

for South Perth—that this agreement can be varied overnight. I challenge the Minister to vary it in respect of clause 25 on page 41 which deals with an exemption from stamp duty. The other night I read to members some correspondence from clubs in the Fremantle area that took exception to stamp duty being discriminatorily imposed upon their members and the takings within their clubs.

If revenue has to be received in this manner from private membership, why should a huge financial enterprise like this be exempted from stamp duty? I believe it is palpably wrong, and an injustice. If the Minister will not comply with my request in regard to amending this matter, then it undoubtedly demonstrates the interests that those on the other side of the Chamber represent.

Schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 11.23 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 30th August, 1967

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

EVAPORITES (LAKE MACLEOD) AGREEMENT BILL

Tabling of Photographs

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [4.32 p.m.]: Last night I promised I would table some photographs of Lake MacLeod. Have I now your permission to table these photographs, Mr. Speaker, for one week?

The SPEAKER: Yes, permission granted.

The photographs were tabled for one week.

QUESTIONS (15): ON NOTICE

COMPREHENSIVE WATER SCHEME

Completion and Extension

1. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) What further work is necessary to bring to a conclusion all work planned under the comprehensive water scheme?

(2) When will this be completed?

(3) Has the Government given consideration to embarking on a second phase of water reticulation to embrace other areas of no less importance than that which was included in the original scheme?

(4) If so, what stage has been reached?

(25)

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) The remaining work is as set out in the 1963 case (submitted to the Commonwealth in the *Green Book*) under years 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 on pages 18 and 19.

(2) 1971-72, subject to the necessary finance being available.

(3) Yes.

(4) Investigations are in hand.

PENSIONS AND ALLOWANCES

Increase: Action by Government

2. Mr. TONKIN asked the Premier:

(1) Has he seen the announcement that the Commonwealth Government had reviewed pensions and allowances and intended to grant increases based on the principle of service rather than amounts paid as subscriptions?

(2) Is it a fact the Commonwealth Government has decided that the Consolidated Revenue proportion of existing pensions should be brought up to the amount that would have been payable if retirement had taken place on the 30th June, 1967?

(3) Will he give consideration to the taking of similar action by his Government?

Mr. BRAND replied:

(1) No, we cannot trace any statement as such.

(2) An announcement to this effect was made by the Treasurer when introducing the Federal Budget for 1967-68.

(3) This and other possible ways of adjusting superannuation benefits are now being studied.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS AND ARTICLED CLERKS

Numbers

3. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

(1) How many legal practitioners are there in Western Australia?

(2) How many clerks in articles are there in the State?

(3) Is there evidence of any reluctance on the part of legal practitioners to take clerks in articles?

(4) If "Yes," what reasons are ascribed?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) Three hundred and ninety-three of whom 280 hold current practising certificates (243 in the metropolitan area and 37 in the country).

(2) Fifty-six (of whom 54 are in the metropolitan area).

- (3) Generally no, but in some cases, yes.
- (4) Mainly—
 - (a) lack of accommodation for the purpose;
 - (b) type of practice is unsuitable for the proper training of articled clerks; e.g. practitioners who practise only as barristers, or who specialise;
 - (c) practitioners employed on salary basis;
 - (d) caution through past unsatisfactory experience with articled clerks and risk of future clerks being unsuitable;
 - (e) increasing numbers of applicants for articles in 1967 and indications of further increase in future years.

WATER SUPPLIES

Eastern Goldfields: Plans to Augment

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

- (1) What plans are envisaged for augmenting water supplies to the eastern goldfields to cater for increasing demands brought about by mineral development in the area?
- (2) When is it likely that a commencement will be made to put such work into operation?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) (a) Enlargement to sections of the goldfields main conduit.
- (b) Electrification and enlargement of Nos. 5, 6 and 8 pumping stations.
- (c) Additional main line boosters.
- (2) (a) Enlargement to sections of the goldfields main conduit will be carried out prior to the summer of 1967-68 and annually as required.
- (b) No. 5 electric pumping station will be commissioned by the summer of 1967-68 and investigations are in hand for the electrification of Nos. 6 and 8 pumping stations and the provision of additional main line boosters.

PESTICIDES

Levels in Food, Water Supplies, and Crops

5. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Agriculture:

In view of the widespread use of pesticides, the introduction by countries importing Australian foods and feeds of threshold levels of pesticides, the attention given by the Australian National Health and Medical Research

Council and the Australian Agricultural Council to the use and possible dangers of pesticides, can he advise—

- (1) What work, if any, has been done to determine the levels of the commonly used pesticides, especially the organophosphates, in foods intended for human consumption, and in feeds for domestic animals, in water supplies, and in tissues of man?
- (2) If such investigations have been done, over what period of time have they been carried out?
- (3) What changes, if any, have been recorded in the extent and levels of those mentioned in the items in (1)?
- (4) What are the permissible levels, if any, in foods and in water available for human consumption in Western Australia, and in feeds and water intended for domestic animals in this State?
- (5) What steps are taken to ensure that pesticides are not used indiscriminately in the control of pests on fodder and food plants, vegetables, fruits, animals, streams, etc.?
- (6) What is currently the mean intake of pesticides, especially organophosphates, by the citizens of Western Australia, as determined by the total amount present in the daily or weekly market basket?
- (7) What legal tolerances, if any, have been promulgated for pesticides, especially organophosphates, in food, water, and fodder for export, and for home consumption, if any differences exist?
- (8) If no standards have been formulated, when can it be expected Western Australia will follow the examples set in this respect by other countries, such as the United Kingdom, United States of America, etc.?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Field investigations involving the treatment of animals, crops, pastures, vegetables and orchards, and the subsequent chemical analyses of meat, milk products, vegetables, and fruit for organochlorine; and latterly also for organophosphates, have been carried out. Western Australian water catchment areas are so located as to preclude pesticide residue

problems emanating from agricultural drainage. Only a few samples of human tissue have been analysed but the matter is being further examined.

- (2) This work has been carried out on a continuous basis since 1961, as has routine monitoring of export food-stuffs.
- (3) Significant levels of organochlorines were commonly detected several years ago, but levels of both organochlorines and organophosphates are now generally at satisfactory low levels.
- (4) Under the Western Australian Food and Drug Regulations, permissive levels for a range of pesticides have been laid down in respect of fruit and vegetables. No levels have been laid down as yet for foodstuffs or water intended for domestic animals.
- (5) The use of all organochlorine pesticides for external application on domestic animals was prohibited in 1962. All pesticide products used in Western Australia must be registered before being marketed commercially. Advisory committees lay down the conditions under which these pesticides may be used for the control of pests on foods, vegetables, fruits, and animals.
- (6) The mean intake of pesticides by the citizens of Western Australia has not yet been determined. This is under consideration, however, using the market basket technique.
- (7) Legal tolerances for organochlorines and organophosphates for meat products, dairy products, wheat, fruit, and vegetables have been laid down or proposed by the majority of importing countries. These tolerances differ to some extent. Local tolerances have been laid down in Western Australia for fruit and vegetables as indicated. The National Health and Medical Research Council has recommended tolerances for fruit, vegetables, and grains. The matter of tolerances for meat, dairy products, and eggs has been referred to the National Health and Medical Research Council.
- (8) Tolerances for products other than fruit, and vegetables which have already been

gazetted will be effected under the Health Act as soon as appropriate recommendations are made by the National Health and Medical Research Council.

SOUTH-WEST WATER SUPPLIES

Commonwealth Funds and Outstanding Works

6. Mr. GAYFER asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) How much of the Commonwealth moneys allocated under the Western Australian (South West Region Water Supplies) Agreement Act, 1965, have already been committed?
- (2) What work is yet to be done outside the present commitment?
- (3) Will there be sufficient funds to complete work on the area of approximately 3,700,000 acres as set out in the first and second schedules to the Act?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) \$2,500,000.
- (2) The remaining work is as set out in the 1963 case, submitted to the Commonwealth in the *Green Book* under years 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 on pages 18 and 19.
- (3) Every endeavour will be made to meet rising costs in order to complete the programme as planned.

WESTERN AUSTRALIA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Surveyors and Scientists Engaged

7. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Lands:

- (1) How many Government surveyors or scientists have been engaged in examining the area of land covered under arrangement with the Western Australia Development Corporation at Balladonia—
 - (a) before the corporation became interested;
 - (b) after?
- (2) How many surveyors or scientists are directly employed by the corporation at present in examining the above area?
- (3) Who is the chief district surveyor?
- (4) Has he furnished the Government with a full and up-to-date report?
- (5) If so, will he make the report available to the House?
- (6) Will he also advise what conditions were entered into between the Government and the Western Australia Development Corporation in any agreement negotiated?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) (a) An investigation of the pastoral, as distinct from agricultural, potential of some of the area concerned was carried out for the Government by the former Surveyor-General.
- (b) The chief pastoral inspector of the Lands Department and party, in the normal course of duties reporting on pastoral possibilities, have carried out field investigations.
- (2) The corporation advises me that, pending the results of negotiations with the Government, no further field work is being carried out, but the consultants examining certain aspects of the proposals include two agricultural scientists and two licensed surveyors.
- (3) Mr. F. Bray is the Lands Department divisional surveyor for the area.
- (4) No.
- (5) Answered by (4).
- (6) No agreement with the corporation has been entered into. The corporation has been given permission to investigate the area without any obligation by the Government.

STAMP ACT

Licensed Clubs: Application

8. Mr. SEWELL asked the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware that under the provisions of the Stamp Act all licensed clubs are asked to pay 3c in \$10 on all moneys received, including members' subscriptions, levies, etc.?
- (2) Is not this tax most unfair to clubs when compared with the 1c in \$10 applicable to other sections of industry and commerce?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No. Licensed clubs are in no different position from other holders of liquor licenses. However, as a result of a review of the stamp duty imposed on receipts, it is proposed to submit legislation in this session with the intention of placing holders of liquor licenses in a more equitable position than obtains under the existing law.

KING'S PARK

Observation Tower: Finance for Building

9. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:
From what funds is the observation building at present being

constructed on the crest of the Mt. Eliza embankment in King's Park being financed?

Mr. BRAND replied:

From traffic fees. A clause in section 14A of the Traffic Act provides that traffic fees may be allocated "for any other purpose which the Minister, on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Main Roads, from time to time determines." In the Main Roads Department's 1967-68 traffic fee programme, an item was included to provide for the construction of the observation building. The programme has been approved by the Minister for Traffic.

STAMP ACT

Licensed Clubs: Reduction of Receipt Duty

10. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:

- (1) Have any approaches been made to him seeking to have the Stamp Act amended in order to reduce the imposition of 0.3 per cent. tax on membership subscriptions and other fees paid to registered clubs?
- (2) Has he agreed to reduce the charge; if so, to what figure?
- (3) If no decision has yet been made, will he give sympathetic consideration to the request in the light of the steep increases of licensing fees imposed in recent years?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) As a result of a review of stamp duty imposed on receipts, it is proposed to submit legislation in this session with the intention of placing holders of liquor licenses in a more equitable position than obtains under the existing law.

SCHOOLS

Science Blocks: Provision with Commonwealth Funds

11. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) At what schools have new science blocks been provided with funds provided by the Commonwealth Government?
- (2) What was the cost of each building?
- (3) Does the cost include furnishing and equipment?
- (4) If not, what amounts were spent on equipment and furnishing in each case?

- (5) How much money has been spent by the State Government in each case?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) and (2)—

(a) Completed Science Blocks—	Cost \$
Tuart Hill Senior High	84,989
Mt. Lawley Senior High ..	80,596
Applecross Senior High ...	76,872
Governor Stirling Senior High	153,877
John Forrest Senior High ..	79,643
Katanning Senior High	64,400
Kent Street Senior High	197,365
Scarborough Senior High	145,643
Collie Senior High	26,147
Manjimup Senior High	27,413
Swanbourne Senior High	69,355
Melville Senior High	110,138
Busselton Senior High	29,729
Narrogin Senior High	57,078

(b) Under Construction—	Cost (Estimated) \$
Churchlands Senior High	120,000
Albany Senior High	90,000
Bentley Senior High	130,000
Belmont Senior High	88,800
Pinjarra Senior High	60,000
Hollywood Senior High	50,000
Cyril Jackson Senior High	90,000
Margaret River Senior High	36,000

- (3) Yes.

- (4) Answered by (3).

- (5) These buildings have been financed entirely from Commonwealth funds. Matching funds from the States are not required under the Commonwealth Act.

STATE BATTERY AT PAYNES FIND

Reopening

12. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Has the State battery at Paynes Find been reopened? If not, is it proposed to reopen this battery?
- (2) How many mines are at present being worked within a 50-mile radius of Paynes Find?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) Yes. It commenced crushing at the beginning of April, 1967.
- (2) There are six gold mining leases and 27 mineral claims existing within a radius of 50 miles of Paynes Find. Only five parties have had crushings treated at the State battery since it commenced in April.

PAYNES FIND SCHOOL

Ages of Pupils

13. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Education:

What are the ages of the five children attending Paynes Find School?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

Children aged 6 years	2
Child aged 9 years	1
Child aged 11 years	1
Children aged 12 years	2
Total	6

Ages estimated from grade enrolments. Actual ages cannot be obtained until school reopens after vacation on the 11th September, 1967. The future of this school is being kept under close review.

Housing for Teacher

14. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Premier:

- (1) Has accommodation been recently provided by the Government Employees' Housing Authority for the teacher stationed at Paynes Find?
- (2) If accommodation has been provided, what is the cost and what does the accommodation consist of?
- (3) If not, what is the cost and the type of accommodation to be provided?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) Yes, in May, 1967.
- (2) The cost of the dwelling was \$5,620, to which must be added furniture. Final cost of furniture not yet available, but will approximate \$500.

The accommodation consists of—

bedroom;
lounge living room;
kitchen;
laundry;
bathroom;

and includes gas hot water system and stove, floor coverings, window treatments, and is fully fly-screened.

- (3) Answered by (2).

SAFETY BELTS

Compulsory Fitting

15. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) Has he considered a unanimous recommendation from the Australian Transport Advisory Council relevant to the fitting by law of seat belts in all cars, station wagons and light commercial vehicles registered on or after the 1st January, 1969?

- (2) Since the Minister for Transport, Queensland, is quoted in *The West Australian* newspaper of recent date that Queensland intended introducing legislation to compel the fitting of seat belts, does he intend to introduce similar legislation in this State in an attempt to reduce injury and fatality at present occurring in vehicles where seat belts are not installed?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) Yes. The full recommendation is as follows—

Motor vehicle safety belts and anchorages shall be provided for all seating positions in all motor vehicles not exceeding 10,000 pounds gross vehicle weight in accordance with the following:—

- (a) Front Seats—for all vehicles first registered after the 1st January, 1969, such belts and anchorages shall be provided for front seat positions.
- (b) Rear Seats—for all vehicles first registered after the 1st January, 1971, such belts and anchorages shall be provided for rear seat positions in addition to (a).
- (2) Yes. It is intended to introduce this provision in our vehicle standards regulations as seat belts are recognised as an effective prevention of traffic accident injuries.

LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Craig (Chief Secretary), and transmitted to the Council.

EVAPORITES (LAKE MACLEOD) AGREEMENT BILL

Third Reading

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [4.47 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

I would point out that during the Committee stage of the Bill I promised the member for Pilbara I would endeavour to table the Iron Ore (Savage River) Agreement, No. 56 of 1965. I was unable to obtain a separate copy of the agreement, because in our own office we work on the bound volumes of the Statutes. I understand, however, the bound volumes of the Tasmanian Statutes are available in

our Parliamentary Library, and that agreement is shown at page 264 of the 1965 Tasmanian Statutes.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

PARLIAMENTARY PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE

Establishment: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 23rd August, on the following motion by Mr. Bickerton:—

That, in the opinion of this House, steps should be taken to set up a Parliamentary Public Works Standing Committee.

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [4.49 p.m.]: I must apologise for not having been in the House when this motion, and the one following it were moved by the member for Pilbara. In the short time that has been available to me, however, I have read the honourable member's speech with interest.

It seems to me the honourable member depended a great deal upon the information available from the South Australian Parliament to put forward his argument that, in the opinion of this House, certain committees should be established. Any Minister, or ex-Minister in this House—particularly if he were associated with the Public Works Department—would, I am sure, appreciate that requests have been made from time to time for the establishment of a public works committee.

The member for Northam and the present Leader of the Opposition would be well aware of this fact. So far as I can establish, these requests met with very little favour, in spite of the fact that a public works committee had been set up in South Australia for many years. As far as I can make out, the reasons which were put forward from time to time by the Public Works Department, and by the various Ministers, were along lines similar to those I myself have put forward at public meetings and at the party organisation level for not proceeding with the establishment of a public works committee.

At this time in the history of Western Australia there does seem to be almost a campaign being launched for the establishment of standing committees on this or that matter. In this case it is a request for the setting up of a public works committee; and, in regard to the next motion on the notice paper, the setting up of a standing committee to examine subordinate legislation. There is also another request which has become quite prominent of late; that is, the setting up of a standing committee on public accounts.

I have an open mind on the formation of these committees. I would want to be satisfied that we are not just setting them

up because another State has them, and because we feel it is a popular thing to do. It is fair to say that at the present time it is rather popular to cast doubts on some of the decisions made by the Executive, or the Government—whether the Government be Liberal, Country Party, or Labor. As I read through the speech of the member for Pilbara it seemed to me there was a good reason for examining further the arguments he submitted—that there was a need for a great deal of further examination—in order that we in this State, having waited so long, do the right thing in establishing committees, and to ensure that they will be worth what is claimed by the honourable member.

When I was in South Australia recently attending the conference of Tourist Ministers, because notice had already been given of the intention to move the motion before us, I spoke to various Ministers—but certainly not Ministers for Works and not Treasurers. I became very interested in the experience of South Australia, as it was outlined to me by some members and by those associated with the new Government in that State.

I was greatly interested, because some of the claims of the member for Pilbara are based on the fact that the standing committee on public works in South Australia is so good that the new Government has not even changed the chairmanship of it. That is a very fair thing for the Government to do, in view of the fact that in the offing in South Australia, as in New South Wales, there is a State election. I consider the setting up of a standing committee on any one of these issues is a policy matter, and the decision should be left for the incoming Government to make. Because I believe this, we should examine further the whole situation of standing committees in Australia.

Before I go further I would point out that consideration was being given in New South Wales to the setting up of a further public works committee. That State, being one of the major States of the Commonwealth, did, quite early in its history, establish a works committee; but according to the documents on the file—and the papers I have before me are copies of those appearing on that file—it has been decided to drop the proposed committee.

It was for this reason that the Minister for Works in 1945 (The Hon. A. R. G. Hawke) recommended to Cabinet that a request from the House be rejected, and suggested that the proposed public works committee might not be as profitable as was claimed by the late Mr. Mann, the then member for Beverley. It is interesting to read the notes which were prepared for the Minister on that occasion. They are as follows:—

A Parliamentary Public Works Committee would presumably only review works estimated to cost more than, say, £20,000.

I realise that this figure can be set at any reasonable level. I think in South Australia works costing over \$200,000 are examined, and even this, I understand, is under review. To continue—

The procedure with such a Committee would involve the preparation of plans and detailed estimates specially for the Committee, and the compilation of a considerable amount of data justifying each particular project.

The preparation of the "case" for each work would occupy a considerable amount of my, and my officers' time and, as the whole examination by the Committee would have to occur after a decision had been made by the Government, delays would occur.

The Committee would desire to inspect sites of works and to visit similar works in other States and it would be necessary for me, or one of my senior engineers to accompany the Committee.

In this State it has been the experience that drought or unemployment has frequently caused projects to be embarked upon at very short notice.

In the case of such a proposal as the Comprehensive Agricultural Water Supplies Scheme it would probably require a number of inspections of areas, discussions, and enquiries, extending over a very lengthy period, involve a great deal of my officers' time, and delay submission of the proposal to Parliament.

It is my impression that, whereas a Minister and the Government can become acquainted with every detail of a project through contact over a lengthy period with its various phases, it must take up a considerable amount of time of the Department's staff making the Committee equally well informed—without which a sound judgment is not possible.

This information, coupled with that received from New South Wales by the Minister for Works, was the basis upon which the then Government of Western Australia rejected the proposal. That has been the basis of rejection ever since.

To be quite fair, my impression is that the South Australian Government is quite happy with the work of the public works committee. It was recognised that some amendment could be made to the legislation, because in that State the legislation gives this committee sweeping powers. In fact, it is given the power to impose gaol sentences.

It would seem to me that if we are to set up such a committee we would not think of going so far as to arm that committee with what I think are unnecessary powers. I also made inquiries from the Queensland Ministers who informed me there was no such committee in Queensland; but, from

my investigations, I ascertained there was a committee there in previous years.

All this causes me to ask: Is it not time for a very thorough investigation? I do not mean an investigation which gathers a little bit of information and puts forward a report in support or otherwise, but an investigation made at ministerial level, with all the information gathered from Ministers for Works in the various States; and that a report be submitted to this Parliament. I am mindful of the fact, and would like to point out to the House, that the South Australian committee has been established for many years. It was established at a time when the pressure and demand on the Government was not as great as now.

Frankly, I cannot see how a public works committee can avoid delaying the decision on some large works, unless they are really major. In a State like ours we are often called upon to make almost immediate decisions in respect of certain works and buildings; and looking back over the past few years, it would seem to me that had it been necessary for us to refer these matters to a public works committee, and all the parties as laid down in the South Australian Act, I do not think this Government or the last Government could have reported the progress which was made in respect of public works.

As Premier and Treasurer of this State, I feel that in regard to certain proposals on public works—to wit, water supplies and the like—a genuine and capable public works committee might well recommend these works be rejected because they would be uneconomic. There is no need for me to point out that in a State like ours there are many works which, for the time being, cannot hope to pay the operating costs.

As for the second motion moved by the honourable member, I want to say straight-out that personally I am opposed to it. I cannot help but feel that in setting up a statutory committee to perform the work of examining by-laws and regulations—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Crommelin): Order! I would draw the attention of the Premier to the fact that we are discussing the first motion on the notice paper.

Mr. BRAND: Perhaps I had better go back to where I started.

Mr. Bickerton: Thanks for the intimation.

Mr. BRAND: I propose to say something a little later on in connection with the committee referred to in the second motion, and seek your permission, Mr. Acting Speaker (Mr. Crommelin), to deal with the first motion and the next one under the one heading. Whether you will agree, I do not know; but it seems to me it would save the time of the House.

Mr. Graham: Is there to be a party vote on this question, or not?

Mr. BRAND: I read with some interest the desire of the member for Pilbara to have this motion treated on a non-party basis. Of course, for a long time the Opposition, whatever its political complexion, has always desired to have a non-party vote after perhaps looking around and deciding that such a vote would be most favourable in regard to a certain issue. I see the Leader of the Opposition smiling. He knows how true these words are. Indeed, I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked the question because he felt a non-party vote was important to the case.

Mr. Graham: I think there is mixed feeling on the opposite side.

Mr. BRAND: I am pleased to hear that and go forward more confidently with what I intend to suggest.

Mr. Graham: Is everybody on your side of the House bound?

Mr. BRAND: I was not at the party meeting and cannot say, but I presume there are some mixed feelings.

Mr. Hawke: If you were not at the meeting it is certain they are bound.

Mr. BRAND: Perhaps we had better not inquire as to what happens at party meetings and just proceed on this basis: The proposition which I am going to put forward as an amendment to the motion is one the Government could support without any real commitment as to what would happen in the future.

I believe it is a matter of policy whether we are going to set up standing committees on public works, public accounts, or anything else. I say this, because I was rather impressed with what I heard in South Australia on the one hand; and, on the other hand, the many conflicting statements from other sources.

I propose to move an amendment and I seek your guidance, Sir, whether it is possible, not only to include a request for a total examination of public works committee activities throughout the whole of the Commonwealth, but also to include in the amendment public accounts committees, and the suggestion made by the honourable member in his second motion, for a standing committee on subordinate legislation. If we are quite genuine and sincere about this matter, I think the House will agree it should not make a decision unless it has before it all the facts in respect of each of these committees.

I do not want any argument or query in respect of Standing Orders concerning this suggestion of mine; I put it forward because it seems to clear up the whole matter. I know the member for Pilbara has made mention of the fact that in South Australia the public works committee is rather highly paid. The chairman receives \$1,500 per year; and I think the members receive \$1,000. The members of the other committee to which the honour-

able member has referred are also the recipients of certain payment.

I would remind the House that for many years the Cabinet in South Australia was a very small one—as small as it could be—and in order to maintain the interests of private members in some of these delicate matters these committees were established. I wonder whether the chairman of the public works committee should today be paid such a high salary? I also wonder whether, originally, there was support for these committees because they offered private members an opportunity to take a more direct and active part in public affairs and, at the same time, provide an increase in their salaries, which were very low at that time?

I believe the chairman of the public works committee in South Australia has a car and a driver who drives him anywhere he wishes to go. I appreciate that any committee which is doing a job should have available to it transport provided by the Government in the form of Government cars. But, here again, I wonder why the chairman of the public works committee in South Australia has a motorcar all to himself.

The chairman in South Australia is a very competent man and I believe he has done a very fine job. He is responsible particularly for the satisfaction which South Australia has derived from the setting up of the committee. He has been a very efficient and able chairman, and has been able to point out to the Government where savings could be made in certain works proposals, and other recommendations which were of great value to the Government itself.

Point of Order

Mr. BRAND: I do not propose to proceed any further. It is my intention to ask the House to accept an amendment to the motion. However, I would like your advice, Mr. Speaker, as to whether I can do it in the way I desire. I would like to move the following motion:—

That in the opinion of this House an examination should be made of the benefits or otherwise of standing committees in other Parliaments with special reference to standing committees on public works, public accounts, and subordinate legislation.

The SPEAKER: The Premier has made a request to deal with Orders of the Day Nos. 3 and 4 jointly. My own feeling in this matter is that the initiative must rest with the mover of the motion, the member for Pilbara. If he were agreeable to this request, it might be possible—with the permission of the House, of course—to proceed as the Premier suggests.

The Premier could follow another course. He could simply move to set up a committee to investigate the appointment of a

parliamentary public works standing committee, and any other matters referred to it, and we could then deal with that motion. Subsequently, when the next Order of the Day was dealt with, he could simply move to amend it so that it too could be referred to the same committee.

If the Premier is not prepared to agree to the motion, his third course would be to have it and the following one defeated, and give an undertaking to appoint a committee, such as that to which I have just referred. The difficulty in that case would be that it would deprive the House of the right to debate the proposal, because it would mean that the Government could set up any sort of committee it chose.

It is not for me to try to influence the House at all, but I believe the first suggestion I made would be the best course to follow; namely, that the Premier should move to set up a committee to investigate the public works proposal and other matters. This would allow a debate on the proposal, and then Order of the Day No. 4 could be dealt with fairly simply. This is the way it might possibly work out.

However, in view of the suggestion the Premier has made, I feel we should give the member for Pilbara an opportunity to comment. Would he like to express an opinion?

Mr. BICKERTON: Does this mean I close the debate?

The SPEAKER: No. I am seeking the honourable member's opinion. I want him to understand it is his prerogative to say in what way we shall deal with the matter.

Mr. BICKERTON: As a member of the Standing Orders Committee, I do not think I could condone the action of the Premier, even though the House may agree with it. My motion is properly on the notice paper; and, from my point of view, I would rather this motion and the other one were treated as they appear on the notice paper, and they can be amended accordingly by the Premier as he deals with them.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Mr. BRAND: I think that is fair enough. While I am on my feet, if you would permit me to do so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the Government would also examine the matter of setting up a standing committee on public accounts, because this seems to be a popular request from the Labor Party, the Country Party, and the Liberal Party.

It is not for me to make a reference to the matter now, but if the House did agree to an inquiry of the kind I have suggested, I would like also to have the benefit of an investigation in respect of a committee on public accounts. However, because I feel we are not in receipt of sufficient information—and I think the speech of the member for Pilbara clearly sets this out—and because the honourable member has laid great emphasis on the South Australian

experience, I believe an investigation would be worth while, because there are five other States.

The information gained from such an investigation would be available to the House either from the Opposition, if there is a change of Government, or from the Government, depending on the result of the next election. During the next session of Parliament worth-while consideration could be given to these quite genuine requests. I might add, "Who knows!" We might be talking of providing for two session during the course of the next Parliament. Therefore we would have a need to examine the information which is gathered before making these somewhat rather marked changes for the first time.

Mr. Graham: Do you think it is necessary that the investigating committee should comprise the Ministry only? Would it not be better if it were a representative committee of this House, because, after all, the decision on the findings would rest with the Government?

Mr. BRAND: No. I do not think so. This is a request to the Government. We are in office at present and I believe we should make this investigation at the highest level. I know the reaction of quite a number of Ministers from other States. They would be in favour of some of these committees. I do not think we would get very far if the committee comprised representatives of every party in the House. I assure the House that the Government will conduct this investigation with all due impartiality and submit a recommendation it believes is the best for Western Australia.

Amendment to Motion

I therefore move an amendment—

Delete all words after the word, "House" with a view to substituting the following words:—

an examination should be made of the benefits or otherwise of Public Works Standing Committees and related matters in other Parliaments in Australia.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [5.19 p.m.]: I take it I am confined to the actual amendment, rather than any remarks made previously by the Premier. However, as the amendment has been moved as a result of the remarks or thoughts of the Premier, I may be able to touch on those remarks where they are appropriate.

First of all I would like to say I cannot really see the necessity for the Premier's amendment. I think the motion in itself is quite a mild one. It does nothing else but ask the House to consider taking steps to set up a standing committee on public works. The Premier's amendment is to the effect that the Government will make an investigation.

If the motion were carried—that in the opinion of this House steps should be taken—I would say this action by the Premier would, in fact, be a step towards the setting up of the particular committee. Therefore, I do not feel the amendment is necessary.

We do know it seems to be the practice of Governments that a motion put forward by a private member must not be allowed to go through. It must be hacked about in some way, not necessarily to suit the Government, but rather to give the impression that business has not been taken out of the hands of the Government.

It is true, as the Premier said, that the motion is based primarily on the South Australian Public Works Committee, a committee which the Premier stated has, to the best of his knowledge—and to the best of my own knowledge—operated satisfactorily. May I ask what I should have based my motion on to set up a public works committee? Should I have based it on a committee which did not work? If the South Australian Public Works Committee has been satisfactory then I would think that would be one good reason why the motion should be based on that particular committee.

The Premier, when putting the case for his amendment, referred to the actions of a previous member in this House. I am not sure whether he was the then member for Beverley or for Avon, but I think it was for Beverley; I refer to the late Mr. J. I. Mann. The Premier mentioned that the then Minister for Works based his argument on certain grounds, which were quoted. I have looked through *Hansard* and I have found that many remarks were also made by members of the then Opposition pointing out the weaknesses in the argument put forward by the then Minister for Works.

Mr. Brand: That is so.

Mr. BICKERTON: As this House is master of its own destiny I do not think it should rely on a decision made some 22 years ago. Perhaps those best able to make a decision would be the present Government, because it is in the position of being able to view this motion in the light of modern times.

I would have thought that by this time—after some nine years in office—this Government would have sufficient experience to say whether or not this House should take steps to set up a public works committee, rather than to say it would rely to a large extent on what a Minister for Works said some 22 years ago.

This motion, which the Premier seeks to amend, is, to my way of thinking, rather mild. In no way does it commit the Government; it simply asks the Government to agree that in the opinion of this House steps should be taken for the formation of a public works standing committee. I do

not think the motion needs any mutilation. Members on both sides of the House agree with many of the remarks of the Premier—that certain standing committees do have merit. I certainly would not disagree with him that investigations should take place with regard to the best composition of such a committee. However, those investigations could take place after the motion was passed by the House, and I would think not one member would raise objection to that.

A side issue, which perhaps had something to do with the amendment, was whether or not this matter should be treated on a non-party basis. As we are discussing the amendment, perhaps it would be better if I put it this way: Whether or not the amendment should be treated on a non-party vote basis, the motion was introduced definitely on a non-party vote basis. There is no doubt in my mind that the members on this side of the House are quite free to vote as they wish, and I would not say they are all of the same opinion. Whether the difference of opinion is great or not, I am not sure.

However, to put the record straight, it is true that one does discuss these matters in the party room, and I think that is fair enough. For the record, again, we have a ruling which says that no objection will be raised to a particular member introducing a motion. No-one is committed to support that member, and members can vote quite freely on the particular motion. I just mention that to clear up the point.

I thank the Premier for his remarks. I spoke sufficiently on the motion when I introduced it. However, I feel that the motion, in its present form, will achieve the objectives which the Premier desires with his amendment.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [5.27 p.m.]: I would like to say a few words on this amendment. I am not too sure how far I can go, or what I can speak to at the moment. I am rather disappointed the member for Pilbara did not take up the offer to improve the terms of his motion, which would have been the case had he accepted the proposition put forward by the Premier to include a reference to a public accounts committee. In my opinion the public accounts committee is more important.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot discuss this matter. The question before the House is that certain words be struck out.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: That is my point. I said I was not quite sure, whether I would be allowed to speak as I intended. If that is your ruling, Sir, I will save my remarks for the motion, if the amendment is passed. I might still be excluded because of what takes place, but I will resume my seat and seek an opportunity to speak later on.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [5.28 p.m.]: I take it from your ruling, Sir, that the matter before us is to debate whether the words shall be struck out.

The SPEAKER: Yes; the member for Pilbara argued that the words should not be struck out because the original motion already contains the substance of the amendment.

Mr. JAMIESON: I wanted to be quite sure. If it transpires that the words are struck out, then further debate can ensue on the words proposed to be added.

The SPEAKER: Yes. If the House agrees to strike out the words, it is not committed to what words will be added.

Mr. JAMIESON: I do not agree with the striking out of the words with a view to inserting other words. The words in the motion clearly make a request and I feel that if the Premier did not quite like the motion as it was worded it would probably have been better had an amendment been moved to include the words "to inquire into the desirability," or something like that. But to attack the motion in this way, and try to eliminate all those words from it, would appear to me to be a case of not playing ball with the mover of the motion.

I have some misgivings about what would transpire if all these words were left in. I do not know whether I would go along with the idea that some of the committees which are set up are, in fact, set up in a desirable fashion. I consider there should be more inquiry into the matter, and, to that extent, I would approve of what is being attempted through striking out these words.

However, I do not say that the move on the part of the Premier on this occasion is a desirable one. We have to make up our minds. After all is said and done, it is a matter of the policy of the Parliament; whether it is going to have such committees, as indicated by the words to be struck out; and it is not a matter of the policy of the Government of the day.

I could appreciate that the policy of the Government of the day would be generally against their appointment, but Governments come and Governments go, and the desirability of these committees seems to be more important these days than it was in the past. This is mainly because administration seems to be getting away from the elected representatives, and there is a general clamour throughout all democratically-elected Parliaments to make more use of the members who are elected by the people to conduct the affairs of the State. This is evident from the set-up of the United States Senate, right down the line; and, as time passes, we are seeing more and more of these committees coming into being.

Federally, they are quite a success. I do not think we will deny this. The

proposition to have such a public works committee is quite simple; it is a matter of whether or not one agrees with the idea—that is the main issue at the present time.

In connection with the actual set-up of the committee it would, of course, be subject to legislation that would have to be produced, debated by Parliament, and approved by Parliament.

As I have said, I do not go along with some of the ideas of the committees that are set up in other States and the terms for which they are appointed. There are a dozen and one other points which we could debate in a general way if the matter were before us by way of a Bill. However, I do suggest at this stage there is a lot of merit in the proposition put forward by the member for Pilbara to set up such a committee.

Amendment put and passed.

Amendment to Motion, as Amended

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [5.33 p.m.]: I now move—

That the following words be substituted for the words deleted:—

an examination should be made of the benefits or otherwise of Public Works Standing Committees and related matters in other Parliaments in Australia.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [5.34 p.m.]: Before voting on this amendment I would like some assurance from the Premier that, in the course of the inquiry, the decision made would not become hidden in some departmental file; but the result of such examinations should be made available to Parliament. There is no indication in the proposed words that this will take place.

I consider that if an inquiry is to take place, the results should be made available to Parliament and not just to the Government; because, as I pointed out earlier, it is a policy of Parliament to have such a committee if the examination suggests this should be the case and, as a consequence, the report of the examination should be made available to Parliament. It is not specified how the examination will be made, but the information should be made available to all elected members. Members could then further clarify their minds. If they wished to come back at a future session of Parliament, and either agree or disagree with the proposition, at least they would have the considered opinion of the expert examination to which, no doubt, this matter would be subjected. I would like to have an assurance that the results of any such examination would be made available to the members of the Parliament of Western Australia.

The **SPEAKER**: Before the honourable member resumes his seat, I would like to mention that the Premier has no right of reply. Therefore, at this stage he cannot give an answer to the question which has been put to him, unless another amendment, or something of that nature, is moved.

Mr. JAMIESON: A wink is as good as a nod to a blind horse.

Mr. Court: The Premier has already covered the point.

Mr. JAMIESON: I am sure that somehow the Premier will be able to accede to my request, and I have no doubt he will be able to overcome any difficulties which arise because of his inability to reply. The remarks I have made indicate my present criticism of the words which are proposed to be inserted.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [5.36 p.m.]: I consider the Premier should enlarge his motion a little in order to include some additional words. I do not think Parliament should dodge the issue. This is something upon which we could very well make an expression of opinion, whether or not we think it is a good idea. Merely to make a decision to refer the matter for the purpose of inquiry commits nobody to anything, except that some sort of an inquiry, perfunctory or otherwise, will be carried out.

Amendment on Amendment

I wish to add certain other words to the words which the Premier desires to add to the motion. Accordingly, I move—

That the amendment be amended by adding the following words:—

with a view to the establishment of such Committees.

If these words are added, the amendment will then read—

an examination should be made of the benefits or otherwise of Public Works Standing Committees and related matters in other Parliaments of Australia with a view to the establishment of such Committees.

This would give point to any inquiry which is carried out. It is not much good just to go through the motions of having an inquiry. An inquiry should have an objective. If we have in view that we would establish these committees if the inquiries justified such a course, I consider we should say so. However, if we only intend to shelve the question to get it out of the way because it is awkward, then, of course, the well-known way of doing it is to refer the matter to a committee. In the latter case we could then kiss it good-bye.

Mr. Hawke: Is the suggested inquiry to be carried out by a committee of this Parliament?

Mr. TONKIN: No; my idea is that if the words which I have suggested are added, then Parliament is indicating that this inquiry should be carried out with a view to the establishment of such committees. Obviously, if the inquiry is such that the information elicited does not support such a proposal, then it will be for Parliament to decide.

I do not agree with the Premier's point of view that this is a matter of Government policy or party policy. When established, these committees are set up to aid Parliament in considering matters brought forward by the Government. Therefore, Parliament itself is the body which ought to determine whether or not such committees should be established.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You have changed your mind on that one!

Mr. TONKIN: What justification is there for the Minister for Works to say that?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Because, when you were in office, you were entirely opposed to it and said so in the House.

Mr. TONKIN: Did I? On what date did I say so?

Mr. Craig: And at what time?

Mr. TONKIN: It is no good the Minister looking so surprised, because I do not think I spoke on the motion.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You were quoted by the Press. You went to the Press saying you believed the Government should govern.

Mr. TONKIN: I do not think I went to the Press on the subject. I know how I would have voted in connection with it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Would you like to bet on it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Graham: This is not a T.A.B. agency.

Mr. TONKIN: It is just another one of the Minister's unsupported assertions.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I will let you know afterwards.

Mr. TONKIN: I would be very interested to know.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You want to be careful because you would have to apologise to the House I am afraid.

Mr. Jamieson: Ministers do not usually do that.

Mr. TONKIN: I am saying that I believe this is not a policy matter for the Government, because these committees are established, if they are considered necessary, to aid Parliament when considering proposals brought before it by the Government. If they do not do that they are an encumbrance and unnecessary expense, and I would not support them. If they do not provide aid to Parliament to enable it more properly to consider legislation involving public works, such committees

would be of no advantage whatsoever and their establishment would not be justified. But if such committees did aid Parliament by putting it in a better position to consider the desirability of certain public works proceeding, and if the expenditure proposed was reasonable, they would be valuable.

I am not opposed to an inquiry if it has some purpose. If we have the idea that a proper inquiry will establish that such committees would be useful and advantageous we should indicate that, as a Parliament, we feel they ought to be established. So I hope that, whatever inquiry is carried out, the information brought to light will then be brought to Parliament with a recommendation from the Government based upon the information which has been obtained.

Parliament should then come to a conclusion on that recommendation and, in the light of that conclusion there should be an obligation upon the Government then in power to act upon the decision of Parliament so made; because in the final analysis these committees are being proposed not to aid the Government, but to aid Parliament better to understand the propositions that are brought before it from time to time. The Government would be in no need of aid from these committees because it has many advisers to call upon to assist it in formulating its policy.

I am strongly in favour of obtaining as much information as possible. Too often we are prone to act upon insufficient data and then subsequently we find, when more information comes to light, that our course of action should have been different from that taken. My own opinion is that these committees could elicit further information, so I feel we should indicate that if an inquiry is to be undertaken—and I am all for it—we should do something if the finding is favourable. I would like Parliament here and now to indicate that the inquiry should be a thorough one and not a perfunctory one. It should be undertaken with a definite objective in view; it should be objective, not negative.

We know only too well that inquiries are undertaken quite often for the purpose of shelving some proposition, and that some reports never see the light of day. An inquiry can be held in abeyance for months, or even years, until people forget about it. I hope it will not be an inquiry such as that. If it is to be a proper and genuine inquiry, I think we should indicate that our view is that if the information is such as to suggest that committees would be desirable, then they should be established. For that reason I have moved to add the words I have already read to the House.

MR. BRAND (Greenough — Premier) [5.45 p.m.]: If we were to agree to this amendment, we might as well agree to the original motion. Let me say at the outset

that the motion, which has been moved by a private member, is certainly a mild one; I hope I have not indicated otherwise. Further, it is a very fair motion. But it would seem to me that, having gone so long without these committees, it would be fair enough, in regard to Parliament making a decision, for the House only to say, "Yes, we will examine the whole matter further and then report to the House, either verbally or in writing." I think I can assure the House that such was my intention, because I think I said so; namely, that as far as the Government is concerned the examination will be a thorough and impartial one.

Mr. J. Hegney: Followed by action.

Mr. BRAND: Therefore it would seem to me that if we agree to the additional words as moved by the Leader of the Opposition, we are not leaving ourselves any margin; and when we agree to the setting up of a committee in this instance, I see no reason why the House should be bound in this way. I would like the House to accept that, for my part, I am impressed with the general arguments submitted with respect to a public works committee; and members can be assured that, after the examination, if we are the Government we will bring the matter forward in the next session, because I think this is a matter that should be resolved, but only after we are satisfied we are doing something for the benefit of Parliament, and of the general government of the country, in regard to public works.

Let me add that in view of the election that is just a few months away, it would seem to me the matter should be decided by a new Government and a new Parliament based on the information we can get. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [5.48 p.m.]: I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition for the same reasons that impelled me to propose the original motion, and oppose the amendment by the Premier. The amendment moved by the Premier does not commit the House to anything. The decision it makes is of no merit whatsoever; it gives us nothing; it nullifies the original motion, which was to be mild in its objective, but which still required some steps to be taken. The amendment has removed the need for those steps to be taken and has substituted in its place something that does not have to be done at all.

The words sought to be added by the Leader of the Opposition would make the amendment moved by the Premier read as follows:—

An examination should be made of the benefits or otherwise of Public Works Standing Committees and related matters in other Parliaments in Australia with a view to the establishment of such committees.

Surely the amendment on the amendment which seeks to add the words "with a view to the establishment of such committees" is important, otherwise we are not voting on anything. The House, without the addition of those words, is not asked to make a decision at all; in fact, it is simply being asked to agree with the Premier. So I support the amendment on the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, because at least it gives the motion some purpose.

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.50 p.m.]: The purpose of the original motion was to obtain an expression of opinion from the members of the House; such opinion, of course, would be binding on nobody. The Premier has moved an amendment that there shall be an inquiry, but again without having the advantage of the viewpoint of the House in connection with a determination of the principle, which, I repeat, would be binding on no-one.

The Leader of the Opposition seeks to have added words which would give us an opportunity to say what we think of the principle of committees—or, more specifically, of a standing public works committee—but before any action is taken there should be a thorough investigation into the operation of these committees as they apply to other Parliaments of the Commonwealth.

For the life of me I can see nothing wrong with the addition of these words. We express our viewpoint upon the proposition, and if the inquiry reveals there are a whole host of weaknesses and disadvantages which are reported back to us, surely we possess sufficient common sense not to demand that any Government should proceed in the face of the evidence and, based on that evidence, in the face of the recommendations that would be made to us.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: But is not what you are supporting tantamount or equal to the decision being made before the inquiry is held?

MR. GRAHAM: If it is agreed to, the motion, with the amendments sought to be made, means that we shall indicate that we desire these committees, but before taking action we would like further advice.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is why I say it is the wrong way around.

MR. GRAHAM: No it is not. Very often requests have been made to Ministers in the House and elsewhere, and the Ministers have replied that while they consider there is merit in the suggestions and they are personally in favour of them, they will have inquiries made as to whether it is possible to give effect to what is sought by particular members. That sort of thing occurs every week, and there is nothing wrong with it.

Mr. Craig: Could not this be construed as an obligation?

Mr. GRAHAM: No; because the motion, with all the words attached, indicates there shall be an inquiry; and the Premier has told us that the results of the inquiry will be reported back to the House.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I would like to hear you debating on the other side.

Mr. GRAHAM: My viewpoint happens to be expressed while I am on this side. Unfortunately it appears there is something in the nature of a party flavour creeping into the debate, which was the last intention of the mover when he submitted the resolution. I have already indicated by way of interjection, or question, to the Premier, that there is some reservation in the minds of some members on this side of the House; and surely there cannot be unanimity of opinion among members on the other side of the House.

It occurs to me immediately that there is an advantage in having proposals of the State—albeit initiated by the Government, in the very nature of things—examined by somebody, and in having more information than usual made available for members to assist them in their work. As a principle, I should say that is very highly desirable. However, some of my reservations arise on account of the factor in connection with this particular proposition that there could be needless delays; there could be delays which would be embarrassing to the Government of the day, whatever its political colour.

It is a matter, therefore, of weighing the merits of the former point against those of the latter. I would have hoped that the Premier would be a little more generous in his treatment of the motion, because he indicated that an inquiry would be undertaken by the Ministry.

We are in the midst of a Parliamentary session, and Ministers are, or should be, rather busy citizens; and I am wondering how much time and attention they could give to a matter such as this, particularly as their inquiries will be directed largely, or perhaps exclusively, to points outside Western Australia. As this session is not likely to last indefinitely, it is more than probable that the results of the research and inquiry and, subsequently, the conclusions, will be made after this Parliament rises.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I think so.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister says, "I think so."

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member is getting a little wide of the amendment. He is discussing the proposal generally. He had his chance to do this when the motion was put.

Mr. GRAHAM: I could be, Sir, but it is rather difficult to separate the motion, which is now in three parts, each one of which, of necessity, impinges upon the other. I do not seek to abuse any privilege that might be mine, but if you, Sir,

would oblige me I would like to round off the point that the decision—if there is to be a decision—shall be taken by the Government in the next Parliament; and it is anybody's guess as to who will occupy the Treasury Benches.

No matter which way the resolution is passed, this matter goes beyond party politics. I agree with the proposition that we should say what it is we are after, and then, as we have done in so many matters, appoint a Select Committee; that is to say a Select Committee composed of members from both sides of the House, and of all political parties, to examine matters of considerable importance, and of lesser importance.

Is there any reason to suspect or fear that there will be a party political flavour introduced into this question if the committee is representative of parties from both sides of the House, and is reporting to perhaps a Liberal-Country Party Government, or to a Labor Government? In any event the final issue rests on those who constitute the members of the Legislative Assembly in 1968. I think the Premier should give a little more consideration to the matter.

The amendment which the Premier submitted does not make particular reference to the personnel of the committee which will carry out the investigations, and I can see no reason why it should not be on a broader basis. Surely those who are appointed can be entrusted to bring down recommendations in accordance with the evidence they are able to adduce.

I conclude on the note that I regret there appear to be two sides developing, in regard to each proposal, and this is something which should not happen in connection with this matter. I hope and trust that members on both sides of the House will express themselves quite freely. This is not a matter of making or breaking a Government; it is a matter of what is the best way to go about making a determination for some time in the future, in connection with a proposition which may be of assistance to Governments, and to all members of Parliament, when considering works that are proposed in the best interests of the State.

We say what it is that we want to do, but at the same time we want further evidence; and I can see nothing wrong with that. In other words, I can see no substantial reason for seeking to reject the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, which I wholeheartedly support.

MR. RUSHTON (Dale) [6 p.m.]: I rise to oppose the amendment on the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, because I consider the proposal of the Premier to be fair and factual. I am speaking on this matter, because in my research to obtain further evidence in

order to make up my mind as to what is best to be done in the circumstances I was somewhat, perhaps not amazed, but interested to read a comment of the then Minister for Works, now the Leader of the Opposition, made in August, 1957. He was commenting on a proposition which had been put forward by the Country and Democratic League which wanted to establish a parliamentary standing committee on public works. Because this comment is of interest, and is very pertinent to the matter before us I draw attention to it. His comment appeared in *The West Australian* of the 1st August, 1957.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That was the date.

Mr. RUSHTON: The article states—
C.P. Proposal Criticised By
Minister

Works Minister Tonkin yesterday criticised Country Party proposals for a public works committee.

He said that the Government must take responsibility for its policy. It would not want that policy dictated by people who had no responsibility of government.

The man best qualified to judge the circumstances behind a works decision was the Minister, who would be aware of all the factors involved.

Mr. Nalder: Who said this?

Mr. RUSHTON: The present Leader of the Opposition. To continue—

His decisions were guided by the advice of technical officers of his department.

The SPEAKER: Order! I allowed the member for Balcatta a certain amount of license in speaking to the amendment on the amendment, but I cannot allow the member for Dale to go too far. The question before the House is that certain words be added to the amendment, and the matter being dealt with by the honourable member should be put forward when the motion is put to the House.

Mr. RUSHTON: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your guidance. I have submitted my thoughts to the House in opposing the amendment on the amendment.

MR. GAYFER (Avon) [6.3 p.m.]: In rising to speak to the amendment on the amendment I would, firstly, oppose the inclusion of the words suggested by the Leader of the Opposition for one reason. In moving the amendment to the motion the Premier said that an examination should be made of the benefits or otherwise of a public works standing committee and related matters in other Parliaments in Australia, with a view to the establishment of such committees. I am more interested in the related matters referred to in the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must discuss that aspect at a later stage, because the proposal before the House is that certain words be added to the amendment. Members will have to stick to the amendment on the amendment.

Mr. GAYFER: I am speaking to the amendment on the amendment, with particular reference to the establishment of such committees, as mentioned by the Premier; and that is in the matter before us. If we agree to the amendment on the amendment, then any discussion or decision that might be forthcoming from an inquiry into the related matters will not eventuate.

The SPEAKER: That is not so.

Mr. GAYFER: Yes, it is, because the Leader of the Opposition has moved an amendment on the amendment to include the words "with a view to the establishment of such committees," which means a public works committee or other standing committees. In any discussion that might ensue, we would have to consider the amendment as amended—if the amendment on the amendment is passed. The latter part of the amendment on the amendment should not be agreed to.

Mr. Tonkin: You wish to sit on the fence.

Mr. GAYFER: I do not wish to sit on the fence. I wish to speak on the related matters, but it has been ruled that I cannot do so at the moment. All I can do, therefore, is to oppose the amendment on the amendment.

Amendment on the amendment put and negatived.

Amendment to motion, as amended, put and passed.

Motion, as Amended

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [6.7 p.m.]: I take it that at this stage I can move for the addition of the words, "and public accounts committee" after the word "committees" in the motion, as amended.

The SPEAKER: This poses a problem for me. I ruled, and I believe correctly, that the amendment suggested by the honourable member would not be consistent with the original motion.

Mr. Brand: On a Point of Order, could I give an assurance to the House that public accounts will be included?

The SPEAKER: I cannot see there is any point of order.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I wish to say a few words in support of the motion. I think it is important that we inquire into the establishment of these committees.

The SPEAKER: The motion, as amended?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I take it the amendment now becomes the motion.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am speaking to the motion.

Mr. Graham: As amended.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: In presenting his motion, I think the member for Pilbara could have put forward a better case than he did. In my opinion, he introduced a lot of matters which were not necessary. I feel some measure of parliamentary control is advisable in regard to these things, but the Government must be able to govern. The committee, if set up, must be one on which the parties will work amicably together.

I had the opportunity to attend a meeting of the Commonwealth Joint Parliamentary Committee on Public Accounts, at Canberra, and all the parties worked amicably together. They did not interfere in any way with government; and their inquiries were dealt with on the basis that Parliament should be informed as to what was going on. There was no political bias among the members.

I had the opportunity to sit in on one inquiry, and the net result was most beneficial, not only to the Government and the members of Parliament, but also to the administration of the departments. I would like to quote something that was said by the officer in charge of the Department of Social Services, the department into which the inquiry was being made. Actually, I propose to read from a report which I made at the time—

The Director General of a certain Department at the first enquiry was most unhappy, and could see no reason why his department should be subject to an enquiry. In my presence at the present enquiry he stated that he had found that matters which previously had been taken for granted were now given thought and consideration by his staff, with very beneficial results.

That was the opinion of one man who was converted from opposition to parliamentary committees to one who found them to be beneficial.

At the inquiry I attended there were representatives of the Audit Department, the Treasury Department, and the Public Service; and these officers were present, for the benefit of their departments, to take notes of the evidence. In addition, they were present so they could be questioned on matters concerning their departments. I spoke to each of these officers afterwards and they were most favourably impressed with the workings of these committees. They were responsible officers who could have been open to criticism, but they supported the establishment of these committees.

In the circumstances, I do not think there is anything more I can say, because I cannot trespass on the public accounts side. However, I support the motion, as amended, because of the assurance given by the Premier that the inquiry—although the motion at the moment does not say so—will include reference to the establishment of a public accounts committee.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [6.12 p.m.]: I have some brief remarks I wish to make. I would like to apologise to the Minister for Works. When the question was raised, I expressed the opinion that I had made no speech in Parliament on this question. I think that is correct. However, I cannot be expected to recall reports which appear in the newspapers from time to time. I have a fairly good memory, but I would not claim to remember all of those.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Fair enough.

Mr. Brand: That goes for me, too.

Mr. TONKIN: I do not mind being corrected when I am wrong. I frankly acknowledge I was in error when I said I did not make any public statement, but I think I am right in saying I did not previously speak on this question in the House.

With regard to the proposal generally, I have mixed feelings. I can see great difficulties in some respects, but I feel an inquiry could elicit information which would indicate that the establishment of such committees would be useful to the House; and, assuming that members would take a responsible attitude if they were appointed as members of the committee, and would not deliberately use their position to make things awkward for Governments, I can visualise they would be of substantial help on very many occasions.

I suggest that the inquiry which the Government will undertake when the time is opportune will be such as to endeavour to get factual information regarding the benefits and the disadvantages, so that at some time in the future we shall be able properly to make an assessment of the situation. Then, I think it will be up to Parliament to determine the question. I do not think we should dodge these issues when the questions come before us. As a Parliament we should have sufficient courage to say what we believe and what we feel ought to be the right course of action. I trust that when the result of any inquiry which is carried out is before Parliament, that will be the attitude adopted.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [7.30 p.m.]: I believe the motion, as amended, is not at this stage sufficient, because obviously the desire of members—and even of the Government—is for some action. Therefore, I believe we should have some time limit included in the motion so that we know action will be taken by a certain

time. In this way we will ensure that either this Government; or whatever Government is elected at the next elections, will bring this matter to a head in the near future.

Amendment to Motion, as Amended

I therefore move an amendment—

That after the word "made" in line 2 the words, "prior to the 1968 parliamentary session" be inserted.

If this amendment is carried, the motion will read—

That, in the opinion of this House, an examination should be made, prior to the 1968 parliamentary session, of the benefits or otherwise of public works standing committees and related matters in other Parliaments in Australia.

I think this is desirable and possibly the Premier will agree to it. It will request the Government—of whatever political colour—to set up this inquiry and ensure that a report is available for the new Parliament when it assembles.

Speaker's Ruling

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is proposing to move an amendment to words which have already been agreed to.

Mr. JAMIESON: No, not exactly, because this has never been before us.

The SPEAKER: That is true, but the Leader of the Opposition moved an amendment to add words at the end of the motion. Consequently, the member for Beeloo cannot go back. He, too, must work on the end of the motion; otherwise there would be no end to this. It could go on indefinitely. I am afraid the amendment is out of order.

Debate (on motion, as amended) Resumed

Mr. JAMIESON: As I believe this is an important matter, I will move to have the words inserted at the conclusion of the motion, as amended.

Amendment to Motion, as Amended

I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion, as amended:—

and such examination be completed prior to the commencement of the 1968 Session of Parliament.

Having overcome the problem as to where the words should be placed, I will return to what I was saying. My amendment makes no great alteration to the motion, as amended. If passed, my amendment will ensure that the investigation will be completed at least in time.

The SPEAKER: Can I sign the amendment and say it is a signed amendment?

Mr. Davies: Did you forget to sign it?

Mr. JAMIESON: Yes. I forgot to sign it, but I will do so now.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr. JAMIESON: I will start again, having signed the amendment and having placed it in the right position. I do suggest there would be no harm if the House agreed to this amendment. In that way those who, God willing, and also the electors willing, have to face up to the situation next year, will have something before them on which to base their future arguments, instead of the matter remaining in some departmental drawer, or some other obscure place, until the question is again raised. In other words, this will ensure the matter will come before the House, and a determination can be made at that time after a study of the submissions of the investigating committee.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [7.36 p.m.]: I would like to say a few words in connection with this amendment. I would like the Premier to agree to it because I think it does give his amendment, which became the motion, some teeth. As it is now, we are left in the air.

The Premier has given certain undertakings in connection with this, and I am quite prepared to accept those undertakings; but the Premier may not necessarily be the Premier by the next session of Parliament. If this amendment is passed, it will be a direction, or a request from this House, to any future Government, whether it be the present Premier's Government, one formed by the Leader of the Opposition, or one formed by someone else, for that matter. It will mean the House has made a request along definite lines by adding that the examination is to be made by a certain time; and I think the incoming Government would have to take notice at least of that request.

It in no way detracts from the amended motion as it now stands; and, in fact, it does give a direction of sorts and means that the members of this Parliament are actually voting on something which will take place rather than on something which just may take place. I support the amendment.

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [7.38 p.m.]: I am a little moved by the complete faith of the Opposition in our undertaking. I have assured the House that if an investigation is to be made, it will be commenced immediately, and will be in time for the next session. However, if adding binding words of this nature is satisfying, then I am quite happy to agree to do so.

Mr. Jamieson: We are not afraid of you. It is ourselves we are afraid of.

Mr. BRAND: Yes. I am rather touched by the confidence the members have in the Premier, and in the Leader of the Opposition.

Amendment to motion, as amended, put and passed.

Question (motion, as amended) put and passed.

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

Establishment: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 23rd August, on the following motion by Mr. Bickerton:—

That, in the opinion of this House, steps should be taken to set up a Joint Parliamentary Standing Committee on subordinate legislation.

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [7.40 p.m.]: As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, although you prevented me from going too far, the attitude of the Government with respect to this matter is the same as our attitude to the last motion. We think the same amendment should apply, and some examination made of the situation in other States or, if we can obtain information of any value, from elsewhere.

As far as I can ascertain, South Australia is the only State which has set up the type of committee referred to. It would seem to me that if this committee had been such a success, and had resolved some of the real problems which a Parliament faces, it would have received some further attention from other Houses of Parliament in Australia before this. You, Mr. Speaker, would know that research into regulations and by-laws as they are tabled in this House, and before they become law, is somewhat of a problem. It does seem to me that the answer is rather a simple one as far as private members are concerned. The answer is that those members take time to examine these by-laws and regulations, rather than have a statutory committee set up to do the work of parliamentarians. I think this is a fair assessment with regard to the responsibilities of private members.

It would seem to me that to set up a paid committee or, indeed, a voluntary committee with statutory powers to be responsible for researching all regulations and by-laws which come to the House, is over-simplifying the work of private members of Parliament. Over many years I have heard of desires to set up an ombudsman, and desires to set up a committee to examine subordinate legislation. It would seem to me that the responsibility of a member of Parliament would be somewhat curtailed and directed along certain limited avenues if that were done.

We, as a group of people and as members of Parliament, are under criticism from time to time for the work we do not do and the job which we do and, indeed, for the payment which we receive for it. We should examine, very closely, the experience of other authorities and other Parliaments, and look very closely, ourselves, at the value and the feasibility of a committee such as this working to our advantage. I therefore hope that, in moving an amendment similar to the

one I moved to the last motion, we will at least be armed with information resulting from the experience of other Parliaments in Australia over past years.

Amendment to Motion

I did have some discussions with people in South Australia and I could not say that they have felt this committee has been a success. Therefore, I will not delay any further a decision on this matter. I move an amendment—

Delete all words after the word "House" with a view to substituting the following words:—

an examination should be made of the benefits or otherwise of Parliamentary Standing Committees on subordinate legislation in other Parliaments in Australia.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [7.46 p.m.]: I do not agree with the proposal to strike out these words on this occasion. Perhaps, with respect to other committees, some embarrassment might be placed on the Government if public works and finances were examined. But with regard to subordinate legislation, I think we should proceed with the setting up of a committee. The Premier wants these words removed, and he also wants an examination made of the position elsewhere. I would say just the opposite to what the Premier mentioned with respect to his reason for deleting these words. Members are just not in a position to study subordinate legislation. Ministers, particularly, are at a disadvantage and, as a consequence, the examination of subordinate legislation should be the responsibility of someone, or some organisation, to protect various members in administrative positions in the House.

I would hazard a guess and say that very few, if any, Ministers have this year viewed the by-laws in respect of their own local authorities, because they have a dozen and one other things to do and just cannot get around to it. A subordinate legislation committee would be able to examine by-laws as they were proclaimed and, while nine out of 10 of them on local government would be following the normal trend, every now and then there would be one which would have a peculiar appeal for a particular reason. That by-law should be examined and brought to the notice of the House because how often have we, at a later date, asked, "How did a certain by-law get through?" Usually this is not anybody's fault, but as the Premier has said, these points should be examined. However, it becomes physically impossible to do this, particularly when the House is in session, and still have time to do the other things which are necessary.

We have studied the various matters before the House and I say such a committee would protect everybody's interest,

and would not do anybody any harm at all. If something rather peculiar went through, and no report was received from this committee, the committee would possibly be in for a roasting. However, I am sure it would not be allowed to pass in the first place. If the members of the committee did let it through then I am sure they would draw attention to it. They would draw attention to the reasons why this particular by-law or regulation appeared not to be in accord with the usual practice. Because of this I consider it is vital that on this subject we should have a different opinion from the one we might have on something which would directly affect the administration.

Mr. Brand: Don't you think we should have a very close look at the powers of such a committee?

Mr. JAMIESON: I could not agree more; but of course the powers would be contained in the Bill which would be brought down by the Government of the day, and would be amended by the House if argument adduced on such legislation were successfully advanced to the Government. At this stage I do not think that aspect applies, because we are not proposing to do anything. It would be ludicrous to assume that we could move on this in time to enable a committee to function this session. Probably it could not function before next session, at the very earliest.

However, I do suggest there is a crying need for this committee. The Premier has mentioned that he does not have any knowledge of this practice in the other Parliaments, except that of South Australia. It is true that the Federal Parliament does not have a committee that applies itself in this direction, but each party has found it necessary to protect the members of its own organisation, and each one has appointed a committee on subordinate legislation.

Mr. Brand: Is it a statutory one?

Mr. JAMIESON: No; they are not statutory bodies.

Mr. Brand: I would be 100 per cent. for a committee on that basis.

Mr. JAMIESON: I might agree, but this does not cover the position of the Administration at all. Its members are at a disadvantage through anything which might come from Government departments.

Mr. Brand: Let us try that for a start and see how it works out.

Mr. JAMIESON: Such a committee has not any power to report to Parliament, but merely the power to report to members of the party concerned. If a committee is appointed which is to be a watch-dog committee, I consider it should have some power to lay a report on the Table of the House. Members could quickly peruse a report made by such a committee, and they could go

through the regulations. I endeavour to do that every time things become dreary in the House. I call for regulations and have a look through them.

Mr. Brand: You are easily cheered up.

Mr. JAMIESON: I mention that it makes life a little drearier. I do consider we have to watch more closely the regulations and by-laws which are being approved merely through being tabled as required under the various Statutes.

For these reasons, I would oppose the Premier's move on this occasion. On reflection I consider there is some justification in respect of the other matters we have heard discussed earlier in this session, but in respect of this matter I consider we have to determine whether it is desirable from the point of view of members of the House. Indeed, we want a joint parliamentary standing committee so eventually we would have to receive the concurrence of the Legislative Council in our endeavours. However, that approach would be subject to our first agreeing in principle that it is desirable to have the regulations franked, observed, and reported to both Houses of Parliament.

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park) [7.56 p.m.]: I will not delay the House by repeating the very sound reasons that have been advanced by the member for Beeloo in supporting the motion. I believe that at this stage we should go ahead and support the establishment of a subordinate legislation committee, as proposed by the member for Pilbara, and supported tonight by the previous speaker.

The amendment which has been moved by the Premier will undoubtedly be carried, but it will not be carried with my support; because I believe the amendment is far too restrictive. The Premier has indicated the Government will make an examination of the position as it exists in other Parliaments in Australia, and he has also indicated that as far as he knows South Australia is the only place where such a committee exists. I should imagine that any inquiry, if it were to be full and comprehensive, would need to go much further afield than to a single Parliament.

Mr. Brand: Do you know of anywhere else?

Mr. DAVIES: The committee system has been widely established in many parts of the world—

Mr. Brand: It is in the House of Commons.

Mr. DAVIES: —and I think it has been operating very successfully in Sweden since the 17th Century. I have here an extract from *Introduction to Sweden*. Incidentally, I mention that the committee system is characteristic of the Swedish Parliament; and, as I have said, it dates back to the 17th Century.

Mr. Grayden: It operates in England, too.

Mr. DAVIES: The member for South Perth has mentioned that it operates in England, and that is correct. I have another extract from a publication of the Swedish Royal Ministry for Foreign Affairs. This extract deals extensively with the system of the Swedish Riksdag. I do not know whether I have pronounced it correctly, but probably my pronunciation will meet the occasion. This extract lists the various committees, how they operate, their jurisdiction, composition, and responsibility. I consider that a document of this nature could be of very great assistance to anybody who was making an inquiry.

If the Premier wants further information, I refer him to *Parliament of Sweden*, written by Professor Elis Hastard. Chapter 7 deals in greater depth with the committee system of the Swedish Parliament, and points out the benefits which have been derived from it over the years.

If these three references are insufficient, I have a further one which is an extract from *Modern Swedish Government*, and this time the author is Nils Andrén. There is an extensive article dealing with the various committees, their jurisdiction, and their responsibilities to Parliament and to the people.

Although America has a slightly different form of government from ours, members will know that the Congress of America makes very great use of the committee system. Our library contains many references to the committee system in America.

If the Premier does not want to consider the Federal Congress of the United States of America as a guide, I refer him to the Legislative Manual for the State of Washington. This lists 20 committees, and covers the operation of a committee such as a subordinate legislation committee. This information would be an advantage to any investigating committee. If these references are insufficient, I have the Pennsylvania Manual for the year 1959-60, which lists 32 committees.

Mr. Brand: How many members are in the House?

Mr. DAVIES: I cannot give the information in connection with that State Parliament.

Mr. Williams: It makes some difference.

Mr. DAVIES: I cannot pick up the information immediately. Admittedly, I think it is a much bigger House than our own. I am sure the information is contained in the volume, and that the volume itself would be of assistance to investigating committees.

In effect, the motion which has been moved by the Premier says we will permit someone to have a look at the position in South Australia, and the workings of the

committee in that State will be the motivating force for any further action that will be taken by the Parliament of Western Australia. I do not consider that action is good enough.

I said at the outset that I oppose the amendment, because the reasons which have been advanced by this side of the House are good and sufficient reasons to support the establishment—or to start the machinery in motion to support the establishment—of the committees as soon as possible.

The Premier indicated that a private member could, if he so desired, read every regulation which came before Parliament. Of course, the Premier meant if the member did not do anything else; because I am quite certain he knows, as well as any other member in the House, that it is on rare occasions when one is able to do what he suggests.

Mr. Brand: Would the committee be occupied fully?

Mr. DAVIES: I should imagine the working of the committee would be such that certain sections of regulations or by-laws would be delegated to them. I do not imagine 20 people sitting around a table considering one by one each regulation that was gazetted. This would be quite unworkable. I imagine it would be a committee consisting of certain sections, with each section being given the responsibility of studying, say, railway regulations, local government regulations, health regulations, and so on. By working in that manner they would carry out their duties fairly quickly.

From my reading of this system in the United States, it would appear that the membership of the committee is continuous, and if one is specialising in health regulations, or local government regulations, one is rapidly able to absorb the effect of any new regulation or any amendment to a regulation in one's own particular section of Government administration. I believe that this is the value of the committees; namely, that their appointment will eventually bring within Parliament experts on regulations which have been framed for certain facets of Government. This would be highly desirable.

I do not think any one person can absorb to any great degree everything that comes before the House. Already there are about 20 papers containing by-laws which have been tabled in the House this session, and there are many more regulations which would be examined by this committee if appointed. In this world in which we live it is highly desirable that we have experts in a specific field. The Government has its own experts, who are used extensively in all phases of the Government's administration; yet, on this very question, the Government proposes to confine its investigations on the desirabil-

ity of the formation of such a committee to the State of South Australia. That is not good enough, and for that reason I do not support the amendment.

At this stage, Mr Speaker, you may be able to give me some guidance. Would I be in order if I were to move an amendment to add after the word "Parliament" in the last line the words—

The SPEAKER: No; you cannot move such an amendment at this stage. What we are to insert if the amendment is agreed to, I could not hazard a guess.

Mr. DAVIES: Very well, Mr. Speaker. I have at least indicated what I would like to do. At a later stage I hope there will be an opportunity to amend the motion to widen any investigation that may be started as a result of the amendment moved by the Premier.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [8.3 p.m.]: I was rather hoping the Premier would not move an amendment to this motion similar to that moved to the last motion before the House. I know he intimated, whilst speaking on the previous motion, that he would do so, but, as other speakers have said, some of the matters raised by the Premier could have some merit so far as public works are concerned. I think one of the biggest fears of those members who have apparently opposed the formation of a standing committee on public works, when the suggestion has been brought forward from time to time, has been that such a committee may delay the construction of a certain project or some important work.

If this proposed committee were formed, however, its function would be more or less administrative, and therefore, if the motion as it appears on the notice paper were agreed to, it would adequately cover the desires of this House in relation to the appointment of a committee to deal with subordinate legislation. The motion requests the appointment of a joint parliamentary standing committee on subordinate legislation, and the Premier is now seeking to delete certain words in the motion with the object of adding other words, of which he has given notice, calling for an examination of the proposal.

Even if an examination was needed in connection with the last motion—the House decided it was, and I am not going to refer to that in retrospect—surely, in this instance, the purpose of a subordinate legislation committee is well known to all of us. By that I do not mean members would know what the Bill would contain, such as the number of members who may be appointed to the committee, the remuneration that would be paid to them, and that sort of thing. That does not matter at this stage. It could be debated by the House when the actual legislation was brought before it. However, members

would have sufficient information before them to be of assistance when they were voting on the question. Unlike a standing committee on public works, members would know that a committee on subordinate legislation would consider all the regulations and by-laws that were to come before the House with a view to making a report on them for the information of members. That is quite straightforward to anyone.

The Bill itself could not be debated at great length, but surely the motion as it appears on the notice paper is quite clear, because it simply requests that steps be taken to set up a joint parliamentary standing committee on subordinate legislation. This would be preferable to accepting the Premier's amendment which calls for an examination. I therefore suggest to members that they should not accept the amendment, because the reasons submitted by the Premier when debating the previous motion do not, in their entirety, apply to this motion.

The Premier seems to have grasped the suggestion about individual party committees, but such a suggestion needs no consideration by this Chamber. That would be an arrangement made by the party itself, and the deletion of certain words would not assist, one way or the other, in putting that suggestion into effect. In addition, of course, party committees would be completely devoid of any power. It is the usual custom, when a subordinate legislation committee is appointed, for all by-laws and regulations to be automatically sent to the secretary of that committee for investigation. This would not be the case with individual party committees, and they would not have any power to report to the House.

When he moved to delete certain words with the object of inserting others, the Premier referred to members reading the regulations, or making an endeavour to work harder on them. We all know that this is not possible, and in the past it has been proved that many regulations can pass through the House without any study being made of them by members. I think it will always be thus. But if a subordinate legislation committee were appointed to examine all regulations brought before the House, and to report to the House, it is obvious that this subordinate legislation would receive more attention in the future than it has in the past.

I believe the motion on the notice paper would enable the Government to take steps immediately to appoint a subordinate legislation committee, which would be preferable to the proposal of having examinations made as and when they are necessary. So I hope the Premier will give this motion a little more thought with the object of withdrawing his amendment and allowing the motion to pass in its original form.

Amendment put and passed.

Amendment to Motion, as Amended

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [8.9 p.m.]: I move—

That the following words be substituted for the words deleted:—

an examination should be made of the benefits or otherwise of Parliamentary Standing Committees on subordinate legislation in other Parliaments in Australia.

In moving this amendment I would like to comment on the fact that if the House had agreed to the original motion, it would have made a very vital change. It is clear that the proposed committee would need to have real power. It would seem to me there is no case for rushing in right now, at the end of this session, with an election around the corner, to make all these drastic changes when, in fact, by waiting a little longer, we can at least obtain information on how the committee works in South Australia, or, perhaps, obtain written information.

I do not want any honourable member to get the idea that if the House agrees to an amendment to have an examination made of the position in other parts of Australia, this will mean we will have someone going all around the world looking for information. The information could be obtained from reports. I am sure such a move will give an indication of how a committee does work, and then maybe the Government could come to a decision on whether it would support such a drastic change.

I believe it to be a drastic change because this would be a very powerful committee. If, on such a committee, we have people who are not as responsible as they might be, the hazards of Government would be made even more difficult than they are.

For that reason I propose to proceed with my amendment to insert the words to which I have already referred. I believe this is the most practical way to achieve our purpose and ascertain whether there is any real benefit to be derived from setting up a joint standing committee of Parliament on subordinate legislation.

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park) [8.12 p.m.]: I was pleased to hear the Premier say the committee would not confine its research to other Parliaments in Australia, but the words "in Australia" are still there, and I ask that they be deleted. I also acknowledge the fact that a committee of inquiry is not likely to get a trip around the world, but it might be possible, if anyone happened to be overseas, for investigations to be made in this direction.

Members of the committee—and here again I have already quoted references—might be able to obtain information which could help them in coming to a decision which would be included in their report. As we know there is only one Parliament in Australia—namely, South Australia—which has a committee of this nature, and therefore the motion might just as well

read that an investigation be made into the standing committee in South Australia. Rather than limit the committee in its inquiry I would like to delete the words, "in Australia," in the Premier's amendment.

Mr. Brand: Why not add the words "and elsewhere."

Mr. DAVIES: If I do that I will have to put it in writing and sign it, and even if I added the words "and related matters in other Parliaments" it would only be a case of tweedledum and tweedledee.

Mr. Brand: I want the emphasis to be on Australia.

Mr. DAVIES: Very well. If I might withdraw what I suggested earlier—

The **SPEAKER:** I will take it that I have not received the amendment in writing.

Amendment on Amendment

Mr. DAVIES: I now move—

That the amendment be amended by adding the words "and elsewhere."

Amendment on the amendment put and passed.

Amendment to Motion, as Amended

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [8.15 p.m.]: At the risk of being trying to the Government and the House I would like to move an amendment to bring this motion into line with the previous one. I now move—

That the following words be added to the motion, as amended:—

and such examination be completed prior to the commencement of the 1968 Session of Parliament.

Amendment to the motion, as amended, put and passed.

Motion, as Amended

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [8.17 p.m.]: I welcome the Premier's decision to accept this amended motion, and I am delighted at the indication given by the Premier that he will have an exhaustive examination made of this question. I am particularly pleased at the Premier's attitude, because it is the policy of the Liberal Party to do all it can to ensure that we limit Government by regulation as far as possible. One of the planks of the Liberal Party platform contains the following objective:—

To legislate by Act of Parliament and not by regulation or decree.

Mr. Tonkin: What a funny story that is!

Mr. GRAYDEN: In those circumstances it behoves all Liberal members to do everything we possibly can along the line to support any move which will limit the powers conferred by regulation.

The other night we heard a most interesting speech by the member for Pilbara, in which he explained the position in great detail and, I think, extremely well. He indicated that since 1935 a com-

mittee has been set up in South Australia which reviews all subordinate legislation introduced into that State and, where necessary, it moves in Parliament for such subordinate legislation to be disallowed. We have seen the effect of that in South Australia.

Last year in that State the committee moved for the disallowance of 16 items of subordinate legislation, and a further four items were removed by consent. So in one year we find that 20 items were successfully objected to as a result of the action of this committee.

On the other hand, in the last 10 years we have moved to disallow only 27 regulations in both Houses of the Parliament of this State. So it will be seen that while we have moved to disallow only 27 regulations in 10 years, the committee in South Australia has had 20 items disallowed in one year.

As the member for Pilbara pointed out the other evening, Western Australia can make just as many errors as South Australia makes. It would therefore appear that some of the subordinate legislation which is law in Western Australia would have been disallowed in South Australia. This is a strong argument for the setting up of the committee envisaged by the member for Pilbara.

I go further and say that the committee in South Australia apparently has had a very salutary effect on subordinate legislation in that State; and this is a very important point. It should be pointed out that the existence of such a committee in Western Australia would make Government departments much more careful in introducing regulations.

The Clerk of the Legislative Assembly in South Australia wrote a letter in which he commented on the committee in that State, and in the concluding paragraph he said it was generally agreed that the committee was doing true parliamentary work of a valuable nature, and that it had a salutary effect on the standard of subordinate legislation. This is an important point which should not be overlooked. We should realise that if, ultimately, a similar committee is set up in Western Australia as a consequence of the investigation proposed by the Premier, it could also have a very salutary effect on subordinate legislation introduced in this State. In saying this I am not only referring to regulations, but also to by-laws, rules, and orders.

The Premier thought that if a standing committee on subordinate legislation was set up in Western Australia it would have to be given real power. I would point out that the committee in South Australia has no real power. If it objects to an item of subordinate legislation, one of its members somewhere along the line can introduce a motion to disallow it. It is then up to either House of Parliament to make a decision; but this does not prevent any

private member from moving to disallow a regulation. It will be seen that the committee in South Australia has no real power in that sense. It simply takes on the duty of moving to disallow regulations, if it considers those regulations exceed the powers conferred by the relevant Acts.

The standards by which the standing committee in South Australia judges the regulations are—

- (a) whether the regulations are in accord with the general objects of the Act, pursuant to which they are made;
- (b) whether the regulations unduly trespass on rights previously established by law;
- (c) whether the regulations unduly make rights dependent upon administrative and not upon judicial decisions; and
- (d) whether the regulations contain matter which, in the opinion of the committee, should properly be dealt with in an Act of Parliament.

When the committee in South Australia reviews subordinate legislation, it takes into account the considerations which I have just enumerated.

In Western Australia we seem to adopt a rather lighthearted attitude towards regulations, and this is a feature which I deplore. We have seen instances in this House where power to make regulations has been delegated; and by making them exempt from the provisions of section 36 of the Interpretation Act this House has removed from Parliament any right to amend such regulations.

The procedure adopted when a regulation is introduced is this: within six days of Parliament meeting, the regulation must be laid upon the Table of the House, and within 14 sitting days thereafter any member has the right to move to disallow it. If either House of Parliament agrees to such a motion, then that regulation is disallowed.

As I mentioned previously, we have had instances in this House where the right to make regulations has been delegated to some outside authority, and the right of Parliament to amend such regulations taken away for all time. We have not only taken away that right from private members, but we have also taken away for all time the right of Parliament to amend these regulations.

That is an extraordinary state of affairs. Under those circumstances, when a regulation is passed, it means that if in, say, two years' time Parliament considers there is something wrong with the regulation, Parliament will not be able to do anything about the matter. I repeat we have had instances where this Parliament has not only delegated to outside authorities the right to make regulations, but it has actually removed from Parliament for all time the power to amend the regulations.

We had an illustration of this only a few hours ago.

I am mentioning these matters to indicate that we have a rather lighthearted attitude towards regulations. I realise that one swallow does not make a summer, and because we have had one recent instance like this it is not necessarily a national calamity. I agree there are occasions when such a move is justified, but let us not get into the pattern of doing that sort of thing too often. If we did we would be throwing aside the principle of the supremacy of Parliament in respect of subordinate legislation. This is something we should try to avoid.

We have had many instances of undesirable subordinate legislation in Western Australia. Some time ago a regulation that concerned caravan parks passed through the House.

The SPEAKER: I cannot allow a discussion on whether certain regulations are good or bad. The question before the House is that the motion, as amended, be agreed to.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I appreciate the point made. I am trying to establish the need for an inquiry, and subsequently for the setting up of a committee along the lines envisaged by the member for Pilbara. Perhaps I could touch briefly on one or two matters.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must relate them to the question before the Chair.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I shall do that. I believe there is a definite need for such a committee. An inquiry into this matter might reveal that there is no such need, and for that reason I am prepared to go along with the amendment moved by the Premier; but at the moment I am convinced there is a need for this committee.

We in this House should make every effort, whenever the opportunity presents itself, to limit the powers conferred by regulations; and we should ensure that Parliament is supreme in respect of subordinate legislation.

Earlier I referred to an instance concerning caravan parks. I shall not relate the circumstances, except to say that under the town planning Act it was possible for caravan parks, which had non-conforming rights, to remain in operation; but then, under another Act, power was given to make certain regulations which completely cut across the provisions of the town planning Act and so could force the caravan parks out of business, notwithstanding the existence of the other Act. Recently there was an undesirable by-law in respect of heights of buildings in Mosman Park.

The SPEAKER: I do not think you can continue along these lines; you are talking about regulations, not the motion.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I will not pursue this, but simply say there are many instances of this sort of thing. I think it is desirable we should have some sort of a committee that will thoroughly scrutinise subordinate legislation when it comes before the House.

The Premier mentioned that this is the job of private members. I agree that system worked perfectly well in the past; and I am mindful that the father of a member in another place, when he was a member of that House, regularly went through all of the motions, regulations, and so on. However, that was in the days when the horse was the form of transport, and members had ample time to do that sort of thing. Today, of course, it is not possible.

Mr. Jamieson: There were not nearly as many regulations then.

Mr. GRAYDEN: In those days there were few regulations and members had ample time to examine them thoroughly; but the position is quite different now. I think all members have a great deal to do and they certainly cannot keep up with the volume of subordinate legislation that is received in this House. This is emphasised by the fact that, from time to time, most undesirable regulations come into existence.

The other day we had a regulation in respect of night chemists. I am quite certain this regulation would not have come into existence had there been a committee such as the one I am talking about. These days there is a tremendous amount of criticism in regard to Government by regulation. We have been reading this in the Press over the years.

Mr. Brand: That one concerning the chemists has been pretty well examined hasn't it? There is no motion as yet, anyhow.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I understand a compromise has been reached; but the point I wish to make is that there have been a lot of undesirable regulations which I do not think would have seen the light of day had there been in existence such a committee as the one I am talking about.

Getting back to the tremendous amount of criticism in the Press in respect of Government by regulation, in the past we have read editorial after editorial on this subject and I think every member, to a large extent, would go along with that criticism as, I am sure, would the great majority of the people in this State.

In these circumstances, I think when we get the opportunity to do something to curtail subordinate legislation we should take advantage of it. Therefore I have a great deal of pleasure in supporting the motion, as amended.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [8.34 p.m.]: I have before me the motion, as amended, and the original motion as it appears on

the notice paper. I notice they have something in common; they both contain the words, "in the opinion of this House." However, the position is not quite as bad as that.

The purpose of this motion was to endeavour to obtain some action with regard to a committee on subordinate legislation and I think, with the co-operation of the Premier tonight, that has been achieved. I thank the Premier and the other members of this House for at least giving us a motion which does support something real in the way of a committee on subordinate legislation.

I did not move my motion with the thought of putting it on the notice paper just to have something to talk about; I genuinely believe that a committee of this kind is an essential part of our parliamentary system. At the present time the regulations and by-laws which are being placed before us are not receiving the attention they should; and the result of this motion will at least be a starting point for an examination of the position to see what can be brought before the House in the way of appointing a committee. Members will then have another opportunity to debate this important issue. All we can hope for, as members of Parliament, is that we will receive justice if nothing else.

Mr. Speaker, as I forgot to reply to the last motion—and I know I cannot go backwards—I wish to thank the Premier for his co-operation in that instance, even though I do not agree with all of his amendments.

Finally, to save the time of the House—this may be a little out of order—I wonder if I could obtain an indication from the Premier whether the words "related matters" include a public accounts committee. I ask this because it was my intention tonight to give notice of a motion for a committee on public accounts; and, as I missed the call, it was my further intention to give notice tomorrow. However, I do not desire to waste the time of the House by putting this motion on the notice paper if it is the intention of the Premier to include a public accounts committee in the inquiry.

Mr. Brand: I think I already indicated I would when the member for Narrogin was on his feet.

The SPEAKER: It was that extraordinary point of order.

Question (motion, as amended) put and passed.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [8.38 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The first amendment contained in this measure has to do with the number of articulated law clerks in State and Commonwealth employ. In the State Public Service, the Crown Law Department has, over a considerable period, experienced some difficulty in recruiting junior professional staff from outside the Public Service.

While, admittedly, suitable juniors have very recently applied for appointment and been engaged, the department regards its main source of recruitment as being, as in the past, from its own articulated clerks and, under existing circumstances, this is likely to continue.

Articles are for two years, plus extensions occasionally, with the result that under the present restriction of numbers, the maximum rate of recruitment from the department's own articulated clerks cannot exceed one solicitor per year. Experience has shown, however, that with wastage and extensions of articles, an average of no more than one solicitor in two years is appointed from the ranks of the department's articulated clerks.

The number of lawyers employed on Crown legal work in this State is well below the average of New South Wales and Victoria when assessed on a population basis and it is estimated that the future rate of expansion in the next few years will average at least two solicitors a year, and this could escalate.

The amendment affecting the number of articulated clerks contained in this Bill has been recommended by the Crown Law Department, supported by the Law School of the University of Western Australia, and accepted by the Barristers' Board.

Section 10 of the Act, which deals with this matter, has been amended on three occasions and the parliamentary draftsman has, in the interests of clarity, preferred to recast the section into the form in which it appears in clause 2 of this Bill; thus incorporating the proposed amendment and also improving the wording of the existing section.

The amendment, which proposes to increase from two to four the number of articulated law clerks that the State Crown Solicitor or the Deputy Commonwealth Crown Solicitor may have at the same time, will apply equally to the Deputy Commonwealth Crown Solicitor in this State. This officer has stated that he would be happy if the proposed amendment could thus be extended to enable him to have four articulated clerks simultaneously instead of two as at present.

He has found it almost impossible to recruit suitable staff from outside the Commonwealth Public Service and he feels that the Commonwealth, also, must look to its articulated clerks as the main source of recruitment to its legal services.

As mentioned previously, the Bill has been accepted by the Barristers' Board

and the board approves it in its present form.

Additionally, support for the proposed amendment has been expressed by Dr. Edwards of the Law School. He has found difficulty in placing in articles the increasing number of final year law students after graduation.

In some other States, and in New South Wales in particular, the matter of placing graduates in articles has become a real problem. Though it is not yet a problem in Western Australia, the Crown Law Department in this State desires to play its part in easing the burden on the Law School in the matter.

The second amendment refers to section 15 of the Act, which relates to the admission of practitioners and has been drafted to remedy a defect in that section.

In paragraph (a) of subsection (2) of the existing section, there is reference to a person who has, "taken a degree in law at a university recognised by the board for the purposes of this section."

Because of this particular phraseology, the board has been occasioned some difficulty at times; namely, where the board has recognised the university but either the board considers that the degree taken is not substantially equivalent to the degree in law at the University of Western Australia, or the degree taken at the other university, which is the University of Oxford, is not called a degree in law but a degree in Arts (Jurisprudence).

The board has accordingly sought the amendment which appears as clause 2 of the Bill. This amendment, in effect, seeks to allow the board to decide whether or not a person's qualifications, whether acquired through university degree or otherwise, are such as to be substantially equivalent to a degree in law at our University.

In point of fact, a case has arisen where the board considers adequate and academic qualifications of a mature age applicant, who has an Arts degree from Sydney University, has qualified for admission in New South Wales through the Barristers' Admission Board, and while not having sought admission in New South Wales has had substantial experience in practice of the law as a Crown officer in Western Australia and elsewhere.

The board desires to accept his academic qualifications as equivalent to a local degree in law, in order that he will have only to serve articles, to pass examination in practical subjects, and to comply with formalities before becoming qualified for admission in Western Australia. It is conceivable that similar cases could arise in future and I accordingly commend this Bill to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. May.

CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [8.46 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In 1964 Parliament enacted a Clean Air Act. This legislation demanded a good deal of preparatory work before it could be fully implemented. This was completed and the legislation became fully operative on the 2nd June, this year.

The Act is administered by a council consisting of 14 persons, representing a number of Government and specialised agencies, together with representatives of industry.

It has already been discovered that the work of the council will involve the imposition of controls on industries which are classified as mines. For example, quarrying and crushing stone is one of these industries.

The existing legislation provides that one member of the council shall be an officer of the Mines Department, nominated by the Minister for Mines. This Bill proposes to amend the wording so that the person nominated by the Minister need not be an officer of the department, but could be any suitable person with an expert knowledge of the mining industry.

An associated proposal is to strengthen the Scientific Advisory Committee by adding an eighth member, who would be a person holding appointment as an inspector under the Mines Regulation Act. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Toms.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Minister for Works) [8.46 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This measure seeks to insert in the Physiotherapists Act a set of provisions along the same lines as those which were inserted in the Medical Act in 1965.

The Bill provides that persons who do not hold qualifications, which would entitle them to register and practise physiotherapy in this State, may be granted registration in special circumstances.

It is proposed that overseas persons, who seek to gain postgraduate experience at the Western Australian School of Physiotherapy, may be granted registration for that purpose. Members will be aware that Western Australia has an enviable reputation, due to the advanced facilities provided for the treatment and rehabilitation of paraplegics. It is, therefore, possible for persons from other countries to learn a great deal at our local institutions.

The second category to become eligible for registration under the Bill is a group of persons who may have expert knowledge in one or more aspects of teaching as applied to physiotherapy. This would enable the local school to engage the services of persons who have developed advanced techniques in specialised aspects of physiotherapy where those persons do not hold qualifications recognised under the Physiotherapists Act. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Norton.

House adjourned at 8.48 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 31st August, 1967

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

QUESTIONS (27): ON NOTICE

1. and 2. *These questions were postponed.*

HIGH SCHOOL AT ROSSMOYNE

Areas Served, and Enrolments

3. Mr. ELLIOTT asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) From which areas will students at the new Rossmoyne High School come?
- (2) What grades will be accepted for enrolment in 1968?
- (3) How many students are expected to be enrolled when the school opens?
- (4) Is construction of the school progressing at a satisfactory rate?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Brentwood, Riverton, Rossmoyne, and portions of Cannington and Canning Vale.
- (2) First-year high school.
- (3) Estimated 200.
- (4) Yes. Construction should be completed prior to the opening of the school.

BURNING OFF IN THE METROPOLITAN AREA

Lifting of Sunday Ban

4. Mr. DUNN asked the Minister for Lands:

Acknowledging the necessity for a ban on Sunday burning off in country areas, because most land owners are away from their homes on this day, and in view of the fact that in areas covered by the Metropolitan Region Plan most householders are away from their homes during week days but home

on Sundays, would he give consideration to lifting the ban on Sunday burning off in the Metropolitan Region Plan area?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

There is no Sunday ban on burning off in the metropolitan fire district. In those areas outside the metropolitan fire district, but within the Metropolitan Region Plan area, shire councils which have applied to the Bush Fires Board for permission to allow Sunday burning off have been granted this concession. Each application is treated on its merits.

SWAN QUARRIES

Dust Control

5. Mr. ELLIOTT asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

What developments have occurred since his department's request to Swan Quarries to create adequate dust control at the company's Orange Grove establishment?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The company called for tenders for dust control equipment. It has ordered a turbulaire scrubber with a capacity of 18,000 cubic feet per minute to control the emission of dust from the quaternary crusher, which is a major source of air pollution. At the same time, acting on the advice of the department, the company is seeking further information about means of suppressing dust at other sources of emission.

ARTICLED CLERKS, LEGAL PRACTITIONERS, AND MAGISTRATES

Number

5. Mr. GUTHRIE asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) How many clerks have been articulated to the Crown Solicitor since the Legal Practitioners Act Amendment Act, 1948, became law?
- (2) What number of such clerks had previously been officers of the State Public Service?
- (3) In the same period as mentioned in (1), how many clerks have been articulated to private practitioners?
- (4) How many clerks articulated to the Crown Solicitor during the period mentioned in (1)—
 - (a) have been admitted to practice;
 - (b) on admission have become law officers in the Crown Law Department?