of other States. I should imagine the Minister could argue along the same line in regard to many other situations; that is, he could say that because something is done elsewhere this State could adopt the same principles with advantage. Therefore my remarks could apply to this Bill; because something is done elsewhere it does not necessarily mean it is a practice we should adopt. I oppose the Bill.

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan) (2.37 p.m.): I support the Bill. I believe it will bring our practice into line with other States. The Bill seeks only to overcome a technicality; a technicality in the sense that when we passed the Stamp Act Amendment Bill last year we increased the stamp duty on loans by 1½ per cent. for the purpose of revenue, and we also adopted a definition of "interest" which excludes stamp duties and fees, but we failed to carry that definition through into the Money Lenders Act of this State.

Mr. Simon Begg who is an expert on hire-purchase legislation and stamp duty matters and is a senior legal practitioner from Victoria came to Western Australia this year and gave an address on the subject. He pointed out that when this Parliament, in December, 1969, adopted a provision in the Victorian legislation to increase the stamp duty on loans by 1½ per cent., the draftsman of the legislation failed to realise that our Money Lenders Act has a different definition of "interest" from that in the Victorian legislation. So what we did was to introduce the definition in the Victorian legislation into our Stamp Act. We provided that loans would carry an interest rate of 1½ per cent. as they do in other States. In effect, we copied what appears in the Victorian Act in which the definition of "interest" includes the following words:—

"Interest" does not include any sum lawfully agreed to be paid on account of duties or fees payable under any Act.

That definition is in the Victorian Stamp Act. It was included in the Western Australian Stamp Act, but we failed to appreciate that our Money Lenders Act did not have that provision, whereas the Victorian Money Lenders Act did. Similarly, the Act of New South Wales contained the same provision.

Queensland faced the same situation in 1968 as Western Australia now faces. Queensland copied the stamp duty provisions from New South Wales and Victoria, under which an extra 1½ per cent.

was charged on loans. Queensland used the provisions in the legislation of the other States, but failed to appreciate that its own Money Lenders Act was not the same as the Acts of Victoria or New South Wales. So Queensland promptly amended its Money Lenders Act in the way that we are attempting to do on this occasion.

This will not increase the interest charged to borrowers. The stamp duty was imposed under the Stamp Act in 1969, and the additional $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. is one of the charges that has to be paid. This charge is normally paid by borrowers, and under the terms of the Act it is perfectly legitimate for the borrower to pay it. That is what happened. Invariably the borrower pays the stamp duty.

When Western Australia adopted the legislation of Victoria the effect was that by not amending our own Money Lenders Act we were virtually saying that when interest is calculated we have to include an extra $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., which represents the stamp duty. It does not mean that the hire-purchase companies will charge any more. They are still charging the same amount as they did previously, but they had to include the extra $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in the technical calculation of interest.

Obviously this gives a false picture and makes it appear that they are charging $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. more than they should charge. If there were an actual increase in the interest charged by the companies the Minister would be misleading the House, but there is not and he is not. He simply implied that this was a technical matter, and that there was not to be any actual increase in the interest rate.

All that this simple Bill does is to provide that the definition of "interest" in the Money Lenders Act shall exclude stamp duty and fees paid on any loans. In this respect it makes no difference whatever to individual borrowers, except perhaps in one respect. Because of the situation that has applied in Western Australia in the last 12 months as I have been informed by members of the Hire Purchase Conference there has been a tendency to restrict personal loans because of the very fact that the companies have to add on the stamp duty as though it were part of the interest. For fear of committing an offence under the Money Lenders Act, in some cases they restricted personal loans. It did not mean that anyone would pay any more in interest, but it had the undesirable effect of reducing the amount of money that was available to borrowers under personal loans.

Hence, that situation had to be corrected. Although this Bill will not make the slightest difference to the amount of cash to be paid out by hire-purchase companies, or the amount of interest they receive, it will enable them to calculate the rate of interest on the same basis as is done in the

other States which have this legislation. They will now be able to do that without breaching the Money Lenders Act.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Justice) (2.45 p.m.): I thought I had explained the reason for the Bill, when I introduced the second reading. I have gone over my speech again; and not only do I think I explained the Bill, but I am now fully satisfied that I did it adequately.

I cannot understand Mr. Claughton's approach to this matter. I certainly do not appreciate the innuendo that there must be some hidden reason for introducing the Bill. I am indebted to Mr. Medcalf for his clearer explanation of the reason for its introduction. To give a little more information, I understand that legal opinions have it that the duty imposed on transactions by the Stamp Act Amendment Act of 1969 must be included as interest under the definition thereof, contained in the Money Lenders Act, 1912-1939.

All that this Bill seeks to do is to amend the definition of "interest" under the Money Lenders Act in conformity with the definition that exists under the Stamp Act. It leaves me cold to think that anyone could suggest that one could read any hidden purpose into that.

The comments made by Mr. Medcalf in connection with personal loans are appropriate. I am told that the interest charged on personal loans must obviously be higher than the interest rate on secured loans. I do not think this needs any further explanation. In order that the matter can be cleared up satisfactorily in accordance with the amendments to the Stamp Act, the Government has been requested to introduce the Bill. That is all there is to the measure, and there is no hidden purpose.

The purpose of the Bill is, as I explained when I introduced the second reading and I do so again, to do what Mr. Medcalf has outlined to us it will do. Perhaps he did explain it in a better manner than I was able to.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would like to make a short statement before I deal with the Bill. Mr. Jack Thomson was to take the Chair in dealing with the Bill, but because this is the last occasion that I will be able to take the Chair he has graciously asked me to do so; and for that I thank him.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Amendment to section 2—

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I thank Mr. Medcalf and other members for their explanation of the purpose of the Bill; and, as the Minister pointed out, it is a reasonable purpose, and borrowers should pay the extra interest rate.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan) [2.51 p.m.]: The first matter to which I wish to address myself is one of the most important to which any member could address himself: I refer to the appalling carnage on our roads and I wish to offer a suggestion which might be helpful in reducing that carnage.

A careful analysis of the road fatalities in Victoria in 1969 revealed four danger points in every week. I will give figures to substantiate what I say. The periods are from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. on Saturdays; from 10 p.m. to midnight on Saturdays; from midnight on Saturdays to 2 a.m. on Sundays; and from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. on Sundays. I shall give reasons why these periods should be subjected to careful examination.

Last year in Victoria in the period from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. on Saturdays there were 48 deaths; from 10 p.m. to midnight, 43 deaths; from midnight on Saturdays to 2 a.m. Sundays, 49 deaths, and from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. on Sundays 29 deaths. This means that there was a total of 140 deaths between 6 p.m. on Saturdays and 2 a.m. on Sundays. We should look carefully at these figures to see whether we can arrive at the reason for their being so bad and consider how we can improve the situation.

One of the first things the National Safety Council of Victoria decided should be done was the production of a poster on which the figures mentioned were displayed. It also decided to issue a warning to all motorists to keep off the road, if possible, between those hours.

I could suggest reasons for the accident rate being so high during those periods but I will refrain from doing so. This task should be the job of the Road Safety Council and the Traffic Department because it requires expert consideration. I make one suggestion for the consideration of those two bodies. As these are the danger periods in Victoria, when the greatest number of fatalities occur—and I assume it would be the same in this State—our traffic police should be busiest during these periods; all traffic policemen, or as many as possible, should be on duty between 6 p.m. on Saturdays and 2 a.m. on Sundays. I think this might result in a considerable reduction in the road toll.

I offer that suggestion quite seriously because the carnage on the roads is one of the greatest problems we have to face. We should put forward anything which might be a possible solution.

In the last couple of days there has been a great deal of talk on decentralisation. In the past few months I have raised the matter of the closing of railways stations in the metropolitan area, particularly the closure of stations in my province. This must be the policy of the Railways Department and probably it has good reasons for the policy of withdrawing staff from various suburban stations. In some districts, however, it imposes a burden on people who once used the stations to send parcels away, and so on.

The policy of the Railways Department seems to be to make Kewdale the central point for the receipt and delivery of goods of all kinds. If this is the policy, of course we can do nothing about it.

However, I suggest that the Railways Department might give consideration to modifying the system slightly to provide for receipt and delivery of goods at some of the more central stations. In this respect I thank the Government for retaining staff at Gosnells station, which is a central point for some of the centres between Perth and Armadale. An officer at Gosnells receives goods and, of course, distributes them. This has been a big boon to people in the area. I have in mind people with orchards and nurseries who send goods away regularly.

I consider the Railways Department should give thought to a timetable to enable an officer to be on duty at certain stations during certain periods of the day. The officer could travel from place to place and perhaps he could carry out duties in two, three, or more centres. In those circumstances, the railways would offer a service to the public which would be greatly appreciated.

That brings me to something else which links up with this point. The fact that a decision has been made by the Railways Department to try to channel all goods through Kewdale has resulted in the

establishment of a big industrial area there. A number of big businesses, factories, and smaller businesses of various kinds have been established. Anybody who has followed the news carefully would realise that there have been some big fires in the Kewdale area. Mention of fires brings in another group—the group about whom I wish to speak; namely, fire brigades.

Generally we find that when a factory has caught fire a brigade has been called to Kewdale from Perth or Belmont. As I said, a big industrial area has been built up and it will be even bigger in future. This being so, there should be a brigade somewhere in the near vicinity so that it can get on the job quickly in the event of fire. For this reason I believe a station should be established at Kewdale.

Answers I received to questions I asked earlier in the session indicated that it was the intention of the Fire Brigades Board to establish a station there. The sooner this is done the better. It will mean that these facilities are established in one of the fastest growing parts of the metropolitan area and, consequently, of the State. Kewdale and adjoining areas need this kind of protection.

The final matter to which I wish to refer concerns my province. After long agitation from members moves have been made—principally by the Main Roads Department—to establish a connection between Albany Highway and Fremantle along High Road.

It is now a pleasure to drive along High Road, and more particularly to drive along the parts that have been upgraded. It is now a wide thoroughfare with one-way traffic in many places. I feel this development will not only help to reduce traffic accidents and, perhaps, fatalities, but it will also expedite the flow of goods between Albany Highway and the Fremantle area which is, of course, the shipping centre.

I cannot say the same thing about another access road, Manning Road. If anybody wishes to drive over one of the worst roads in the world, and one of the most dangerous at night, I commend Manning Road to him.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You should drive from Halls Creek to Turkey Creek.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I am afraid I do not know them all. However, this road is as bad as any I have ever travelled on. Whenever I have to travel along Manning Road at night attending to my parliamentary duties, I always heave a sigh of relief upon arriving safely home. Not only is one faced with difficulties in regard to potholes, but the road also seems to be one upon which 90 per cent. of motorists disregard courtesy and the traffic rules and drive with their lights on high beam. They never seem to dip their lights, and one is faced with oncoming traffic with

glaring headlights and also one has to put up with glaring headlights from behind, which adds to one's difficulties. If one has to take evasive action and move off the road a little one is likely to drive into a pothole anything up to a foot deep.

I believe the local authorities concerned are chiefly to blame because the Main Roads Department has made an allocation for the upgrading of the road, and it is waiting on the local authorities to provide their share. The quicker the road is upgraded the better it will be for all users.

Before I sit down I would repeat that I hope the Minister will refer to the Minister for Police and the Traffic Department the suggestion I made regarding the traffic fatality figures in Victoria. I hope they will examine the figures here in the same relationship to see whether something can be done to solve our problem; that is, the carnage on our roads.

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (North-East Metropolitan) [3.03 p.m.]: I rise to speak with mixed feelings because as members all know this is my last appearance in this Parliament. I have some nice memories of my time here. I have always found everyone to be most friendly. I have no complaints about the Legislative Council in that regard, although I entered this place as an antagonist and I still hold my political views in that direction. I thank the members of this House—and especially you, Mr. President, particularly during the period before you were President—for the kindness they have extended to me.

I read an article today which indicated that 22,000 young women of 18 years of age will be eligible to vote at the next election. That was not possible when I entered Parliament and it gives me great pleasure to know that those young women will be able to vote. I hope some of them will become members of this Chamber so that they may argue against the men. Up till now we have had only one lady member of this House. I will do all I can to help women to be elected to this Chamber. A young woman has already been selected to follow me. I hope she gains election and I will be looking forward to that.

The appearance of women in the Legislative Council is now possible as a result of many arguments put forward in this Chamber by the Labor Party for adult franchise for all women. In my opinion, the responsibility that goes with the right to vote will have a good effect on youth. I think the lowering of the voting age will benefit society as a whole. It may well develop a more stable attitude in the young in the future because I feel they will definitely take an interest in public affairs at an earlier age, which the older generation did not have the opportunity to do when 21 years was regarded as the age of adulthood.

Much public interest is shown in adolescents nowadays. They have more knowledge and it appears that the present generation is far more advanced than previous generations. Education is being upgraded, and I think that is of great importance because it will help to stabilise public thought and action to the benefit of society as a whole.

This House is still a House of privilege, and the boundaries still remain undemocratic. The boundaries are still drawn up by the Liberal and Country Parties in such a manner as to make it impossible for Labor to win a majority in this House. That has been a fact ever since I have been here. Labor cannot progress because this is still the most powerful House in the British Commonwealth, more powerful even than the House of Lords where a Bill, after a second challenge by the Commons, automatically becomes law. However, in Western Australia as it is at present one could go on forever without gaining anything.

I have in my hand a few of the Bills I was responsible for bringing to Parliament. One of the most important is connected with the jury reform system and I was successful in my efforts to have women recognised as competent to serve on juries. I will never forget the day I approached a certain gentleman about this. He was a lawyer and he was absolutely horrified that I should even suggest that women should serve as jurors. He said it was a dreadful thing. I told him that times were changing and I said I was sorry I had struck such a backward young man, and I moved on. However, the right for women to serve as jurors came to pass. It is taken for granted now and much good has come from it.

I think one of the instances in which a woman's point of view is most valuable is in relation to juries. Only a woman looks at the different sides of nature because she understands her children and as they grow into men and women she understands their problems. I was happy to read some time ago that the first woman judge had been appointed in Britain. When I visited Great Britain I went to see her and I found that she is a lovely woman. I think the men who appear before her would not mind being judged by her because she is such a nice person.

We have made very much progress in regard to the prejudices I had to fight when I first entered Parliament and which I encountered in my public life—and I was in public life long before I entered Parliament. I do not give women all the credit for having brought this about; I would have to agree that men have done much to bring it about.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: When I first saw you it was love at first sight.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I cannot help that, Mr. President, it just seems to come naturally! While I have had some very worrying moments during my life here I have also experienced some very happy times, for which I thank the members of this House. I am very sincere in what I say in this regard.

I suppose I had some right to expect support from the members of my own party, but I must say that I appreciated very much the attitude and the consideration shown me by members from the other side of the House. I daresay that on many occasions when I was handling legislation or speaking to a particular measure, they probably considered me an old hag, but, by and large, they have shown considerable restraint and patience.

My visits to other countries, particularly to Ireland and Great Britain were very pleasant indeed and, if they did nothing else, they helped me in my approach to problems as they arose. I was asked by the women in those countries how the men viewed my position in this House; what the Australian men were like, and what they said.

I replied that by and large I was accepted as a member of the Legislative Council which comprised not only Australians but also Englishmen and Irishmen. I was very unhappy about the situation I witnessed in Northern Ireland. Ireland is a lovely country and it is a pity to see such strife evident in that area.

I was particularly moved when I stood at a little place in the south of Ireland. I was taught by the Dominican Nuns and they all came from that area. It is times like these when there comes to one snatches of songs which one has heard in one's childhood. One song I recall went something like this—

There is not in this wide world a valley so sweet

In the depth of whose bosom the bright waters meet.

This refers to the meeting of two rivers in a particular area. As members know, I did, of course, take Fred along with me to educate him in these matters. He was a most apt pupil and I found him very obedient.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am glad that is your experience.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: We also visited Scotland where we were engaged in work on epilepsy.

One of my great joys in this House has been in having Mr. Wise as a colleague. Before I entered Parliament he was a legend to me, and the judgment I formed of him at that time has in no way altered. He is a fine man and Parliament can be justly proud of him. I thank everyone in this Chamber for all they have done for me.

I would point out, however, without wishing to strike a discordant note, that I propose to continue to fight for the abolition of the Legislative Council, because I feel Western Australia would be far better off with one House of Parliament. It would not then be possible to have the political manoeuvrings that are so evident when it is necessary to get legislation passed. Our Legislative Council is still the most powerful House in the British Commonwealth. I know what I am talking about, because I have gone into this matter very thoroughly. We are a young and growing country, and I think it would be to our benefit to abolish the Legislative Council.

I recall my early life on the goldfields. It was always a challenge and I think we all know that the riches of this great country of ours have yet to be fully tapped. If we do not act now we might pay the penalty later.

I trust that all members have a happy time. Everybody has been most marvellous to me and I wish each member in this House all the good things he might wish himself.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [3.06 p.m.]: The fact that I follow a lady in rising to support this measure is purely coincidental and I assure members—including Mr. Lavery—that my intentions are strictly honourable.

I would like to take the opportunity to wish all those members who are shortly to retire from public life a very happy retirement. I hope they experience the most excellent good health. I trust they have found their parliamentary career most rewarding and happy. We all have differences in the political arena, but I believe that in this Chamber, at least, we enjoy a spirit of comradeship at most times.

May I wish all other members a happy Christmas and a bright New Year—I trust that 1971 will be a most rewarding year for all of them.

This Bill gives me the opportunity to deal with matters I wish to mention. There has been a great deal of comment during this session, and indeed during the course of other sessions, on the subject of minerals. In my view the most important mineral is water.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The most important one in the world.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: That is so true. The water position in Australia causes us all a great deal of concern, because we live in such a very dry continent. This is particularly true of Western Australia.

In this State, however, water has been harnessed by various means, and I would like to pay tribute here and now to the skill and efficiency of those charged with

the responsibility to provide water both in the metropolitan area and the country districts of this State.

I think it is not a bad thing to remind ourselves occasionally that it is many years now since we have had a shortage of water with the consequent water restrictions in the metropolitan area that are generally imposed during a long dry period. This rather emphasises, to me at least, the foresight and planning which has been evident to very good effect, and I applaud those who have been responsible for our water supply position.

While I have mentioned the metropolitan scene I am, of course, particularly concerned with the water position in the country districts. I refer particularly to farm water supply schemes. We have had some very dry conditions in the last few years; indeed, last year the conditions in the whole of the agricultural area of Western Australia caused great concern, because they were, in fact, drought conditions.

I daresay it is the remainder of the drought conditions that prevailed, particularly last year, that has prompted me to touch on this subject today in an effort to ensure that we might, perhaps, protect our heritage and the well-being of our rural industries by providing a more efficient and more adequate water supply.

We cannot, of course, dissociate soil conservation from the subject of water supplies. To my way of thinking, water supplies and soil conservation are more or less synonymous—one goes with the other. When speaking of water supplies, I do not refer only to irrigation. To have adequate water supplies does not mean to say that we should have irrigation schemes throughout the whole of Western Australia because, in fact, certain types of soils do not lend themselves to irrigation schemes or to heavy applications of water. Therefore, we must have different schemes for different areas, depending on circumstances.

Speaking of irrigation, I would say that any scheme would need to be very closely analysed. Careful research would have to be undertaken on a cost-benefit basis because such schemes would involve the heavy expenditure of public money. I realise the benefit of irrigation practices, but I believe the need must be tempered with the thought that each scheme has to stand the test of the cost-benefit analysis—in other words, what real benefits do we get from such water schemes in rural areas?

I believe we should have a consolidation plan and opportunities for the diversification of agriculture—and diversification on a very large scale. Such schemes could be promoted with proper soil and water conservation.

How can we set about improving the situation? Maybe the best way to plan for soil and water conservation would be to tackle the issue on a State-wide basis, bearing in mind that we have within the State a very large area to service. I do not believe we would be doing justice to the situation if we were simply to tackle the problem in isolation. Therefore, I suggest we should do it on a State-wide basis. In so doing I think we would have a far better chance of making the best use of our existing resources.

Perhaps the starting point for all this could be the establishment of a rural soil and water conservation authority. To make any authority work it must have certain powers conferred upon it.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Have you studied the Soil Conservation Act of this State?

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: I have had the opportunity to do a little research on it. I do not know all the answers, but I suggest—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It is one of the best in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. V. J. FERRY: —that these comments could be studied by those who have a greater ability than I have with the object of making better use of our natural resources.

Soil and water in the agricultural areas are all-important and when we in this Parliament talk of harnessing our natural resources, whether they be bauxite, timber, or anything else, we need to make sure that what we are about to do is indeed the right method. Therefore, I am offering some suggestions in an effort to be helpful in this respect.

I think that an authority such as I have suggested should have statutory powers and should be able to formulate a policy in respect of water supplies. Maybe the body could have power to co-ordinate with other departments which deal with farm water supplies and soil conservation. Maybe the new ministry dealing with the physical environment could play its part in the scheme of things.

In my view this suggested water and soil conservation authority should have the power to raise loans—loans for its own use as well as for approved applicants for water assistance schemes. As is the case with irrigation projects, so it is with private water schemes on individual farms. Each scheme would need to be researched, and would have to be viable.

All applications for loans would need to be the subject of a cost-benefit analysis in order to avoid wastage, and perhaps the undertaking of uneconomic projects. When we speak of loans, we must realise that there needs to be some measure of qualification. When I am speaking in respect of primary industries I believe that the authority should be empowered

to look at applications from all types of primary producers, and not those in only one particular line of agriculture.

In respect of any loans that may be approved, it would seem to me that there would need to be a deed of charge against the property on which the water supply may be established. I think this follows a normally accepted practice, and I see no reason to change this line of thought. As regards the interest rate, here again I do not suggest any particular rate; rather do I suggest—and I believe this is in keeping with normal practice—that the rate should be as low as practicable, in line with loans made for other rural purposes.

In the first instance perhaps the State Government could provide the initial capital to get the authority working. What it would cost is something I cannot say. I do not think anyone could say what amount would be required until a thorough investigation and survey had been made of the whole State. I would envisage that to be successful, any scheme would need to be established first in declared or designated areas, in a restricted way, and then extended to other parts of the State in the light of circumstances and experience.

In respect of repayments of loans, I think these could be channelled into a revolving fund under the control of the authority. By this method one would hope as time went by that the fund would become self-sufficient and would therefore no longer be a charge on the State or the people.

In implementing water supplies on rural properties I do not think the authority itself should undertake the physical establishment of supplies except, perhaps, in certain circumstances where it is reasonable that the authority should do the work itself. Rather do I envisage that the authority would encourage the use of private contractors to carry out this type of construction. We have in this State a number of very efficient and qualified contractors who could be capably employed in establishing water supplies on farm properties. I believe it is only proper that these people and their equipment should be used in this way.

Another major function of an authority such as I have outlined is the provision of detailed technical advice and assistance to landowners. I think it is very important that the authority should not only advise on the physical layout of water supplies but should also supply the data it has at its disposal in respect of such things as the treatment of soil.

In suitable areas, I suggest that such an authority would lean towards key dams in more or less isolated sections. Key dams are not new. A key dam system is operating in the State at the present time.

I envisage the enlargement of this system, and I think that in so doing we could greatly improve the production and viability of properties in the lighter rainfall areas, particularly. Even in the south-west of this State there are several properties that could be served in a fairly localised way by key dams, strategically placed. A considerable amount of work has been undertaken in the south-west by the irrigation section of the Public Works Department in recent years, and I appreciate this sort of research.

I am also aware that there is a greater acceptance by people on the land of guidance in respect of water supplies, and a greater awareness of the need for orderly supplies. I am thinking of the situation where streams have been dammed by settlers, and in some cases it has almost come to shot guns at dawn or dusk when one farmer upstream has perhaps drawn a little more water than was fair and the farmers further down the stream have not got an adequate supply. In the south-west there has, therefore, been a greater acceptance of the need to control water supplies for greater efficiency and more orderly farming.

I have made a suggestion which would help the rural sector of the community in the State. I do not set myself up as an authority on water but I recognise the need very keenly because I have been associated with the farming community all my life. I believe these suggestions should be investigated and I trust some good will come of them. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill and I hope that what I have said on this occasion will be heeded.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (South Metropolitan) [3.34 p.m.]: This being the last Bill that I will be speaking on in Parliament, I will leave the nice things I want to say until after I have discussed some parts of the Bill.

On the 18th November I asked some questions of the Minister for Mines in regard to the siting of the proposed Kwinana Freeway through Como and Mt. Pleasant. I am not making a complaint, but the question was only half answered. The questions I asked were—

- (1) Have any decisions been reached as to the siting of the proposed continuation of the Kwinana Freeway in the areas of Mt. Henry, Como, and Deepwater Point at Mt. Pleasant, and beyond?
- (2) If so, at what points will the Canning River be crossed?
- (3) When is it proposed that this work will commence?

The replies were—

- (1) and (2) No firm decisions have been made, although it has been recommended to the Metropolitan

Region Planning Authority that the route should be by way of a river crossing at Mt. Henry.

- (3) No work on this crossing is expected to commence before 1974.

I realise that I cannot expect an answer from the Minister this afternoon, but in past years he has been able to send answers to questions later on, and I ask him if he would find out where the bridge will enter Deepwater Point in the Mt. Pleasant area. The residents of this area have asked me to find this out. They now know that they do not have to make any deliberations as to their future before 1974, but if the Minister could supply me with the additional information I would be most appreciative.

The second matter I wish to mention is a very important one. I am a proud Western Australian; I am proud of Australia; and I am proud of the business methods adopted in Australia, in the normal course of events, but every now and then we find a person who belongs to the group of people who used to be called "Get-rich-quick Wallingtons" by the American newspapers. There are a few of those around in Western Australia at the moment.

The matter I intend to speak about only came to my notice on Tuesday and I have not had much time to investigate it. An American lady in California who intends to visit Western Australia in June has sent a query to some friends in South Perth, who, in turn, have passed it on to me. An extract from the letter written by that lady reads—

Man called selling interest in West Australian land—Geraldton (north of?).

You do not own the property itself, but an interest in a large area.

Cost \$4,190 (U.S.) for 1 unit, \$400 down payment, \$35 a month, 6% interest.

This is sold through "Safeguard Industries" and they in turn own Australian Land Title Ltd.

If one should want to sell their units they cannot sell back to company but must advertise and try and sell any way they can. What do you know of this?

A booklet—of which I have only the cover, and have been unable to get another copy—has been issued which is entitled, "Your Opportunities in Western Australia." Over the page the following appears:—

Photographs in this book illustrate varied activities in Western Australia in 1970.

Most important, YOU can share in the profits coming from Western Australian land . . . right from here!

What makes land values go up? Natural resources . . . what's under the land (oil, gas, iron, nickel, other minerals); . . . what grows above ground (crops and livestock) . . . Industry . . . processing of resources . . . Accessibility . . . harbors. Ocean transportation is most economical. People, people, people. All these are found today in Western Australia—the fastest growing state “down under.”

To anyone who knows anything about Western Australia such literature is repugnant. I visited the Companies Office and was assisted by a young gentleman present to make inquiries about this particular company. I found that no company known as Safeguard Industries is registered in this State, nor is the Western Australian Land Title Company Ltd. registered. A company known as the Australian Land and Cattle Company is registered, but this is a very reputable concern, having been registered in Western Australia since the 17th February, 1968. After spending two and a half hours going through its memorandum of association I came to the conclusion that this company has nothing to be ashamed of.

However, I pose the question: Is it right that Western Australia should have its name dragged through the mud—that is my opinion, anyhow—by companies who issue the type of literature I have quoted to the House. I know the Minister for Justice cannot do anything about somebody who is operating in another country, but I think it is important to make it known that the Australian Land Title Company Ltd. is not registered in this State. I draw attention to this fact because I think the matter should be investigated with a view to refuting the information that is being circulated by this company. I will advise the persons who wrote to me that I have discussed the matter with a member of this Chamber and he has advised that they should have nothing to do with this company.

I now wish to speak on road maintenance tax. The Minister for Mines, speaking on the Alwest agreement Bill last night, mentioned that large tonnages of coal would be hauled by road transport for the use of this company. The trucks to be used will have to be of great capacity. Therefore, it seems to me that as Australian Iron and Steel Pty. Limited has been granted concessions on freight rates on iron ore transported from Koolyanobbing to Kwinana a concession might be granted to these contracting transport companies when the project comes into production.

What I have in mind is that a concession could be granted to Alwest by the removal of the road maintenance tax on those road hauliers who will be transporting coal which will be used by this company, with a

view to reducing costs. Therefore I hope that after the next election, whatever Government is in office, it will take steps to remove this impost which is borne by only a certain section of our community.

I now wish to deal with third party insurance claims. The Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust has many claims which have not yet been dealt with, because adjustments still have to be made before they are presented to the court. However, in many instances the trust is unable to obtain finality because some members of the legal fraternity fail to administer these claims and take these cases before the courts within a reasonable period. All members of this House know Mr. Harry Curran who represented the electorate of Cockburn in another place. Eight years ago he was involved in a very serious accident and as a result he lost one of his legs and the other is severely crippled. Because of this he had to resign from Parliament.

I have been handling his case for some time, but I am not getting anywhere and I would like to obtain some advice in regard to it. Since the accident Mr. Curran has accumulated medical expenses to the extent of about \$14,000, and these medical expenses will continue to mount because his condition will not improve. Up to this point of time, the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust has told me that the solicitors concerned have made tentative arrangements with a Q.C. to take the case to court, but apparently the Q.C. has been unable to obtain the papers from the solicitors handling the case. Eight years is a long time to elapse before a claim for damages is heard, and as a result a second writ has been issued to prevent the provisions of the Statute of Limitations being put into effect.

I do not know whether I should approach the Barristers' Board in regard to this case, because as yet I have never approached such bodies for assistance. The solicitors who are handling Mr. Curran's case have now dissolved partnership and the two men have gone their different ways. In my opinion it is time that some action was taken on behalf of Mr. Harry Curran.

Sitting suspended from 3.46 to 4.05 p.m.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I suppose every member of Parliament has some worries about traffic matters. I wonder whether the new points demerit system is working as effectively as anticipated. I have not asked any questions in the House about this, but I was very interested to read a report which appeared in the journal of the Australian Road Safety Council, of October, 1970. Among the many interesting items is one dealing with a matter which has been mentioned by Mr. Dolan. On page 3 the following appears:—

1057 DRIVERS LOSE LICENCES

One thousand and fifty-seven New South Wales drivers have had their licences suspended under the State's points demerit scheme in the first seven months of this year.

Of those suspended, 69 had a record considered to be so bad that the Commissioner of Motor Transport had placed them on a provisional licence for a further 12 months beyond the three months' normal suspension.

In the same period the State also cancelled the licences of 4204 provisional drivers, while a further 600 who had a "P" plate for the second time were suspended.

Police Traffic Superintendent Lane expressed concern at the growing number of drivers caught driving while under suspension.

ONE THIRD REJECTED

About a third of the applicants for a motor driving licence in South Australia are rejected on their first test.

This was revealed by the Secretary of the South Australian Road Safety Council (Mr. B. J. Plew) recently.

Mr. Plew said that many young drivers had not been taught to drive properly.

"Just learning the skills to manipulate a vehicle was not enough, they must be able to accept responsibilities and have right attitudes of mind," he said.

I know a couple of persons who have lost their drivers' licenses under the points demerit system. I wonder whether this system could not be extended by prescribing a further penalty. That would be preferable to having one's license suspended for a second offence. This will cause people to value their licenses. In my opinion a driver's license is more of a privilege than a right. Learning to drive a motor vehicle is the same as learning to operate any other complicated piece of machinery. It is the action, rather than the theoretical learning, that counts.

For a long time I have been very concerned with the fact that there are not, during the ordinary hours of traffic, as many traffic police on duty to apprehend drivers who commit minor breaches as there are during the peak hours. These breaches seem to be the causes of the minor accidents, and of the insurance companies having to pay huge amounts in repair bills. All this brings about an increase in comprehensive insurance. I am quite sure that the insurance companies are keeping down the premiums as much as possible, but the time is fast approaching when due to the high cost of repairs to motor vehicles the insurance companies

will have to increase premiums, and it may not be long before many motorists will be able to afford to run vehicles.

I think that a series of education lectures on traffic matters should be introduced. I have discussed this question with the Minister for Traffic. When one goes to Singapore and into a picture theatre one sees many notices. Among them are health notices which indicate where people can buy food and what type of food they should buy. If people have any doubt about the type of food they should eat they are advised by the notices to buy food which has just been cooked, because in the process of cooking harmful bacteria would be destroyed.

Other notices advise motorists to drive with their headlights on in certain areas only, because a motorist is not allowed to have the bright headlights of his vehicle on when he is travelling within a five miles radius of the city. The streets are well lit, and it is not necessary for vehicles to switch on their bright headlights. I am sure that in time this practice will be adopted in this State. The glaring headlights, particularly on wet winter nights, make it very difficult for motorists to see the road ahead and do the right thing.

I put forward the suggestion that the Traffic Department, the Road Safety Council, and the new group which has been formed should prevail upon the motion picture industry to exhibit, after the advertisements and before the commencement of the entertainment, films dealing with particular phases of driver education so as to reduce accidents. The Minister for Traffic is enamoured of this idea, but he has not been able to put it into practice. Here is a sphere in which visual education—as applied in schools, hospitals, and other centres of learning—could be used to advantage to give instruction to drivers.

In 1952 you, Mr. President, and I entered Parliament together on the same day. Since that time I have seen many members come and go. On this occasion I think I should make reference to this matter. Since I was elected a member of Parliament in 1952 there have been 30 changes in the membership of this House. I am grateful to the Clerk of the Parliaments (Mr. Roberts) for supplying me with these figures. In that time, 12 members have retired, eight have been defeated, and 10 have died in office.

Those who died in office were The Hons. R. J. Boylen, C. H. Henning, C. W. D. Barker, H. Hearn, G. Fraser, C. H. Simpson, E. M. Davies, J. H. Teahan, W. R. Hall, and A. R. Jones.

Those who retired and who have passed on since 1952 include The Hons. J. A. Dimmitt, Sir Harold Seddon (ex-President of the Legislative Council), Sir

Frank Gibson, Sir Charles Latham (ex-President of the Legislative Council), and H. L. Roche.

I thought this would be an interesting exercise because, from time to time, members retire from this House. As I said, 12 have retired and six have already passed on since 1952. It is pleasant to remember having been in the company of those esteemed gentlemen in this Chamber. I did not mention the other six retired members, but among them was Mr. Leslie Craig.

After all is said and done, parliamentary life does, in fact, mean something to individual members. It has certainly meant something to me. I did not have an academic education; I was educated until I was 13 years old and I then had to leave school. When I came to this Chamber, and made my maiden speech, I well remember Mr. Craig crossing the floor of the Chamber and telling me that I seemed to be apologising for my lack of academic education. Mr. Craig said that after listening to my speech he could see that I had some general knowledge which would stand me in good stead in this Chamber.

I have found that to be true. I have also learnt from other members. The point I am trying to make is that I plead guilty to accepting the advice which was given to me. I have worked on that advice and, over the years, I feel that I have improved. When I leave this Chamber today, for the last time, I will do so knowing that I was not too big, not too clever, and not too arrogant to sit and listen to, and take advice from, those who knew better than myself, and perhaps in some cases, from those who knew less than I did.

Parliamentarians come from all walks of life. When I was overseas I found it heartening to tell other parliamentary representatives that we, in Western Australia, did come from all walks of life and we did not have eight solicitors, or 10 specialists in another field, sitting in the Chamber. The people to whom I mentioned these facts realised we were really a democratic people in Western Australia. That is the reason I have mentioned our dear friends who have departed.

I have served on the Joint House Committee for several years and, as is known, I am a Deputy Chairman of Committees. I have served on two Select Committees, one dealing with guns and firearms, and one dealing with metropolitan transport. The result of the latter Select Committee was the formation of the Metropolitan Transport Trust, which was a great step forward as far as Western Australia was concerned.

You, Mr. President, Mr. Logan, and I are the only three surviving commissioners of the five who served on the petrol Royal Commission. The report of

that commission has been recognised throughout the world. It was one of the longest commissions ever held into the petrol industry, and only one inquiry has been held since. Automotive Chambers of Commerce use the report of that commission.

You would remember, Mr. President, as would Mr. Logan, that on one occasion we met all the managers of the oil companies in a private session. No record was kept of that confidential meeting. To me it was wonderful experience to be able to discuss the situation with those oil company managers who were, in the ordinary course of events, barred from giving public evidence. However, they presented their evidence knowing that it would be treated as confidential. About four years ago I met Mr. Chard, one of the oil company managers, in Sydney and he commented on the commission. I thought I would like to get that off my chest.

One of the great events which occurred during the time I have been in Parliament was in regard to the McKenzie baby. He was a boy of 18 months, and we sent him to America for a heart operation. The doctor who was looking after the child—we do not mention doctors' names—asked me whether I could do anything, by way of meeting people to raise funds to get the baby to America. He said the baby had to be there within seven or eight days. I was fortunate enough to meet the chief journalist of the *Daily News*, and he said that provided we handled the money ourselves the *Daily News* would set up an appeal fund.

The results of that fund were recorded in *Hansard*, some years ago. The people of Australia raised £6,170 in five days. So much money came in that three Treasury officers were sent to Parliament House to handle it. Mr. Phil Thornber was one of the officers. He and I were trustees.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: As a matter of interest, there is a small residue in that fund from which I am still able to assist needy cases. I was able to assist one in the last week.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am pleased to hear that because I was about to say that there was a balance of about \$1,000 after the account had been cleared up. That money was transferred to the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Two people have been assisted out of that fund, and one person was sent to New Zealand for specialist treatment.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: That is as a result of the effort of the people at that time. This evening when Mrs. Hutchison was speaking she said, referring to herself, "I had to educate Fred while overseas." I intend to refer to another story. On one occasion when I was in the Chair as Deputy Chairman, Mrs. Hutchison

had missed her opportunity to speak to the second reading of a Bill dealing with welfare. During the Committee stage Mrs. Hutchison commenced to give a second reading speech. The Minister in charge of the Bill quietly said, so that I would hear, "Is this a second reading speech?"

I was in a bit of a spot. I knew what I should do as Chairman of the Committee but members will know what the situation was. Sir Keith Watson started to laugh, but my good friend, the Clerk of the Parliaments, said, "Let her go; she will probably have less to say now than she would have said at the second reading stage." So we did that. When Sir Keith Watson got up to speak he said, "Fred squibbed it; he should have called Ruby to order."

In saying farewell I prefer to refer to my parliamentary colleagues as my parliamentary friends, because we can have a stoush in the Chamber and then adjourn and drink coffee together. In saying farewell to you, Mr. President, I would remind you that when you were making your maiden speech in Parliament I did not realise, at the time, that I should not interject. I was attempting to help you, Mr. President, with an interjection and you turned around and said that you would deal with me later. To your everlasting credit, you have not done so yet.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: There is still time.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I thank you, Mr. President, and I also want to thank your staff. The Legislative Council has been fortunate in having a very fine staff. Mr. Roberts has a distinguished military background which has been recognised. However, he also had another career for which he should be further recognised.

I refer to the fact that he was in charge of the Citizens Military Forces, and while in charge of that body Prince Philip came to Western Australia and took part in the presentation of colours. I believe that the ceremony attaching to the presentation of those colours deserves tremendous praise because it was a sight we are never likely to see again. I hope the authorities will recognise the great service Mr. Roberts has given to the youth of Western Australia.

Mr. Ashley has also given great service to Parliament, and he has been a very active member of the Junior Football Council. He was president of that council for many years—both A and B Grades—and he has been in charge of about 4,000 lads. Last year 3,500 lads belonging to that council played football and a man who can lead a group of young people in sport deserves great credit.

I would say that Mr. Hoft had an important job to take up when he followed Mr. Browne and Mr. Ashley but, in

my opinion, Mr. Hoft would be a great loss to this Chamber if ever he left us. I refer to his courtesy and to his efficiency. I should also like to mention the time he has taken to produce a small booklet on the history of the Western Australian Parliament. I sometimes wonder whether his efforts in producing this booklet have been fully recognised. I refer to the number of hours and to the tremendous amount of research that went into its production. It is similar to the effort put in by Mr. John Roberts, the Clerk of the Parliaments, to produce the brochure on Parliament House. Both are to be highly commended in my opinion.

To Mr. Hoar and his group I say "Thank you very much." This includes Wally Truscott and that young man who brought great credit to his people when he came to work in Parliament; namely, Philip Ugle. He is on holidays at the moment. I hope it will be conveyed to him that I felt it was a proud day when he came to work in this Chamber.

To our new member, Alan—whose surname I do not know—I also offer my grateful thanks. Whoever was responsible for inviting Philip Ugle to become a member of the staff will never regret it. I am sure each and every member of Parliament will appreciate the fact that a true Australian has joined us in our work.

I could not close my parliamentary career without extending my grateful thanks and congratulations to the *Hansard* staff. Over the 19 years of my office they have always been so helpful and efficient in the reporting and the typing of the speeches. The lady typists also are entitled to some praise.

I want to thank you very much, Mr. President, for your help during my parliamentary life, and also for your grace and help during the many difficult times I had at one period of my life. I thank you for your wise counsel and for the advice and help you have given so many people in so many ways, which pass unnoticed. You, Sir, have been a person who has done this without writing it on the wall.

Before I close, I would like to say how much I appreciated the late Gilbert Fraser. I must also mention The Hon. Frank Wise and our junior boy, young Bill, as we call The Hon. W. F. Willesee. I have not had very good health in the last three or four years and members would be surprised at the extent of the help given to me by Mr. Willesee. I am sure he would give it to all others in similar circumstances. Thank you all very much.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [4.33 p.m.]: This will be the last occasion on which I will speak in this Parliament. It might be of interest to review some

of my life as I have compiled a little story which I have before me. What better place to begin than at the beginning?

My surname is Hislop and my Christian names are James Gordon. I was born way back in 1895—on the 14th day of August to be precise—and I was admitted as a member of the medical fellowship in London. My father's Christian name was James and this was handed on to me. I was born in Windsor in Victoria, Australia. My father was a pharmacist. My mother's Christian names and maiden name were Catherine Anne Collins. Her father was William Collins and he was a railway station officer. I was married on the 8th December, 1925 and we had one son and one daughter. My son is also a doctor and his Christian names are Ian Gordon.

I was educated at Scotch College, Melbourne, Eastern Hill, and Brackley College, and finally at the University of Melbourne. I have a fine picture of Scotch College and I wonder whether the college in this State would like to have it. From the University of Melbourne I went to Royal Melbourne Hospital and subsequently became a consulting physician.

I thought it might be fitting to provide this information for the records as I have been in Parliament for some time now—in fact, since November, 1941. That was the year that Mr. John Nicholson died. I have seen many things happen in my time in Parliament, including changes to the Constitution of the Legislative Council. Many matters which come before this Chamber are difficult to resolve but we do our best to pass fair legislation.

Perhaps members might be interested to hear of some of the medical appointments I have held in my lifetime. These are many and varied. In the early 1920s I was with the Children's Hospital, which is now known as the Princess Margaret Hospital. I was once a junior at the Manchester Royal Infirmary, a second registrar, a resident of the Brompton Hospital, and I have visited European hospitals.

As a senior, I was medical superintendent at the Children's Hospital between the years of 1923 and 1926. Prior to that, in 1918 I was resident at one hospital in Broadmeadows and two in Launceston during the influenza epidemic of that year. In 1919 I was in charge of a school in Hobart which had been converted into a hospital. I have also been a physician to inpatients at the Royal Perth Hospital, and a representative of the honorary staff on the Royal Perth Hospital Board from 1941 to 1948. My posts have included consultant physician to the Royal Perth and Fremantle Hospitals. These hospitals received excellent services from many consulting physicians. During the years 1960 to 1968 I was senior rehabilitation physician at Melville centre.

Another side of the coin is that I was president of the Perth Rotary Club in 1939 and district governor of rotary between 1947 and 1949. As I have mentioned, I was elected to the Legislative Council in 1941. I was fortunate to receive the coronation medal of King George VI in 1935. I have also met Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

My duties have included membership of the Civil Defence Council of Western Australia, and I was Honorary Director of Emergency Medical Services during the war years; in fact, I held this post between 1942 and 1946. In the same years I was Executive Director and Deputy Chairman of the Medical Co-ordination Committee. I was Chairman of the W.A. Committee of Medicine, A.M.A., from 1959 to 1964, and have been the Western Australian representative of the Australian Federation of Post Graduate Medicine since 1959. In this year, 1970, I was made life governor of the Australian Post Graduate Federation in medicine.

On the recreation side my pastimes include bowls, reading, and photography.

I have many memories tucked away in my brain of different periods of my life, particularly during the war years. I could relate many experiences I have had and many that friends of mine had during the war when daily people found themselves in danger, and so many ships and aircraft were lost. However, I shall not do so on this occasion. I merely thank all members for the kind remarks they have made concerning me and I wish them all the very best for the future. May I extend personal thanks to you, Mr. President, and to all members of the staff.

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [4.51 p.m.]: I want to discuss one or two matters during the debate on this Bill. I want particularly to make reference to a suggestion I made during my speech on the Address-in-Reply debate. I wonder if the Minister could let me know whether anything has happened in regard to the suggestion I made because I cannot see any result.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: What was the suggestion?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I suggested that the Government give consideration to setting up a travelling art scholarship so that money will be available to the young artists in our community. I went on to describe an art competition which was held in my electorate prior to that occasion. I explained that similar arts scholarships are provided by the Governments in other States which enable students who so desire to extend their studies by travelling overseas and gaining experience. A greater opportunity

to study would be available to young artists in this State if the Government provided a scholarship.

This is the Appropriation Bill (Consolidated Revenue Fund) and it is appropriating quite a few million dollars. I suggest that a scholarship in the vicinity of, say, \$2,000 per annum could be made available by the Government. During the Address-in-Reply debate I mentioned that we in Western Australia are past the pioneering stage and we are reaching a time in our history when we should be more aware of arts and culture. If a scholarship was made available it would be of benefit to the students studying these subjects in Western Australia. I would ask the Minister whether he passed on my suggestion, because he did not bother to mention it when he closed the debate.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I will give him a reminder.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I think it is a fairly important point and if we can afford to appropriate the sums of money provided in this Bill I think we can well afford to appropriate a couple of thousand dollars to provide such a scholarship.

I would like to refer to another point. Members will recall that from time to time I have been fairly critical about the building of high density flats in various districts by the State Housing Commission. Members need not fear that I will do that again this time.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Have you received an invitation to go to the opening?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: That is the point I am about to make. Bear in mind that we are discussing the Appropriation Bill and that we have heard criticism from various quarters—either justly or unjustly, I am not in a position to say—of the expenditure of Government departments on the use of public relations companies to ensure that everybody knows what is going on. I received an invitation from the Minister for Housing to attend the opening of the Bentley housing project, which is to be opened by the Premier, The Hon. Sir David Brand. I thought, "Well, that is fair enough. I have been critical of this type of project, and of this project in particular, but now it is completed I will be pleased to go along to the opening."

The project is in my electorate and my constituents would expect me, as one of their elected representatives, to attend. However, a day or two later I received an invitation from the Minister for Education to attend the opening of a new school in my electorate which is something less than three-quarters of a mile from the Bentley housing project. I took strong exception to that because, as I mentioned earlier,

we have heard criticism of the amounts of money expended by Government departments on the employment of public relations companies, and here we have the situation of two important public buildings in my electorate being opened on the same day and within a half-hour of each other. I believe my constituents are entitled to see me and other members elected to represent them at the opening of these buildings.

In this situation it is virtually impossible for those members to be there. The matter goes further than that. It also affects the local authority because the members of the authority have been asked to attend both functions. I believe it is an embarrassment to them to have to decide which one they will attend. Surely in the lines of communication of the Government, each Government department should be made aware of what the other is doing, particularly in this case where the functions are to be held less than three-quarters of a mile apart on the same day. I express my dissatisfaction of the position because I think it is a case of mismanagement, to say the least.

I think it is rude because, I repeat, my constituents are entitled to have their elected representatives present at official functions when buildings erected at the cost of the people are opened. I express that dissatisfaction for what it is worth. My colleague, Mr. Dolan—who represents the same area that I do—will also be expected to be in both places. I do not know what action he will take.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I propose to be at one of them.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: But the honourable member is entitled to be at both. That is the conclusion of my criticism for this afternoon.

Today is the concluding session of my first term as a member of this House. I was the first member elected to represent the South-East Metropolitan Province under the electoral laws that provided for full adult franchise, and I feel very humble at having been elected by the people to represent them in this House.

I have met many wonderful people while I have been here, and I wish to pay tribute to some of them. I first want to pay a tribute to the officers and staff of Parliament House—the attendants, the dining room staff, the typists, the telephonists, Mr. John Roberts, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Les Hoyt and Mr. Hoar—and others who have shown me consideration and courtesy.

They have helped me with all the requests I have made, and I am grateful for their assistance and the work they have done for me. I also wish to express my appreciation to you, Mr. President, for your many acts of kindness, consideration,

and courtesy; for the knowledge that you have imparted to me as a result of your great experience in this House. I have always felt most humble that you should have had the time and the interest to give me the benefit of your knowledge, on matters that concern not only this House but the State and the country generally. I am indeed pleased to have been associated with you during my stay here.

I do not think my expressions of appreciation will be complete unless I pay a great tribute to the members of the *Hansard* staff. They have all helped me greatly; indeed, as a result of the assistance they have accorded me my speeches have always appeared to read better than those I actually made! As I say, I am grateful for their consideration and the help they have given me. I do not think it would be any exaggeration to say that it is nothing short of genius for them to be able to produce the work they do out of the speeches I have made.

I wish to say how very grateful I am for the consideration and courtesy that has been extended to me by every member of this House—whether he be a member of my party or of any other. I would like to feel that each one of them is a friend of mine; they certainly are as far as I am concerned.

I knew Mr. Dolan when I was at Fremantle Boys' School, but before I entered this House I had not met any of the members, apart from the Minister for Justice, whom I met on one or two occasions. It is heartening to recall the welcome that was extended to me on entering a House full of comparative strangers.

Like Mr. Lavery I have always been proud to listen and learn. I have made that a practice during my life. I listen to all that is said and make my own judgment. There have, of course, been times when members have been cross during the course of a debate. I have been cross with some members as they have been with me. As we know, however, this is all in the spirit of debate; each one of us endeavouring to win his point of view. I appreciate that everybody does not always see eye to eye with me; indeed I have had some heated exchanges with my leader, although I am pleased to say that I have just about got him around to my way of thinking, because the exchanges I have had with him recently have been less heated. He is obviously a good pupil.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I thought it was the other way round.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: When members express an opinion in this House they do so in the sincere belief that their point of view is the right one and should be accepted. I bear no malice towards anybody whose point of view has differed from mine.

As we all know, several members are about to retire from this Chamber; some voluntarily and others because they feel they have given as much service as they can to the community. I would like to say cheerio to all of them. As we all know, Dr. Hislop has been in this House for many years, and I wish him well in his retirement. It is unfortunate that Mr. Garrigan is not enjoying the best of health and accordingly he is not seeking re-election. I trust that his health will improve and that he will enjoy life for many years to come. I have appreciated his company very much during my time here. Mr. Strickland is also ill and this, too, is unfortunate. He has served the State capably for many years and has been a strong debater at times. I am grateful to him for his advice and assistance, and I regret that ill-health has caught up with him. I wish him well.

I would like to feel that Mr. Lavery is a special friend of mine, and while we have had our arguments I have never doubted the sincerity with which he puts forward his point of view.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Who gave you your first job to do?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I will come to that in a moment. I wish Mr. Lavery well in the future; he has represented his province most ably. I now come to the interjection made by Mrs. Hutchison. It was Mrs. Hutchison who gave me my first job. I well recall the occasion on which she phoned me after I had been elected and asked me whether I could call on an elderly lady in South Perth. The lady in question had a problem and she had contacted Mrs. Hutchison who had represented the area previously. Believing that I should earn my salary as soon as possible after being elected, Mrs. Hutchison asked me to do this job for her. I cannot remember the name of the elderly lady, but I can recall the house. Unfortunately she has passed on. I am pleased to say that I did go to see her and that I was able to rectify her problem.

It indicated to me that Mrs. Hutchison did not have any qualms about my not belonging to the same political party as she did. She was prepared to advise the people to come to see me, and I was very grateful to her. I will treasure having known Ruby Hutchison. I had heard about her from time to time during her political career, and I knew she had views that clashed violently with the views I had on certain points, and she still does, in fact. I think she has that right. However, I believe she is a lady with very great principles and understanding, and this State will remember Ruby Hutchison for a long time. I am pleased and proud to have known her and to have served with her in the Chamber.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Thank you.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: I wish her well in her retirement.

Finally, another one of our distinguished members has decided not to return—I refer, of course, to Mr. Frank Wise. Just before I commenced speaking I said to Mr. Wise that I would be speaking for only 20 minutes. I think I misled him somewhat because I have been speaking for 20 minutes and I still have a few things to say, and some of them concern Mr. Wise. I apologise to him for taking so long.

The other day I was reading through some old copies of *Hansard* and I read a speech that was recorded when I was four years of age. The date was the 18th July, 1933, and, on that particular day, at 3.50 p.m., a certain member said, "I desire formally to second the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply." That was the speech made by Mr. Frank Wise on that day and, as I said, I was only four years old at the time.

The record of this gentleman since that time is, of course, well known to all of us, and I feel very humble and proud—and indeed I shall brag about it—that I have been able to serve in Parliament with The Hon. Frank Wise. His work and his achievements over the years are well known and have been well recorded. I have no doubt that Australian history books of the future will include many chapters on the achievements of this honourable gentleman. He is a very humble man and probably he will not thank me for what I am saying. I do not believe, however, that I have the ability to say all of the things that I should say about him.

I simply want to say that during the time I have known him his wisdom, sincerity, at times his tenacity, and certainly his thoroughness and kindness, have been most apparent. As I said, I am proud to have been associated with him. I wish you, Mr. Wise, the best of health and happiness and I thank you indeed for the help and assistance you have given me during the time I have been a member of this Chamber.

I conclude by saying that I hope all those members who are not voluntarily retiring will be back next session and we will be able to carry on where we leave off today.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [5.21 p.m.]: This is an occasion when one can make a choice of the sort of speech one wants to deliver. One can be whimsical, reminiscent, belligerent, or constructive; and, as I have said on previous debates of this kind, this is a time when one can talk of cabbages and kings, and perhaps a mixture of those headings might be the right course to follow.

Speaking whimsically, this to me is an historic occasion. After 38 successive years in one Parliament or another I leave this seat today. There was another important historic occasion in Perth this day—the

filming of part of the film, "Nickel Queen." I am an early riser and I listen to all the news services between six o'clock and a quarter past eight in the morning. One that took my fancy this morning concerned a news reader who was commenting on the fact that the "Nickel Queen" was being filmed in Perth this morning and, in particular, that the Premier, and The Hon. Charles Court would be present; and that one of them was to speak. Whom do members think was the one to speak? The speaker was to be The Hon. Sir David Brand. Is that not an historic occasion!

Whether that is how it worked out or not, I do not know. I think perhaps it did not because I have an idea the Leader of this House was also a film star today! However, it certainly was an important and historic occasion for the Premier to speak first.

I have been asked by one or two members to give some idea of how a very serious matter in this State's history, some 20 or 30 years ago, was adjusted—I refer to what happened following the dire drought in the pastoral regions of this State. That drought was spread over many years and it covered pastoral areas in the province I now represent, and also pastoral areas in provinces now represented by other members. Although with pastoralists today there is nothing comparable with the assets situation of pastoralists in the days of which I am speaking, there is a need for the position of the pastoralists to be considered very seriously by those in Government circles.

The years of which I speak were from 1940 to 1946, and during that period the pastoralists faced a very serious problem. I have in my hand a schedule showing the position of many pastoral properties. I cannot table it because it would affect individuals who should not in any way be prejudiced by the mention of their names. I have the history of many properties with which I was intimately associated. One of these properties owed £27,791. In 1936 a total of 25,000 sheep were shorn on that property and, at the end of 1940, there were only 2,500 left, and, as I said, the debt on the property was £27,791.

There were many parallel cases; the owners, or the past owners, were desperate and distraught because of their debt situation. I took to Cabinet—and I can recall doing so—a proposition that Cabinet should give me authority to confer with all the creditors of these people in an endeavour to solve their problems without statutory authority. That was agreed to, and Cabinet further agreed, very soon afterwards, that all pastoral rents owing at that time for people surrounded and circumstanced by drought, and drought effects, should be waived, or written off, and that carry-on rentals should not be raised against them.

Conferences were held in my office with the then President of the Pastoralists and Graziers' Association, the late Sir Langley Lefroy, who was also Chairman of Directors of the Bank of New South Wales, and with representatives of all the banks, to try to get them, voluntarily, to agree not to repossess in any case where pioneer families were involved, in particular, but preferably in all cases. We endeavoured, by discussion, to look for a way out of this very serious problem.

It was agreed finally, after weeks of endeavour, that over a period of five or six years, according to the prospects of restoration of the property, they would suspend their claims for interest on the debts owed; and during that five or six years the follow-up debts would be written down to a value based on the economic capacity of the property at the end of the five or six-year period. Only one institution did not go along with enthusiasm to try to right the position. The same position obtained then as one can imagine obtains now.

Then, as now, stock firms and banks were reluctant to make any further advances. Indeed, they hold people on very hard budgets, so hard that it is not the parents who consider whether they can send their children to Perth or anywhere else to school; it is not the parents who consider whether their children's education may be helped by the services of a governess; it is not the people whose name is on the leasehold of a property who make a decision as to whether they will employ an out-camp man or not; nor is it their decision as to how he should be victualled.

In those days the direction was given as to whether even luxuries like tomato sauce or pickles would be allowed to the out-camp man. There are members in this Chamber who know that to be the situation. While the situation is not as serious as that on this occasion, the cash position is serious. In some places where a poor season has been experienced because of depressed prices and past bad seasons, the debt structure is again bad.

To continue the examination of the case I have cited, the debt was £27,791. That was voluntarily reduced by the pastoral firm concerned to £18,800 over a five-year period. In addition, the debt was finally adjusted to £17,900. All rents had been remitted. The Crown had made a contribution equal to several thousand pounds in rent remitted, and paid the firm's interest at the rate of 2½ per cent. on the debt suspended. Members can imagine the task I had in convincing a Cabinet to pay the pastoral firm 2½ per cent. of a suspended debt in order to keep people on their properties. That took some achieving, but it happened in many cases. I had 40 cases on this list but there were 400 involved,

and it was achieved without an Act of Parliament. Most of these cases were in the North Province.

I will now quote the case of a very well-known family who owed £39,835 to a pastoral firm. The property was reduced to 1,780 sheep. In that case, £19,129 was the amount of relief given to the pastoral lessee at the end of six years. Perhaps one of the outstanding cases is the property that has made one of the greatest recoveries, where a flock of 30,000 sheep shorn in 1935 was decimated to 3,500. These people enjoyed total relief of nearly £20,000. The sacrifices were made by the firms and the banks concerned but the gesture came from the Government initially.

I know that to any Government suggestions from Opposition members are usually not acceptable. From my own experience, I can see ways in which I would like to help in this dilemma, and the sums involved would not be of the magnitude of the sums involved in those years. The ways I can see to right the situation are not only humane but are also important in a national sense.

I think one of the greatest things that happened as a result of that exercise was that the sons of great families, instead of riding off with a horse and saddle as their only possessions, are still the owners of those properties. Although it is still a cash problem, there are ways and means of alleviating the distress about which members of this Chamber must hear and know in many parts of their districts, and about which they must be worried.

I would now like to speak of this Parliament. There have been very many changes in the last 38 years. I wonder how many of the members seated here at the moment realise that this House is unique in more than one particular. It is unique amongst all the elected legislative bodies in the British Commonwealth. This used to be a non-party House, with no Leader of the Opposition, but it must be a party House now because there is a paid Leader of the Opposition. That change has occurred in my time in this House. There was no Leader of the Opposition in this House for more than 20 years of my parliamentary life.

The interesting result of that is that in all Parliaments modelled on the British Mother of Parliaments—the House of Commons and the House of Lords—those who support the Government sit on the right-hand side of the Speaker or the President, and those who are in opposition sit on the left-hand side. In this House we have the unique situation that three Opposition members—who have been very vocal Opposition members—are seated on the right side of the President, and there are seven Government supporters who are seated on the left side of the President. I

wonder who will take the step of altering it? As far as my researches go, this is the only elected House in the British Commonwealth where this applies. I mention it because it is more than a matter of interest. It is a thought that I leave with members today.

I would like to make one or two interesting comparisons in connection with Parliament. When I came into Parliament I left a job worth about £700 a year to accept £480 a year as a member of the Legislative Assembly. The salary was £600 a year less 22½ per cent. financial emergency deduction. The sum of £480 was not the net salary; it was before tax—State income tax. The private members' component of my salary did not rise above £560 a year until 1947. As a Minister I was one of a Cabinet of eight from 1935 to 1947. We shared £8,500 under the Constitution Act. It was specified in the Act, if members wish to look it up. At the same time we paid a ninth Minister—the so-called Honorary Minister—out of our salaries. In addition we paid the party secretary and the party whip, and we paid monthly into a Cabinet fund the sums necessary for the entertainment of visitors from overseas or interstate who were guests of the Government. The Ministers did that from their own salaries.

It is quite different today, not only in relative values but also in actual earnings. Fortunately there is a better recognition of the value of the services of a public man. Looking back for a moment, I have enjoyed—I think that would be the word—20½ years in higher office positions, and I leave Parliament as a private member.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Surely you will get a very generous allowance because of having held high ministerial offices, including the Premiership.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I could say that is a sore subject, and I would not like to be nasty in any way on this day. However, if the honourable member wants to know the figure, or if the House wishes to know it, for 20½ years in higher office in the services of this State I will receive, above the base pension to which I have subscribed since superannuation was first introduced, \$713 a year as the higher office component of the pension. I hope that answers the honourable member's suggestion about a generous allowance.

The Hon. J. Dolan: You will not receive as much as I receive now out of superannuation—not parliamentary superannuation, either.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: That may be so. Except for a gap of five years, I have continuously paid into all funds. I am told that my long service in higher office is not included in the calculations because it ante-dates a certain period. I do not

want to debate this subject. Suffice it to say that this sum of \$713 is not based on the higher office within the pension scheme but on the emoluments of office divided by the sum that members enjoy as part of their superannuation. I leave it at that. I do not want to discuss it in this Chamber, but the fact remains that I do not qualify for anything higher, so I am told. I will continue to contribute at the rate of \$750 a year towards the base pension, to which I have contributed since it was first introduced, with the exception of a gap of five years. How much? Much more than most people in Parliament today. I am sorry that I have developed that subject so far. Much more could be said but I will not say it here.

There are two or three things that strike me as being very important in the future of this State. The prime one is a better understanding in Federal-State relationships. I suppose I have spoken for many hours on this subject in this Chamber, but I still hark back to comments I made when trenchantly criticising the Commonwealth Budget a year or two ago. Members may recall I said it struck me, when analysing the Federal Budget, that the Commonwealth Government was raising hundreds of millions of dollars just for the fun of it, that it was taxing the Australian community for hundreds of millions of dollars more than were necessary to meet its budgetary needs. And so it proved. The subsequent Budget figures the year after showed that to be exactly the situation.

I repeat that, even if it costs the States, jointly, \$250,000, I would like to see some-one of the highest calibre and the highest capacity in Australia employed to analyse Commonwealth accounts and Commonwealth Budget tables as stringently as the Commonwealth Grants Commission used to examine ours. The result would be sensational, because it would be found that wastages occur to the detriment of the people of the sovereign States of Australia.

I have often wondered how Parliament could get over to the public the messages that members of Parliament try to get over in the debates that take place in this House. The Press does its job to the best of its ability; it can devote no more than a certain number of lines to reporting the proceedings of our Parliament, but would it not be true to say that, of the 81 members of this Parliament, with the exception of yourself, Mr. President, and the Speaker in another place, there are many who do not have the cases they put before Parliament presented to the public through the medium of the Press? On many occasions, after an honourable member has spent hours marshalling his facts and figures to present his argument in

Parliament, and he has made his speech in the House, he finds that it has not warranted a mention in the Press.

This is certainly not the fault of the newspaper reporters themselves and is not, I think, in part, due to the policy of the newspaper itself. In the main, the reason a member's speech has not been reported in the Press is that there has not been sufficient space in which to publish it. Therefore, I intend to advocate, and to point out, for the benefit of those members who will continue to serve in this House, how we can make *Hansard* a popular seller. I suggest we should do with *Hansard* what has been done with *Portnoy's Complaint*; that is, we should ban it. If we banned *Hansard* so that it would not be available to be read and used by members of the general public, we would find it would be avidly sought after and read by most people in the State. Therefore, I think a move should be made to print *Hansard*, but to ban its general circulation.

The Hon. Clive Griffiths: That statement will get you a mention in the Press.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It is strange to say, but nevertheless true, that I still have some friends in the Press. One of them lives in my home but she would not dare write a word about her father unless he edited it. However, to be quite serious, I would like to see some method introduced whereby the matters that we raise in Parliament—such as those outlined by Mr. Clive Griffiths—could be brought to the attention of the public, because we are not people who treat matters lightly; but we can, of course, be facetious when the mood strikes us.

The arguments we advance are those in which we believe. I have heard some members put their arguments before Parliament most vehemently, vigorously, and earnestly—I am looking at one of them now—but what happens? Their arguments are pushed around by others, a vote is taken, and they are almost lonely in the support they get. We must give to every person the credit for being earnest, for the belief that he holds, knowing that he believes it is his holy right. That is one of the great principles that has been followed in this State Parliament—or until recent years has been followed—namely, it has been conducted on the basis of mutual trust and on respect for the other fellow's argument. Should another honourable member strongly disagree with it, at no time should he doubt the earnestness and the right of the person advancing the argument to express his views.

From this seat I wish to make only a brief reference to the great work that is done by the officers of Parliament. They have been mentioned and particularised by other members, but I will not do that. All the officers know me well, and they know I am grateful for what they have done.

To you, Mr. President, I would say that all of us have enjoyed your domination and your intensity in keeping us on the right track, during which you have always displayed your great generosity. However, only a few members in this Chamber, including myself, would know how your speeches were enjoyed when you were a private member on the floor of the House and when you sat in one of the seats on the front bench and never failed to say what you felt on any subject, despite what the rules of your party may have laid down. If you considered that the principle was wrong you did not fail to express your views and you must have been right because more often than not you recorded your vote on the same side of the House, as I was, I not only respect you for that, Sir, but you know the depth of my feeling towards you in that regard.

The members of this Chamber have been very kind to me. Because they are transparent all members know my bad qualities. They know how irascible I can be on certain occasions. I can recall, from the seat Mr. Willesee now occupies, being—to put it mildly—very het-up on some occasions, very rude, and very cruel, and I was always sorry for it afterwards. But on looking back I suppose there is nothing that any of us have done that would be done in a different way if it were possible for us to do it again.

I can recall the time when we did not have a Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber, and when the present Leader of the House used to sit where Mr. Baxter is sitting at the moment. I can even take my mind back to the days before that when, as a very petulant young gentleman, he won a seat in the Legislative Assembly. I think I crossed swords with him even down there. To those of us who study our fellow men, it was obvious that The Hon. Arthur Griffith—that is his proper title nowadays—would be a man who would be heard of during his parliamentary career.

I can also recall being taken to task by one, The Hon. Leslie Logan, for being a little rude in the comments I made about the Grants Commission on one occasion. He applauded all it did, but I did not; I have never done so. As is known, I would have advocated a showdown with that commission long ago. I can remember The Hon. Graham MacKinnon sitting in the seat that Mr. Abbey now occupies, almost cutting his teeth, as it were; the sort of teeth I am told he needed in some of the Bills he has introduced this session. I would think that during the time he has moved from that seat to the seat he now occupies, he has cut many teeth; wisdom teeth. May I conclude on the note of thanking all members, and to point out that the basis of all our service is not only friendship and mateship, but to remain

humble, and I thank those electors of mine who have for so long honoured me with their confidence and trust.

THE HON. C. R. ABBEY (West) [5.56 p.m.]: In having to follow Mr. Wise, I rise to speak to the Bill with some trepidation, and I will have something further to say about that honourable member later in my speech. It has been my pleasure to be a member of this House for a little over 12 years, and I will complete nearly 13 years' service by the time my present term expires. I had the good fortune to have an extra year of service when the franchise of this House was changed. That was a memorable occasion. History was made, and the starting point, of course, was the motion moved by Dr. Hislop. It was a most courageous motion for a Liberal Party member of this House to move, because at that time the present Government parties had not thought a change was warranted.

The motion was moved by Dr. Hislop and it was accepted by the Government parties in the right spirit, because the Government eventually sponsored the change that was necessary. It is as well to remember that, because it is just another one of the very many forward moves that have been made by the Government. I had the pleasure of sitting for many years alongside my colleague, Dr. Hislop, whilst occupying the seat now occupied by Mr. Berry, and I know the great contributions Dr. Hislop made to the debates during that time. I am aware that the doctor has a very busy life as a medical practitioner and as a member of this House. He always took the opportunity to take home the Bills presented to the House so that he could examine them thoroughly in the early hours of the morning, because that was the only time available to him to carry out this task.

During the war years and the post-war years, which was a very difficult period, Dr. Hislop took a leading part in many of the debates that took place in this Chamber. I feel that I am a better member of Parliament for having known the honourable member whilst he has occupied a seat in this Chamber.

I would like briefly to refer to several members who have decided to retire; Messrs Fred Lavery, Jim Garrigan, Mrs. Hutchison, Mr. Strickland, and last, but not least, Mr. Wise. All of those members have made great contributions to the debates in this Chamber, and have given considerable thought to any matters that affect the government of this State. I take this opportunity to congratulate them on the wonderful service they have rendered to the State over the years.

I think it is only fair that I should particularise in the case of Mr. Wise who, in the wonderful service he has rendered to

the State, has been an inspiration, I am sure, to many who have sought appointment to either House of this Parliament.

The leader of our party, and the Leader of this House, during my term as a member of this Parliament has given wonderful service to the community, to the House, and to our party. I would like to convey to him my appreciation of the way he has carried out his duties as leader; he has set an example to our party and to me particularly. He will be contesting his seat again and I am as certain as I stand here that he will return to this House again. I hope I will be here when he is returned, because he will certainly have my support if I am fortunate enough to be re-elected.
Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: Prior to the tea suspension I was referring to the members who are about to retire. I would also mention the two members who are on the sick list and who have endeared themselves to members of this House, generally, because of their approach and their cheerful nature. I refer, of course, to Mr. Strickland and Mr. House. Both gentlemen have made quite a mark in this House, particularly Mr. Strickland. Mr. Strickland has occupied the position of Leader of the Opposition, and he was a Minister when I first came here. He has always impressed me as being a man who was very capable in his job, and very sincere and loyal to the cause of his party. Mr. House also displayed those qualities, and I wish him and Mr. Strickland a quick return to good health.

I have been a member of this House for 12 years or so, and most of that time I have supported the present Government. I served a very short period as a member of the Opposition in this House and in that time I did not learn how to become critical. Because of my support of this Government I have been critical on very few occasions. I take this opportunity to acknowledge the terrific advancement and the achievements by this Government, which I have had the very great honour to support. However, I hope I will be forgiven if, very briefly, I am critical of the present abattoir situation.

The position is very worrying to the producers of our State, who find themselves held to ransom by the men who are on strike in the main metropolitan abattoirs.

The Hon. R. F. Claughton: I thought the honourable member intended to criticise the Government.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: Do not worry; I intend to. I am leading up to that. Reports appear in the paper every day concerning the strike situation and a report which appeared today is very disturbing. Apparently pickets have clashed

and damage has been caused to cars. That is not a good situation to have in our society, and it is one which I am sure everyone deplores. It is unfortunate that in the meatworkers' union there is a very small element who are popularly known as stirrers.

The managements, in their wisdom, have decided they will not re-employ those few men, and I applaud that decision. I am sure that without those stirrers the situation would be much healthier and we would have a return to work. It is perhaps strange that at this time of the year many itinerant workers are employed and we always seem to get a similar situation. Perhaps it is not really strange, because the itinerant workers do not wish to settle down. They move about throughout Australia, and probably New Zealand, and they do not intend to settle and they do not seek permanent jobs. For that reason they usually do not care what finally happens to an industry.

The Liberal Party has advocated, for some considerable time, that one of the solutions to this problem is to create a stable labour force in the industry. The rural committee of the Liberal Party has made a submission on this matter and it believes that to establish a stable industry we need well-trained workers who want to stay in the industry permanently. The committee recommended to the Government that skilled workers within the Commonwealth and from overseas should be encouraged to come to Western Australia and that the State should provide adequate housing for them. We need family men who want to stay in the industry, and not disturb it.

Furthermore, I am critical of the abattoirs situation. For years now we have not had adequate abattoir facilities, particularly in the metropolitan area. The abattoirs at Midland and Robb Jetty are inadequate for the job. The works at Robb Jetty are very old, and the management, in its wisdom, has used the freezer storage space other than for the storage of meat. That additional storage has meant that the Robb Jetty abattoir has been able to make a small profit; but surely a public facility of this nature does not essentially have to make a profit. I believe the Robb Jetty abattoir should have been enlarged years ago so that it had excess capacity.

Some members will recall that when the lamb export industry of Western Australia was at its height a number of additional chains could be brought into operation when needed. At other times of the year they were put into wraps.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Does the honourable member know the background of the abattoirs?

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: No, not all of it. I take it for granted that Mr. Wise would know far more than I do. I am expressing my own observations, and I think it is a shame that a large works—very old, of course—on a large area of land are not being properly used.

The Towns and Austen report, of recent date, recommended that both the Midland Junction Abattoir and the Robb Jetty abattoir should be brought up to a certain standard. In the case of Robb Jetty, the report suggested that the capacity should be brought up to 6,000 sheep and lambs a day. The recommendation for Midland Junction Abattoir was about 8,000 per day. Towns and Austen, who were advisers to the Government, are both experts in their field, and their opinion was that the figures I have mentioned were about the limit to which the abattoirs should go.

It is unfortunate, in my view, that the Minister for Agriculture and his departmental officers have decided that they will ignore this report. I cannot understand that attitude because the report is a good one and, in my view, its recommendations would have quickly overcome the situation in which we find ourselves at the present time. The Towns and Austen report, in section 2, reads as follows:—

- (1) The sheep and lamb capacity at the Midland Junction Abattoir be held at 8,000 per day.
- (2) (a) That sheep and lamb capacity at the Western Australian Export Works (Robbs Jetty) be held at 6,000 per day.
- (b) That a feasibility study be undertaken at Robbs Jetty as to the best means of achieving the capacity recommended.
- (3) That the contemplated major expenditure at Midland Junction be the subject of thorough analysis and in particular that the expenditure proposed for boning facilities proceed only on the basis recommended in this report.
- (4) An additional sheep/lamb facility is required immediately.

Those are the points I want to develop. It is a matter of very great concern that we have not had good facilities to handle the stock which is available in this State. Most other States of the Commonwealth have excess capacity and they are able to swing into action when additional stock is offered due to seasonal conditions. Those abattoirs are able to handle the excess. This has an effect on the return to the producer.

In Western Australia, because of the lack of adequate facilities, during the flush period producers receive 2c or 3c a lb. for their mutton. The price is often quoted at 4c or 5c but that is only for

the good quality meat. Generally the export type of mutton is likely to bring 3c a pound.

What do we find in the Eastern States? We find a situation in which mutton brings about double the price for export. This is not good enough. We have had a drought, and the farming community is suffering great financial difficulties; it should not have to bear this burden. I am amazed that the Minister for Agriculture and his advisers have recommended to the Government that such large sums of money should be spent on the extension of the Midland Junction Abattoir. What we need—and this is in line with the Towns and Austen report—are additional lamb and sheep facilities immediately. There is plenty of room to put in a new works. I think the site was originally 100 acres. This land is prime industrial land which is set apart for that purpose. The land is well away from established housing settlements and it would be an easy matter to find a site for the purpose of this industry. If we went into some other area of the State, whether on the seaboard or elsewhere, we would have to find a large area of land to ensure that the industry would not cause a nuisance to adjacent housing settlements.

The money that is proposed to be spent at Midland and Robb Jetty could go towards providing a major new works in the metropolitan area. What would that mean? It would mean more than just the additional capacity at both Midland and Robb Jetty; it would mean that we would have a new works up to D.P.I. standard—not easily achieved with old works—and more important, it would mean that the labour force required to handle the new works would be something like half of that required for the old works. That is the basis of my objection to the present scheme. At the moment the Midland abattoir is a hotbed of industrial unrest, and it has been for years. But what are we going to do? We are going to add to that unrest by increasing the work force at that place from something like 1,200 to 1,400 to upwards of 1,800 to 2,000. In that situation we must continue to have industrial strife.

It is good news for the producers of this State that the capacity at Midland will be increased over the next 12 months or two years. It will be increased to a capacity of something like 12,800 sheep and lambs per day.

That will not be the end of it. Having achieved that capacity we will have to bring in more itinerant workers and the industrial situation will always be at boiling point because these workers are not stable and do not intend to remain in the industry for long. I foresee a great deal of trouble in the future.

I have mentioned previously that the Minister for Agriculture and his advisers apparently intend to ignore the Towns and

Austen report, and I base that on the reply I received to a question I asked last week, and also on the reply to a question asked by Mr. McNeill on the 6th October. In his reply the Minister said that in his view there was no need to set up a meat industry authority. The Towns and Austen report strongly recommends the establishment of a meat industry authority to overcome the difficulties with which we are faced at the moment in our abattoirs. The authority would determine the need for, and capacity of, new plants and also where the plants should be built. That recommendation is contained on the first page of the report. Obviously Towns and Austen believe that the meat industry in Western Australia should be controlled by a thoroughly representative body.

At present the Midland Junction Abattoir is controlled by a board comprising a representative of the industry and the Farmer's Union, a representative of consumers—who is the chairman—and a representative of the butchering interests. I believe the manager at Midland is a capable man and at Robb Jetty we have an expert in charge of operations. As has been recommended for some years, firstly by the expert committee set up by the Pastoralists and Graziers' Association comprising representatives of almost every meat handling interest, plus the representatives of producers, I think the abattoirs of this State should be controlled by a meat industry authority. The Liberal Party conducted an independent investigation in 1968 and it also recommended that a meat industry authority should be established. With regard to the membership of the authority, the Liberal Party recommended as follows:—

One Commissioner who shall be Chairman of the Authority and shall have a wide knowledge of the Meat Industry and of business administration.

One member who shall be an appointee of the Government.

Two producer representatives, one each from the Farmers' Union and the Pastoralists' and Graziers' Association.

One representative of the Meat and Allied Trades Federation.

One representative of the W.A. Meat Exporters' Association.

One representative of the W.A. Live-stock Salesmen's Association.

All appointees shall be submitted to the Minister in a panel of three names from each organization.

I think possibly another representative should be included; that is, a representative of the United Beef Breeders' Association.

That briefly sets out what I think would be a most useful and knowledgeable body. We have had indications that such bodies do work. The State Electricity Commission, for example, is a body which conducts its affairs very well. Most interests in this State believe that a meat industry authority would overcome a great many of the difficulties we are facing in regard to the location of abattoir facilities. I repeat again that the Towns and Austen report strongly recommends the establishment of a meat industry authority. It is pointed out in the report that such an authority has either been established, or is being established, in most States of the Commonwealth.

This is one step towards achieving a more stable industry and it could well lead to a better situation for those employed in the industry; that is most important, because a great deal of the industrial strife could be overcome. The members of the authority would be realistic in their adoption of policies with regard to such matters. I say again that a stable work force is the prime need of the industry.

I think I have said enough on that subject. I wish to finish my contribution to this debate by saying that my term of office—it will be almost 13 years by the time my present term expires—has been a most pleasant one. As other speakers have said, being a member of Parliament gives one a unique opportunity to experience different sections of life in our community. That experience is not available to very many people. It was said to me in conversation during the tea suspension that perhaps a parliamentary career is one of the few things left to be conquered. Certainly it is a very hard career to conquer, although people like Mr. Wise have made their contribution towards conquering this very difficult job. I have enjoyed contributing what I have been able to contribute and I am sure other members have also.

I offer my good wishes to all those retiring and seeking to come back again. I feel that those members have much to offer in their lives ahead and I sincerely hope they return. Their experience is invaluable, despite what some people may say about them. I would like to join with others in expressing to you, Mr. President, my very sincere thanks for your courtesy and attention. I congratulate you on your long occupancy of the Chair in this House. The fact that you have continued as President for so long is an indication of the high esteem in which you are held by members. I express to you my thanks and I extend my good wishes to you for the future and particularly for the festive season.

I join with others in expressing my appreciation to the officers of this House and the staff of Parliament for the help

and the courtesies extended to me. It has been a wonderful experience to be part of this organisation. Like others I am offering myself for re-election and I hope I will be back. We all have to accept what is handed out by fate. I do not think any member really worries about that. We do the best we can and we know that if we have done a worth-while job we will be back. If the electorate thinks otherwise, then fair enough; that is a democratic decision.

THE HON. G. E. D. BRAND (Lower North) [8.00 p.m.]: I would like to draw the attention of the House to several problems that exist in various parts of my province. The lack of rain has accentuated stockfeeding problems, particularly in the Gascoyne and Murchison-Eyre portions of the province, and it is certainly causing a great deal of concern at the present moment.

The economic situation that exists in the wool industry and as it affects the pastoralists adds to the worries of the people who find it necessary to send their children away to schools in Perth, Geraldton, and other areas, for purposes of higher education.

The school at Carnarvon is a three-year high school. At present committees of the various service clubs—Rotary, Lions, and Apex—have formulated a plan with a view to meeting the Minister by way of a deputation to solicit any information and assistance he might be able to give to upgrade the present school to that of a five-year high school.

As members are aware, this is a growing district and it is most important to the district that this school be upgraded to a five-year high school. Any help that can be given by the Minister will be greatly appreciated.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What would be the number of fourth and fifth-year students who will avail themselves of this?

The Hon. G. E. D. BRAND: I believe that each year over 150 children come to Perth to attend the schools here. The present economic situation adds to the difficulty and if the people concerned just cannot afford to send their children away for further education they will just have to return to the local school, and that will be that. It will assist the position if we can add to the numbers which will be presented to the Minister before Christmas.

I have written to the Minister and asked him whether he would meet a deputation if an application was made to him in this connection. I would be pleased to support any such deputation and go along with its submissions. The Minister, however, is apparently very busy at the moment and he has informed me that he will not be able

to visit the schools in his own area before they break up. This does not make the prospects of a deputation look too hopeful.

I feel sure, however, that when the deputation is ready the Minister will give it a hearing and, no doubt, Mr. Berry and I will add our support to anything the deputation might put forward. In this connection, of course, we are faced with quite a problem, because it is necessary for us to visit our rather extensive province. Such a visit generally takes about three weeks so it is possible that we may or may not be of some use to the deputation.

We are grateful to the Government for the assistance it has given to children who are required to leave home for higher academic education. The Government pays about one-fifth of the fares required and the parents find the remaining four-fifths. Hostels have been erected for the accommodation of those children who live out of the towns in question.

In another direction I would point out that a committee on the goldfields is making investigations into the number of children who will be attending the hostel which it is hoped will be established at Kalgoorlie to serve the districts from Esperance to Leonora and on to Laverton and perhaps Wiluna. I hope it will not be long before a hostel is established in that area.

I think I have made it fairly clear that we wish to gain the sympathy of the Government and of the Minister for the upgrading of the Carnarvon High School to a five-year high school. There are other problems in connection with education which stretch into other towns—the Murchison for example, where there are schools which are not high schools but which go as far as the third year, in which many of the local people would like to see domestic science and trade courses established.

The headmaster in Meekatharra, particularly, endeavoured to get some sort of training for the children in these two important aspects and I am sure the department is very appreciative of his efforts, even though there is no curriculum set down for such education.

It has come to my notice that the School of the Air in Carnarvon is having some problems. Members might know that for a long time the School of the Air was run from a room with a cement floor—in fact it was a girls' washroom.

This has now been shifted to another room which has been found more suitable for broadcasting. We tried to secure a broadcasting studio but we were not successful in this direction. Last year a great deal of trouble was experienced with the broadcasts. Students and mothers could not pick up the signals and, as a result, the students lost interest. Apparently the

fault lay in a line between the flying doctor service and the point of broadcast. A certain amount of trouble is still being experienced in the broadcasting system, and I hope this will be corrected very shortly.

Another problem we face deals, strangely enough, with roads; though this is not so much in the Gascoyne area. The Government is to be praised for the great amount of finance it has made available for the sealing of roads. When I entered this House I think we had bitumen roads for about 162 miles of the journey to Meekatharra. However, the road has since been completed to a point some 40 miles north of Meekatharra.

It is to be hoped that when the North-West Coastal Highway has been completed to Port Hedland, the road from Meekatharra to Port Hedland will be upgraded and bituminised. To give an example of the roughness of the road I would point out that recently a truck driver asked me to have a look at his truck which was laden with about 20 tons of timber. When he opened the door of the truck I found that the dashboard had been split in two and the steering column had broken away from the steering box. How he had not been killed I do not know. That will indicate the difficulties experienced by vehicles using the road in question.

These people would certainly not mind paying the road maintenance tax if it could be spent at once on the road to which I have referred which is used extensively to cart goods from Perth to Meekatharra and to the important iron ore centres in the north.

The final matter to which I wish to refer is the damming of the Gascoyne River. This problem is forever with us. The first item of importance which came to my notice in connection with the damming of the Gascoyne is its importance to the growers in that area. I contacted the authorities concerned with this today and I am informed that the partners who were entrusted with the feasibility study of the Gascoyne are now finalising negotiations with a firm of subconsultants for a geophysical survey of the foundations of the Rocky Pool dam.

They have carried out a study in connection with the hydrology of the Gascoyne River and the Commonwealth Government has nearly completed a market survey for the area. It is to be hoped that it will not be long before we have a dam on the Gascoyne River. Those of us who have visited the area on the various tours that have been conducted know what this will mean to the people of the district. We are aware of the trouble they experienced after the cyclone when they lost all their crops and property. Fortunately they are coming good now and by next year they will probably be back to normal. They are

certainly very appreciative of the support given through the Banana Industry Compensation Fund.

I would like to say how very pleasing it has been for me to be a member of Parliament representing the Lower North Province. I have met many people during the course of my stay in this House. As a member of Parliament one just does not know how well one is going. On a recent trip I made to Carnarvon somebody rushed up to me and asked me, "How is Bill Willesee going?" I was not too sure whether he liked me or whether he was only interested in Mr. Willesee, who lived there for many years and who had some old friends in the area.

I wish those members who are leaving the very best for the future. It has been jolly nice to meet all the members in this House. I admire the work done by Mrs. Hutchison for those who are less fortunate than we and it has been a privilege to meet her husband who, quite obviously, she keeps in order.

I miss Mr. Strickland, because when I first came into the House he, and the Minister for Local Government, were the only ones who got me into trouble with the President. We all know the long and valuable service that has been given to Parliament by Dr. Hislop, and I wish him well in his retirement. It is unfortunate that Mr. Garrigan is not enjoying the best of health and I think we will all miss him when he retires. I wish him all good luck in the future and I hope he enjoys his well-earned retirement.

We will, of course, all miss Mr. Wise. The great fund of knowledge that has come to him as a result of his ability and long experience in parliamentary affairs will be sadly missed in this House. I thank him for the many hints he has given me from time to time, and I appreciate the occasions on which he has scolded me for not rising to speak to a particular Bill; which my natural modesty prevented me from doing. I know that he will leave this House cherishing the thought that we wish him all the best of good health, and happiness for the future.

It has been said that Mr. Wise has refused certain honours which he might otherwise have received. There are occasions when I think this is one part of Labor policy which I do not like very much. If someone has done a good job he deserves recognition for it.

I wish you, Mr. President, the Ministers, and everybody in this House the very best for the festive season and the future.

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan) [8.13 p.m.]: I would like briefly to say a few words concerning the retiring members. I do so with a sense of humility, because I have only been in this

Chamber for three years, but nevertheless I think this entitles me to say that during the time I have been associated with them I have formed certain very strong impressions. I feel it would not be right for me to let this opportunity pass without saying what I wish to say.

I do not suggest that anything I express in connection with the retiring members would in any respect do justice to them. I do not pretend I would be in a position to do that because I have not known them long enough.

Therefore, what I say is purely my own impression. It is something I have felt and I consider it necessary and desirable that I put this forward tonight, the last night of this session of Parliament. I have not really known Mr. Garrigan particularly well, but I have been impressed with his friendliness and cheerfulness. He is obviously a man whose heart is in the right place. He has certainly looked after the interests of his constituents and I have appreciated his personality and presence in the House during the time I have known him.

I have had the great pleasure of getting to know Mr. Fred Lavery during the short time that I have been a member of this House. On one or two occasions I heard him refer to the necessity for members to be guided by common sense and he is a very good example of that. He exemplifies common sense in all his utterances, and he has demonstrated that his approach to problems is a practical one, from a man who has passed through considerable adversity. He looks at matters from the point of view of one who has had to battle, and that is a tremendously important contribution to make. By virtue of his common sense I believe he has made a great success not only of his life but of his parliamentary duties.

Mrs. Hutchison has struck me as being a dedicated feminist. During the last few days I have had the opportunity to read through some of the speeches which she made in the stormy years just after she entered Parliament. It is certainly an education to see the number of points of order and other points that were taken on those occasions. Clearly she battled for the causes that were very dear to her heart, and she did so with considerable success. The atmosphere has changed considerably since she has been a member of this House, particularly in respect of women's rights. These achievements do not happen by accident; they happen because people battle away regardless of the consequences.

However, I cannot agree with what I regard as being her pet theme—the abolition of the Legislative Council. I really have not been able to formulate any argument as to why I do not agree with her. I hope that time will prove that I do have

some valid argument on that subject. Nevertheless, I admire the way she has stuck to her guns through thick and thin.

I believe she is a woman of very great character and great purposefulness. I know that she has supporters in all walks of life. I have met them myself in the Liberal Party, and they have let it be known that they greatly admire the work she has done on behalf of women's rights and on behalf of the less fortunately situated members of the community. She may rest assured that she has many supporters whom, perhaps, she does not know of.

As for Dr. Hislop, he is far better known to every member of Parliament as a parliamentarian than he is to me; but I have still known him for many years. Before I entered Parliament I knew and recognised him, as he was then recognised, as a very great physician. He had a standing that was unequalled in the medical profession of this State. A few years ago when I took an interest in medical matters and was involved in a few medical cases I learnt that he was recognised as one of the leading physicians, if not the leading physician, of Western Australia. His opinions were keenly sought after.

He was particularly good in certain specialised fields, of which members are aware, having heard his views on more than one occasion on medical subjects. He was, indeed, an authority on the matters with which he dealt in the House. Not only was he a great physician, but also a great public servant in the very general and broad sense.

During the war he was engaged on a number of matters of national importance on the medical side and the manpower side, in addition to his duties as a member of Parliament after he was elected to this House in 1941. To me his great quality, quite apart from his abilities I have mentioned, has been his absolute sincerity of purpose and his determination to pursue the highest ideals of his professional life.

The Hon. Frank Wise was well known to me by repute—almost by legend—before I was elected to this House. His name was a byword throughout the West when I was a boy. I wish I could say, as Mr. Clive Griffiths has said, that I was four when Mr. Wise made his maiden speech; but I cannot, because I was then 15 years of age, and that was the year I did my Junior. I do not remember the occasion of his maiden speech but I do remember hearing him soon after that when he made his name in this Parliament and became a Minister of the Crown a few years after he entered Parliament.

His name was well known throughout the State. In those days people seemed to have a greater knowledge of the leading political figures than they do today.

At any rate, I heard his name often in those days, and he was somebody I felt I almost knew.

When I came back from the war in 1946 I was invited to have lunch in Parliament House by the legal practitioner to whom I was articled; that was Sir Ross McDonald, who was then the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly. He pointed out The Hon. Frank Wise to me, because he happened to be sitting at a table not far away. He spoke of him as a man of very great ability and as an outstanding leader of the State. I was very impressed by those remarks from the late Sir Ross McDonald. I know how true they were.

Some years later I was at Esperance with a party which included The Hon. Leslie Craig, just prior to the Chase Syndicate coming to Western Australia and just prior to the opening up of the Esperance area. On that occasion Mr. Wise was there. I am not quite sure whether he was there in a ministerial capacity, but in any event he was looking after the interests of the Government in relation to the negotiations which were about to take place with the American interests.

I well remember the occasion when one morning we had to get up early. When we got out to the car at about 7 a.m. we saw Frank Wise walking back to the hotel. He had been up for an hour walking around, literally tossing up in his mind what decision should be made by the Government in respect of the American interests. I know, because I heard something about the matter. He was worried, and he had the cares of the State on his shoulders in those days as he had had for many years.

I feel it a great privilege indeed to have had the opportunity to spend the last three years in association with him in this Chamber. It is something which I, like Mr. Clive Griffiths and other members, will always cherish: the fact that I have had the opportunity to hear him and of being together in the same Chamber with him.

Some people seek the company of celebrities. I have not been one of those, but I have always been honoured to be able to associate, even if only in a humble capacity, with people whom I consider to be great men. Great men are not always people who appear to be great. Often they are the modest type, and not the outstanding type who seem to dominate everything. I have been impressed by the fact that Frank Wise is one of the great men I have met, and I hope he will forgive me for saying that. I will remember many of the propositions I have heard him utter.

I believe he has one great quality, among many others, which he shares with Sir Robert Menzies; that is, he is a great

parliamentarian. I know he believes in the forms of Parliament and in the observance of the true spirit and meaning of Parliament. This is something which makes one feel very humble at times, when we realise how blithely we sometimes dismiss matters which have a great deal of significance. I know that he understands the significance of parliamentary forms and processes. Having learnt something from him I hope I will be able to continue to observe not only the letter but also the spirit of parliamentary forms and processes. I have certainly gained from my association with all the members to whom I have referred in different ways. There are different ways of learning things. I hope I do not stop learning. I would like to add my voice in tribute to the retiring members.

THE HON. J. HEITMAN (Upper West) [8.26 p.m.]: Like the other speakers in this debate, I rise to support the Bill; and in so doing to pay tribute to the retiring members. I wish them all good health, long life, and happiness when they leave this Parliament. Since I have been a member of this House there has developed a great friendship between the retiring members and myself. My one wish is that this friendship continues after they leave Parliament. I hope that I will continue to see them from time to time.

I do not want to eulogise the qualities of all the retiring members, because that has already been done by others, but I cannot let this occasion go by without saying how much I have admired The Hon. Frank Wise. I have been here only a short eight years, but when I come to think of it Mr. Wise has been here just 30 years longer than I have been, and that is a long, long time to serve as a member of Parliament. The amount of good work that he has done in those years must be tremendous.

I have always enjoyed listening to his contributions to debates. I have always regarded him as being one of the best debaters I have heard. He has a good command of the English language and he always makes himself understood in speaking in the debates. I wish him well, as I do every other retiring member.

I feel sure that the article which appeared in this afternoon's issue of the *Daily News* will be worth reading and saving, to remind us of the tremendous job he has done for Western Australia. I join with other members in wishing Mr. Wise well. I certainly hope that our friendship will continue in the years to come, and we will continue to see a great deal of him after he retires.

I have come to know Dr. Hislop quite well, and I apply to him the remarks I have applied to Mr. Wise. I also hope

that the friendship that has grown up between us will continue to flourish for many years to come.

To the other retiring members I say the same. I hope we do not lose sight of them when they retire, and that our friendship will continue to grow.

This evening I looked to see what happened when I first came into Parliament. In looking at *Hansard* No. 1 of 1963 I see that I came into this Chamber in that year on the 23rd August. On the 27th August, just four days later, I spoke on the Address-in-Reply. On that occasion I thanked everyone in Parliament for the wonderful kindness that had been afforded me when I came into the House. I must say that this practice has not changed in almost eight years. The Clerks of the House have been kindness itself. I am sure we have all learnt a great deal from them. I would like to thank them for the extremely decent way in which they have always treated me. I think this applies to all the staff in Parliament House. It is possibly a privileged job and I am sure they live up to the jobs which they hold here. I do not think any member could ever say that he has had a cross word with them. They know their work and carry it out to the letter. They are kindness itself in the way they assist and help all members of Parliament.

To you, Mr. President, I would like to say that perhaps I have learnt one or two lessons from you when I have overstepped the mark. You have brought me to heel and I have learnt a great deal from it. At all times you have carried out your position with decorum and plenty of common sense. I hope that when I return next year this will continue.

One of the items I especially mentioned when I first came into the House was water supplies in country areas. In referring to *Hansard* I see the different ones I mentioned. It is worth mentioning the number of country water supplies that have been finished and the number of towns that have been reticulated in the past eight years. At the time I first spoke in this House I mentioned that the water supply at Geraldton was very inadequate. Since then a 24-inch main has been built from Allanooka to Geraldton and consequently the town has a much better supply of a much better type of water than it had with the supply from Eradu. Reticulated water supplies have also been provided in the last eight years to Northampton, Dongara, Mullewa, Nabawa, Morawa, Perenjori, Watheroo, Yericoin, Eneabba, Jurien Bay, Wanneroo, Quinns Rock, Coorow, Carnamah, Dalwallinu, and Mingenew. Of course many towns and districts still need water. I mention that water will be provided to Piawaning, Latham, and Badgingarra.

Of course, many towns need an improved supply. I think of Miling and in particular of Bindi Bindi because in that area something like 55,000 acres have more or less turned to salt over the years, and this salt appears even in the dams and the bores. The stock cannot live on salt water. A reticulated water supply is an eventual must right throughout the district.

I would like to thank the department concerned and the Government for the way various areas of the State have been reticulated. This has certainly made life in the country a great deal better than it was some years ago.

In 1963 I also mentioned that the northern areas were being neglected so far as the S.E.C. was concerned. Since that time the S.E.C. has loomed large and gradually extended its power lines. Power will be in Geraldton in the next year or two but at present current is being bought from the Geraldton Municipality. The power will extend to Northampton, Chapman Valley and through the farming areas of Geraldton to Mullewa.

When we come further south, S.E.C. power lines are already at Moora and the S.E.C. will take over more towns very shortly. It buys current from the Western Mining Corporation at Morawa and has extended the lines from Morawa to Three Springs and the surrounding districts. I would say that in the next two years S.E.C. power lines will be right through the northern districts, or what I might call the Upper West Province. I do not think there will be one district which does not have power and light from the S.E.C.

This again shows that the Government has not neglected these areas but has tried to give them modern amenities which we see in other parts of the State. I am grateful to the S.E.C. and to the Government for the manner in which they have gradually improved these amenities in these areas which once were sadly neglected.

When the Minister was talking on a new mining Bill which was before the House a couple of evenings ago he said that one of the agreements which had been put through was the Dampier-Tom Price agreement. This has been passed since I have been a member in this place. The Minister also said that something like \$800,000,000 has been spent to further the production of iron ore in the area, and that we are now getting very close to the amount of finance that has come from the agricultural industries.

I do not think we ever stop to think just how much money has been invested in farming in Western Australia. When the Federal Government developed the Eneabba area for returned war service land settlers the average cost was something like \$24 an acre to develop, to put in 1,600 acres of pasture, to build fences,

and to erect a house and sheds on the land. Since that time costs have gone a great deal higher and it would now cost very much more to develop land to this extent.

If we consider that every acre of developed farming country in Western Australia would have cost in the vicinity of \$30 an acre to develop, to pasture, to fence, and to supply water to, thousands of millions of dollars would be invested in the agricultural industries of Western Australia, quite apart completely from the amount of machinery which is necessary on farms.

Farmers have had a fairly bad time over the last few years and higher costs of development and machinery have placed them in a very bad way financially. I know the Government appreciates this and during this last session the Government has tried in various ways to assist the farming community.

Even in this session of Parliament we have seen the cancellation of the vermin and noxious weeds taxes. People might say it amounts to only \$600,000 to \$800,000 a year, but it is a great help to those who have had to pay these taxes. Many people, too, have been relieved of the amount of money they had to pay in land tax. Of course there was the abolition of the controversial receipts tax which must be a big help to everyone. Overall, it is not a great deal but the fact that many people in this State will save money must be acknowledged. We must also consider that it will now be possible to cart stock without paying road maintenance tax. I think all these actions have been aimed at trying to help the farming community and, here again, I would like to thank the Government for looking into these matters and doing what it can to assist that community.

Earlier tonight Mr. Abbey mentioned meat. This morning I was rather disappointed to read that the capacity of the Midland abattoir would be increased to something like 12,000 sheep a day. If the Towns and Austen report had been followed in its entirety, I feel this money would not have been spent at Midland. It would have been spent on a brand new abattoir with up-to-date killing and handling methods, which would cut down on the number of staff required.

Midland has not enjoyed an enviable reputation over the years as far as strikes and turmoil amongst the slaughtermen and others who work there are concerned. I know it is under new management and I think it is under much better management than previously. Nevertheless I feel that an entirely new abattoir would be preferable to making additions at Midland, although the additions will be of great benefit and will help out for the present.

I am sure the Government realises that a new abattoir will have to be built every few years to cope with the increase in

stock. Four or five years ago the figure of sheep in this State was 16,000,000 but today it is something like 32,000,000. I do not think it will continue to increase at that rate in the coming years. However, I do believe that every five or six years we will need new works capable of killing about 6,000 animals a day.

There is always a chance that private enterprise will come into this field. There has been a great deal of talk about proper killing works. I believe there could be too many small works. According to the Towns and Austen report a works capable of handling 6,000 animals a day is possibly the most economical that can be built.

I hope the Government will look at this and ensure that more killing works will be established so that farmers will be able to get their stock killed and exporters will be able to have them killed and sent overseas. I consider the local market does not take anywhere near the number of animals that can be reared in this State.

I would like to mention something which Mr. Abbey also touched upon; that is, the current strike. If most of the men who are on strike realised what it is costing the producer they might have second thoughts. The costs are high for the producer who cannot have lambs and sheep slaughtered at the present time. If these facts were fully known I am sure the men might have doubts about continuing the strike.

The fact is that many producers had up to 4,000 or 5,000 lambs just ready to go onto the market. When the lambs are weaned they are normally sent straight onto the market. Farmers will have to carry the lambs after they are weaned and will have to shear them because of the grass seeds and other seeds which get into the skin. The cost of shearing will set them back a certain amount and we must realise, too, that many of the lambs will have to be carried on until next March.

This means extra costs in feeding and watering. In many areas farmers rely wholly and solely on dam water for their stock. We have to consider that 2,000 or 3,000 lambs would be drinking approximately one gallon each every day. This gives some idea of the amount of water which would be necessary. This amount of water would have to be in reserve but it is not, because of the poor rainfall in many areas. If some farmers are to get through they will need to cart a great deal of water.

It costs approximately 49c to shear a lamb and this has to be considered in relation to the poor price for wool. The farmer would not get sufficient from the wool to pay for the shearing. These are all added costs.

If the farmers had been able to have their lambs killed straightaway after weaning and without shearing they would show a certain amount that was clear

profit but now they will show a loss bearing in mind that it costs 49c to have one lamb shorn on the farm.

I realise that there are many speakers to follow me, and I would like to say in conclusion that I hope to see here next year those who come up for election this year. The education they have received here will fit them very well to come back and continue the work they have done so ably over the last few years. I wish everyone the very best for the festive season and trust we will all be back next year.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [8.46 p.m.]: My remarks on this Bill will be very brief. One receives many complaints from the people in one's electorate or province about the sums of money that are spent by the Government on education, health services, etc. The Appropriation Bill of 1950 was the first Appropriation Bill that I had to deal with when I entered this House. It is interesting to compare the allocations made in that Appropriation Bill and in the Bill that is now before us.

The total amount in the Appropriation Bill (Consolidated Revenue Fund) in 1950 was \$72,000,000; this year it is \$317,677,000. Going through the schedules to the Bill, and comparing the amounts allocated to the various departments from the Consolidated Revenue Fund we find the following: Premier, Treasurer, and Minister for Tourists \$38,898,000 this year, compared with \$8,000,000 in 1950; Minister for Education \$67,848,000 this year, compared with \$5,044,000 in 1950; Minister for Health, Fisheries and Fauna \$50,803,000, compared with \$1,700,000 in 1950; Public Utilities \$76,864,000 this year, compared with \$20,000,000 in 1950.

Those figures indicate what has happened in this State in 20 years—the advancement that has been made, the sums of money that are now required for services, amenities, and necessities for the people of the State.

To digress a little, my attention has been drawn by Mr. Syd Thompson to an item in the vote for the Premier, Treasurer, and Minister for Tourists for a grant of \$250 to the Fellowship of First Fleeters. I understand, from brief inquiries I have made, that this refers to people who came out on the early ships. I am not sure whether they were convicts or free people. Perhaps this is an association that has been set up to mark an historic occasion, or perhaps it has something to do with the Captain Cook centenary. The Minister may be able to explain this item to us.

I had been referring to the advances that have been made in the State and the increases in the sums spent on education, health services, and so on.

The Hon. J. Dolan: You do not spend money on education; you invest money in education.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I agree with the honourable member, but we have to take into consideration the fact that this money has to be found in this progressive State, with its increased population and the increasing number of children who have to be educated. It is a very good thing that we can find this money. I think some of our people are a little too critical of what we do not do for this and that, without giving any thought to where the money comes from. There are so many demands. If one reads the section of the Bill dealing with the Premier, Treasurer, and Minister for Tourists, one sees that large amounts have to be paid out to various organisations, societies, universities, and so on. It is amazing to find that the figures have reached such proportions today, but this is the trend in any country that is developing. I do not always give credit to the Government but I think it deserves credit for being able to find the finance and spend it in so many important directions.

I think it is a pity that the contents of this Bill cannot be published in our main newspapers so that the people can be informed of these things. They would then know what the money is devoted to, and, although they would not grasp the whole situation, they would have a general idea of what is being done by the Government, and of the volume of expenditure involved.

The Hon. J. Dolan: We should not have teachers teaching classes of 53 children, as happens in my district.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: The honourable member knows that the Education Department has difficulty in obtaining the number of teachers it requires. We all know that very great endeavours have been made to try to train people as teachers in this State. The Government has advertised and sent people overseas to try to recruit teachers. With the development of industry, people who are trained as teachers are being diverted into private industry because they receive more money and, perhaps, better conditions.

I would like to join with other members in wishing those who are going into retirement the very best of health. I begin with Mr. Wise, about whom so much has been said tonight. Mr. Strickland has not had the best of health; he came into the House at the same time as I did and he has been a very close friend. Mrs. Hutchison came into the House in 1954, Mr. Lavery in 1952, and Mr. Garrigan in 1954. I join with those who have expressed their appreciation of those members and the services they have given.

To those members who, like myself, will be facing the electors next year, I express the wish that they and I will be returned.

It does not matter which party members belong to; I do not like to see members defeated at elections, particularly those with whom I have been associated for many years.

I have overlooked an old friend of long standing in this House—Dr. Hislop. Even before I came into the House I knew Dr. Gordon Hislop, who was particularly good to my late father in his last year. I will never forget what he did for him. I have a very soft spot in my heart for the venerable doctor, who has been a wonderful man, not only as a member of this House but also as a doctor. He has done a lot of study in various avenues of medicine and has contributed a great deal to debates on medical matters in Parliament. I think I should say: Thank you, Gordon, for all you have done during your political career and your medical career, and I wish you the very best of health during your retirement.

I wish to thank you, Mr. President, for the manner in which you have helped us all in the House—particularly myself, as Chairman of Committees. My thanks also go the Deputy Chairmen of Committees—Mr. Willmott, Mr. Lavery, and Mr. Jack Thomson—who at all times have helped and co-operated in the Committee work in this House.

The Ministers have given us full co-operation. We realise there is a great deal of co-operation between Ministers and members of all parties. To members generally I express my appreciation for the manner in which they have assisted me to carry out my duties. I also thank, very sincerely, the officers of the House; Mr. Roberts, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Hoff, and the attendants who, at all times over the years, unhesitatingly have helped every member of this Chamber. I also take this opportunity to express my appreciation of the work performed by Mr. Burton's staff.

During the 20 years I have been in this establishment I have had every co-operation from everyone associated with the Parliament. Many kindnesses have been shown to me by many people and I appreciate them very sincerely. I trust that everyone associated with this House will continue to have good health. I support the Bill.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [9.02 p.m.]: When dealing with legislation of this nature, for a long time now it has been the custom for the Minister introducing the Bill to explain briefly its purpose, to advise the House how much money the Bill is to appropriate and then, having made that brief explanation, he resumes his seat to afford members an opportunity to speak to the Bill. I followed exactly the same course this evening as I have done for the past 11 years; that is, I got out my notebook and pencil with the idea that I might

reply, to the extent I was able, to the comments that were made and then give the usual undertaking that in regard to those matters to which I could not give an adequate reply, I would make inquiries and advise members later.

In years past I found myself—on some occasions, anyway—coming out fighting at the conclusion of a debate on a Bill such as this. But after the speeches tonight I gathered the impression—which I later found was fulfilled—that there was something a little different in the remarks made by members who have spoken to the Bill. The speeches were given in a much more benevolent atmosphere this evening, and I think I can understand the reason for it. Many members are retiring and many others, following the close of the session, will be standing for re-election, and so the opportunity was taken for each member to exchange good wishes with the other.

I am not going to join members in doing that at this point of time, because it is customary for the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition to make remarks of a seasonal nature under the heading of "Complimentary Remarks." The reason I will not do that tonight is that I do not want to deny the opportunity afforded Mr. Willesee to reply to any remarks I make. So for the present I thank members for all that they have said. To some extent I have enjoyed listening to what has been said. I would find it very difficult to reply to a good many of the remarks, because I felt that as they were passed from one honourable member to another there was a great feeling of friendship and kinship between all of them.

As Mr. Baxter has said, there is no doubt that we do have our fights and differences of opinion, but this is the place where we should have them, and each one of us is entitled to—and indeed should adhere to—the principles in which he believes. There is one common feature which we share and that is whatever our thoughts and beliefs, we are all working for the common good. As Mr. Baxter was able to demonstrate tonight, over the past 15 or 20 years Western Australia has indeed gone forward a long way.

We have spent quite a time speaking to this Bill, and I repeat it is not my purpose to endeavour to reply to what has been said except to say that the points raised by members will be conveyed to the Ministers' departments and, to the extent possible, where information can be given, it will be passed on to members.

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.

QUESTION ON NOTICE RURAL RECONSTRUCTION BOARDS

Establishment

The Hon. N. McNEILL, to the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Is the Government acquainted with the nature of the proposal announced by the Federal Minister for Primary Industry for the creation of rural reconstruction boards in each of the States?
- (2) If so, what is to be the function of such a board in Western Australia?
- (3) When is it anticipated that the board will come into operation?
- (4) What discussions have taken place, and with what departments or organisations in Western Australia, in order to determine—
 - (a) the form of administration; and
 - (b) the nature of assistance; that could be provided by such a board?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) to (4) The only information available is the announcement in the Press that the Minister for Primary Industry intends submitting a report to Cabinet based on a report which the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has prepared for him on rural indebtedness. Details of the proposal will be provided when approved, and whatever co-operation is required to implement any such scheme will be provided by this State if necessary.

LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Assembly with amendments.

Assembly's Amendments: In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. F. D. Willmott) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Justice) in charge of the Bill.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The amendments made by the Assembly are as follows:—

No. 1.

Clause 5, page 3, line 9—Insert after the word "weekday" the words—

"and on Christmas Day where it does not fall on a Sunday".

No. 2.

Clause 5, page 3, after line 13—Insert the following paragraphs:—

(b) by inserting after the word "club" in line five of paragraph (d) the passage "and to his guests, not exceeding three in number, in his company";

(c) by deleting all words after the word "premises" in line six of paragraph (d);

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have had a look at the amendments that were made in the Legislative Assembly by the member for Balcatta. The first amendment provides that the facilities of a club shall be available on Christmas Day when it does not fall on a Sunday. At the moment the provision is that clubs can choose to remain open for trading, but not on Good Friday or Christmas Day. Under the Licensing Act, and prior to the Liquor Act coming into force, clubs did have the right to trade on Christmas Day when it did not fall on a Sunday. I move—

That amendment No. 1 made by the Assembly be agreed to.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Does that only apply to clubs, and not to hotels?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The amendment in that section deals with the trading hours of clubs.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move—

That amendment No. 2 made by the Assembly be agreed to.

We should also agree to this amendment made by the Assembly, because the wording is in conformity with the wording used in another section.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I would be grateful if the Minister would explain what this refers to.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This clause which seeks to amend section 35 deals with club members and their guests. If the amendment is agreed to it will enable club members to invite guests, not exceeding three in number.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: The effect of the amendment is to enable the guests to pay for the liquor as well as to consume it.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

Report

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

BILLS (4): RETURNED

1. Securities Industry Bill.
 2. Sale of Land Bill.
 3. Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 6).
 4. Disposal of Uncollected Goods Bill.
- Bills returned from the Assembly without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

Complimentary Remarks

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [9.25 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until a date to be fixed by the President.

The business for the year is now concluded, and this is the twelfth consecutive occasion on which I have risen, as Leader of the House, to address a few remarks to you, Mr. President, as I did to your predecessors on the conclusion of the business of the House prior to the Christmas adjournment.

To say the least, 12 years is a long time. It has been a very busy time, and I think everyone will agree it has been a very interesting time. Since your election to the presidency of the Legislative Council on the 28th July, 1960, you have occupied the high office with great dignity, and it is with confidence that I express on behalf of all members of the House our appreciation of the manner in which you have conducted its business during your term of office as President.

I express my appreciation and also the appreciation of my ministerial colleagues to the Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) and to his deputies (The Hon. F. D. Willmott, The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery, and The Hon. J. M. Thomson).

In your capacity as President and in the functions of the Chairman of Committees and his deputies, it is your task and their task to conduct the business of the House while it is in session. I am sure all of us appreciate the job of work—if I could put it that way—that you all have done.

My appreciation is extended to Mr. Willesee as Leader of the Opposition. Over the years I have continued to enjoy the understanding and trust that has existed between us, and I have a feeling that this understanding and trust will, in fact, become warmer as the years go by.

To the Government Whip and to the Opposition Whip I would like to offer our thanks for the work that they have done. The work of the Whip is an important function of the House, and it is sometimes necessary to record pairs and the speakers on the various pieces of legislation. As far as the Government Whip (Mr. Heitman)

is concerned the Ministers work him very hard; but I do not know how hard Mr. Willesee works the Opposition Whip (Mr Stubbs).

I offer my thanks to my ministerial colleagues who continue to co-operate with and help me in the task that I, as the Leader of the House, have to undertake. I also extend my thanks and appreciation to members in general for the manner in which they have joined in the debates on various pieces of legislation that have been introduced.

This is the conclusion of the third session of the 26th Parliament, and somewhat less than half of the members of this Chamber will be facing the electors within a few months. As we heard to-night, other members have decided not to continue their parliamentary careers and they are retiring of their own volition. At the risk of repeating a good deal of what has already been said I want to add a few remarks to those that have already been uttered. I feel if I did not it would be a dereliction of duty.

I want to convey my personal feelings of regret to the members who are retiring and who will not be here in the following session. First of all I want to mention the name of The Hon. F. J. S. Wise whose parliamentary career commenced in 1933, in fact, on the 8th April of that year. On that occasion he was elected as member for Gascoyne in succession to The Hon. E. H. Angelo. The mention of the latter name takes one almost into the realms of parliamentary history.

I first encountered Mr. Wise when I was a member of the Legislative Assembly. I used the word "encountered" because not only did I encounter him but there were occasions when he encountered me. I must say he was very free with his advice to young members of Parliament. I can remember him saying to me on one occasion, "It is quite important, Arthur, what you say in the House and what you do in the House, but it is equally important what you do in your electorate." All present are well aware of the long and distinguished parliamentary and administrative career of Mr. Wise, and that career is now drawing to a close.

I would like to outline quickly that Mr. Wise was appointed Minister for Agriculture and the North-West on the 26th March, 1935, and later took on the portfolios of Education, Police, and Lands. He was Leader of the Labor Party from the 31st July, 1945, and was appointed Premier and Treasurer on the same day. He resigned from that position on the 1st July, 1947. Purely good-humouredly, I happened to look at the Consolidated Revenue Estimates Bill which the honourable member introduced when he first became Premier. I think he made

the shortest speech on record when all he said was, "I move that the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Wise was Leader of the Opposition from the 1st April, 1947, and resigned his seat on the 9th July, 1951, having been appointed Administrator of the Northern Territory. He resigned as Administrator on the 30th June, 1956, and was elected as member for the North Province in the Legislative Council on the 22nd September, 1956, in succession to the late C. W. D. Barker, whose voice I can almost hear now.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Talking about Carnarvon.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I feel as though I can still hear his voice and hear some of the things he used to say to Mrs. Hutchison at the time. Mr. Wise was appointed Minister for Local Government and Minister for Justice in the Hawke Government on the 13th November, 1958, and he held that office until the Government resigned on the 2nd April, 1959. The honourable member held the position of Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council from the 25th July, 1962, until the 30th June, 1966, when he made way for a younger member—Mr. Willesee. Mr. Willesee has held that position ever since.

I thought I would simply add those remarks to what has already been said by other members. I have learnt to respect Mr. Wise greatly and I am sure that when he occupied the position of Leader of the Opposition the same trust existed then as exists now between the present leader and myself.

I want to make a few comments on the membership of Dr. Hislop who was elected as member for the Metropolitan Province in the Legislative Council on the 1st November, 1941. He has represented the W.A. Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Hobart and in Perth. I think Dr. Hislop is now father of this House, in the period of service. Quite naturally, the doctor has evinced a keen interest in medical and health legislation and has been to the fore in recent years through his promotion of abortion legislation.

I think it is true to say that Dr. Hislop was really responsible for adult franchise being introduced into this Chamber. I am not in any way trying to detract from Mrs. Hutchison and the work she has done. However, I think I can say that I had something to do with the introduction of adult franchise because I ultimately introduced the Bill.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I thought the Minister might get into the act.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: We all assisted because we all voted.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: On that occasion I did not have any grease paint on either. I wondered, at the time, whether or not I was doing the right thing and it gave me a great deal of worry. However, this House is now elected on adult franchise.

I want to say that to me, personally, the doctor has been a great friend. There have been times in the stress of ministerial office when I have needed some help and the doctor has never hesitated to afford me that assistance.

I now turn to Mrs. Hutchison, with whom I have had many fights. She was elected as member for the Suburban Province in the Legislative Council in May, 1954, and she was the first woman to be elected to the Legislative Council with the object, as the honourable member has often indicated—and as late as this afternoon—...

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Of getting rid of the Legislative Council!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: As Mrs. Hutchison has just said, her object was to get rid of the Legislative Council. She has been saying the same thing since 1954.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: She has enjoyed every minute of it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: My first encounter with Mrs. Hutchison was when she was my opponent in 1953, so I know what she is like as an opponent—and I say that in the friendliest of terms.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: I always get on very well with the Minister's wife so I do not know why I cannot get on with him.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I could not understand anybody not getting on well with my wife.

The honourable member joined with Mr. Lavery in a real partnership on the 14th May, 1966, and both members will cease to be members of this Chamber, of their own volition, at the conclusion—not tonight—of this Parliament on the 22nd May, 1971. Everybody will cease to be a member of this House on that date.

Mr. Lavery was elected as a member for the West Province in the Legislative Council in May, 1952, and both he and his wife have contributed to many debates in this Chamber. I would like to say to these two people that they have my infinite respect, although I have had quite serious arguments with both of them from time to time.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Only in this Chamber.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Has the Minister considered that I can become respectable when I leave this House, and become Mrs Lavery?

Several members interjected.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: You will understand, Mr. President, if I restrain myself in a commendable manner and do not make the obvious retort which comes to my mind. I now turn to Mr. J. J. Garrigan, who was elected as member for the South-East Province in the Legislative Council in May, 1954. Mr Garrigan has contributed to many debates affecting mining operations in this State and has invariably evinced a great deal of interest in all legislation directed towards the better health of miners, and the safety and improvement of their working conditions. He has also had a few heated words with me from time to time. Of course, I have had a few heated words with each one of the people about whom I have spoken, but that has not been one-sided. I am sure that all those members know that I respect them personally and I wish them a long and happy retirement.

I think that each retiring member, in his own way, has made a contribution to this Legislative Council. I want also to refer to Mr. Strickland and Mr. House, neither of whom is here tonight because of illness. I hope that both of them will have a quick recovery, and that they will be back in the House next year.

As you are aware, Mr. President, in a period of less than four months this Chamber has dealt with 87 Bills. We have passed 86 of those Bills, one having failed to pass. Many of those measures have granted improved living conditions in the community in acknowledgment of the era of prosperity which has come about, in the main through the expansion of our secondary industries. I feel prompted to say that amongst important legislation of this nature has been the expansion of the workers' compensation legislation and improved superannuation payments. We have passed Bills dealing with salaries, land tax alleviation, the reduction of the voting age for the next election, and substantial benefits accruing from the easing of death duties. Important amendments have been made to the Public Service legislation by the setting up of a Public Service Board, and improved conditions were provided for Government employees in respect of superannuation and pensions.

At this point I desire to express my appreciation to the officers of the House. One member, who did not go through all the names of the members of the staff, said he felt that everyone knew his sentiments. I do say to Mr. Roberts, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Hoft and Mr. Hoar and all the assistants, many thanks. On this occasion I feel I should make reference to the quiet, efficient services of Dave Carrick and Bili Joiner. Those two people are not now as obvious in this Chamber as they used to be. This House is indeed fortunate to have the services of such a fine group of courteous and very experienced people as attendants.

Mr. Roberts, after his sojourn at Westminster, has doubtless expanded his knowledge of parliamentary procedures. I feel sure the advice Mr. Roberts gives will be appreciated in all manner of ways.

My thanks are due to all members of Mr. Burton's staff for their attentive efforts to cater for the material needs of members. I would also like to express appreciation to the *Hansard* reporters who have worked long and arduously through this session. My appreciation also goes to the members of the Press for the work they do in reporting Parliament.

The session which is now drawing to a close has been conspicuous in two other respects; namely, the introduction of ratifying industrial agreements such as the Western Mining Corporation agreement Bill and the Alwest legislation, and also a fairly long sequence of Bills dealing with legal matters of particular interest to the community. I refer, in particular, to the Securities Industry Bill introduced with the basic concept of protecting investors in the stock exchange.

Other important legislation included the conservation measure covering fauna conservation, and the protection of our physical environment. There was the usual fairly long list of legislation dealing with our agricultural pursuits, and others introduced for the purpose of dealing with pressing community matters. Some of those Bills dealt with the prevention of cruelty to animals; factories and shops; civil aviation carriers' liability; tertiary education; university legislation; criminal injuries compensation; disposal of uncollected goods; sale of land; and road maintenance contribution tax. To that list I might add the group of Bills dealing with the betting industry.

I think that when one contemplates the amount of legislation with which Parliament has dealt, and with which this Chamber has dealt, one can say that we have had a very constructive year in this Parliament.

Those are the main points that come to my mind when I am called upon to make my complimentary remarks and in closing those remarks I express once again my appreciation of the efforts of my secretary and my typist.

Next week we shall be joining together at the annual Christmas festivities which are held at Parliament House each year. To those who are not able to attend on that occasion I express my best wishes for a merry Christmas and may the new year bring the peace and prosperity for which we all hope.

I conclude by saying that, so far as the Ministers are concerned, I am sure Mr. Logan and Mr. MacKinnon join with me in saying that the period of time we have spent here has been worth while.

Of course, we are looking forward to continuing this worth-while occupation for another three years at some date early in 1971.

I wish members success in their elections. It would be entirely hypocritical of me—and I am not a hypocritical person—to say anything else, but, may the best man win and may many be Liberals.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [9.47 p.m.]: I hardly know where to begin because I seem to have been relegated for the next three years. I am conscious of the many speeches made tonight in the most unusual situation which we are facing with so many members leaving the precincts of this Chamber as from tonight. So much has been said that I find it difficult to add anything more. I agree with all that has been said by so many people. The appreciation shown by members to Mrs. Hutchison rather surprised me. I did not realise she was such a gracious lady. I have always admired her, but I was surprised tonight to see how much members thought of her.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: It surprised me, too.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I believe we think a great deal of people we have been associated with over a long period because we know their better qualities. I would hate to develop that theory too far in regard to what I sometimes think about the three Ministers sitting opposite.

It is a great pity indeed that Jim Garrihan, Ted House, and Harry Strickland are not with us owing to ill-health. We only hope they will be restored to good health as soon as possible. I have known Harry Strickland since childhood and I know him to be the man who was spoken of tonight—a man of great natural ability and a big man in every way.

I regret that Dr. Hislop will be no longer with us after this evening. He has had a long and distinguished career in Parliament and has been a great man in his profession. He will be remembered in both fields in years to come. Fred Lavery is a little lucky because he will always be consoled by Ruby, whatever their domestic position might have been up till now. I am sure Mrs. Hutchison will rejoice in the name of Mrs. Lavery whatever their future might be.

It seems a long while ago that I sat in an open air theatre in Carnarvon and listened to what in my view is the best speech I have heard. It was delivered by Mr. Frank Wise who, of course, was much younger at the time. I recall his truculent start when he said that the audience should be grateful to him because had it not been for him—Mr. Wise—they would not have seen the member for their

district for another six years. That was his opening remark as I remember it. He continued and kept me enthralled. In closing his speech—and this is as close as I can remember it—he said, “If you want profits rather than promises, ability rather than amiability, and energy rather than lethargy, vote Wise.”

Mr. Wise has lived up to those sentiments with distinction over the years. I have always remembered his energy rather than lethargy. He always seemed to me to be a human dynamo with a tremendous capacity to keep going and, accordingly, success was inevitable for him. If there is one small way that I can convey to the House the secret of Mr. Wise's success I would say that it lay in his untiring energy.

From tonight's atmosphere he moves into retirement and the House will certainly lose a great man. We all wish him well.

I join with other speakers in wishing you, Mr. President, a happy time in the future. I thank you for presiding over us as you have done over the years. You have done this most capably and well.

I also wish to record my appreciation of the work done by the staff—particularly that done by Messrs. Ashley, Hoft and Hoar, while Mr. Roberts was away for part of the year. These members of the staff just did not miss a beat. Mr. Truscott will be leaving our midst and I regret this very much indeed. He has been an asset to the staff and in my opinion he has done a great job.

We accept so much what Mr. Burton does; we seem to take it for granted. I daresay this is because of the simple regularity in his department. We do not seem to realise the amount of work and energy that is needed for this purpose. My attention was drawn to the fact that Mr. Stubbs apparently does not work as hard as he might. I will check his weight in the morning and if there is not much variation I will see that he works a lot harder in the future.

My expressions of thanks and appreciation would not be complete if I did not include *Hansard*. I have never sought justice from *Hansard*; merely kindness and appreciation. I also extend my appreciation to the Press. I find it a little difficult at this moment to express my appreciation of the Ministers who constitute the Government in this House, though I do have a great appreciation of the work they undertake. I am a little disappointed that they do not see my point of view as often as they might; but we all have our jobs to do and we endeavour to do them to the best of our ability and in the manner we think fit.

If we can emerge at the end of a session of Parliament with a greater appreciation of each other I think then that somewhere along the line there has been a job well done. The longer I know the Leader of

the House the less chance there is of my altering my appreciation of him. At the conclusion of this session I intend to shake hands with him as I always have done and I hope that at the end of the next session we can shake hands again.

THE HON. J. M. THOMSON (South) [9.57 p.m.]: On behalf of my colleagues sitting on the back bench I wish to associate myself with the sentiments that have been expressed this evening. It is very difficult to say goodbye at a time like this to the members who might be retiring; one does so with mixed feelings because of the associations that have been formed over the years.

There are among us some who will not be here when we reassemble next year and to them we convey our expressions of goodwill and hope they enjoy their retirement. We trust we will have the pleasure of seeing them in the precincts of Parliament House. My close association with Mr. Wise dates back to the time when together with Mr. Jim Murray we served on a Select Committee. The association we formed then has stood the test of time. There are only a few members present this evening who were here when Mr. Baxter and I entered this House. Dr. Hislop is one of them and from him we have always had friendliness and kindly fellowship. We have all appreciated that very much indeed. We wish Dr. Hislop much pleasure in his retirement and we look forward to seeing him around Parliament House in the future.

Mr. Lavery, Mrs. Hutchison, and Mr. Garrigan have made a considerable contribution to the debates in this House. They have always been friendly both in and out of the House and we wish them well indeed. It distresses me to find that my colleague, Mr. House, is not with us this evening and I hope that it will not be long before we see him and Mr. Strickland back again. Both these gentlemen have contributed much to the activities of this Chamber and they have been greatly missed over the past few weeks.

I would also like to express our feelings of goodwill and appreciation to you, Mr. President, for the manner in which you have presided over us and for the courtesy which you have extended to us. To Mr. Roberts, Mr. Ashley, and Mr. Hoft go our particular thanks for their assistance and co-operation during the session. I am sorry to hear that Mr. Truscott will be leaving us because we have all appreciated the courtesy he has extended us from time to time.

My remarks would not be complete if I did not include *Hansard* and thank them for the good work they have done during the year. We face the electors next year and it is our sincere hope that we will all meet here again after the election.

We wish one and all the season's greetings and we trust that all members will enjoy the best of good health and that with their families they will look forward to a very happy and prosperous new year.

THE PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) [10.05 p.m.]: I would like to address some remarks to Mr. Griffith, Mr. Willesee, and all the members who have spoken not only during this evening but also during the afternoon. I will preface my remarks by saying "Thank you" to everyone who paid tribute to my officers and members of the staff who cannot express their own thanks. On behalf of Mr. Roberts, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Hoff, the various members of their staffs, *Hansard*, the Press, and Mr. Burton I would say "Thank you for your good wishes." One person appears to have been overlooked, and I would like to thank Miss June McKinnon, my secretary, for services rendered.

I feel this is rather a momentous occasion. After sitting here listening to the speeches made this afternoon and this evening one feels that if we could only have the feeling which has permeated this Chamber extended throughout the world what a wonderful place it would be. We could have differences of opinion without wanting to fight one another. I think it is obvious that a great deal of this feeling exists in our State today while we are making such tremendous progress.

I must also take this opportunity to say how sorry I am that Mr. House, Mr. Strickland, and Mr. Garrigan are not present due to ill-health and I join with other members in wishing them a speedy recovery. To those members who are retiring from this Chamber I would like to express my thanks for the contributions they have made to the counsels of Parliament. I would like to refer particularly to Mr. Wise. He was a great friend of my father and I knew him for many years before I came to this House. The first time I met Mr. Wise was when he was Minister for Agriculture during the war and I was a member of a local authority. I had a problem and I came to Perth to discuss the matter with the Minister for Agriculture. When I left to return there was a letter in a mailbag on the very same train directing the health officers of my local authority as to what steps they were to take to remedy the problem. At the time swine fever was prevalent and this was the first example I had of the application of Mr. Wise.

I think Mr. Wise could well write a textbook for young people thinking of entering Parliament. In the last few years I have heard several new members say that no guidelines are laid down for them and I would think that Mr. Wise could publish a simple handbook which would be of great help to members. I think that with the passage of

time we will always have an epitaph to Mr. Wise in Barrack Street—the Rural and Industries Bank. Through the years Mr. Wise has always shown a great interest in that institution and it will always live to his memory.

Dr. Hislop is also retiring and I think I can say without fear of contradiction that no man in a similar position to his has played such a great part in the welfare of the miners of this country. He played an important part in achieving better conditions for the miners, especially in regard to miners' phthisis. Mrs. Hutchison may not realise it but I think our association has been most amiable over the years. Perhaps that has been brought about by my childhood reading material. When I was only a boy my grandmother used to send me newspapers from London and they always included articles about Pankhurst and how the suffragettes tied themselves to pillarboxes. I will say that Mrs. Hutchison has never chained herself to a railing. However, perhaps that background assisted me considerably in managing the honourable member.

With regard to Mr. Lavery, I thought I had dealt with him from time to time during my time as President. However, seeing that he has not taken any words I have directed at him as being in the nature of chastisement, I am happy to leave it on that basis. It has been a delightful association.

To all those members going before the electors and offering themselves for re-election I say: always remember that you are the sitting member and you have to be put out. I think that is a wonderful start in an election and I hope to see each of you here when the House assembles next year. With those few words I thank members and trust that they and their families will enjoy the best of health. My experience over the years has proved to me that the greatest asset any person can have—and something money cannot buy—is good health. I think if one has good health one has everything God can bestow.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.12 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 26th November, 1970

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. A. Manning) took the Chair at 11.00 a.m., and read prayers.

STOCK (BRANDS AND MOVEMENT) BILL

Council's Amendments

Amendments made by the Council now considered.