can set up price control where necessary. The Government does not want to poke its nose into those places where it is not necessary, but it does want to have the power provided in the Bill so that it can be exercised in those cases where some people take advantage of the situation.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	14
Majority against	1

Ayes.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. R. J. Boylen
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	*(Teller.)*

Noes.

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. J. G. Hislop
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. A. R. Jones
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. J. McI. Thomson
Hon. H. Hearn	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. C. H. Henning	Hon. J. Murray
	(Teller.)

Pair.

Aye.	No.
Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. Sir Chas. Latham

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 2.15 p.m. tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 8.52 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 20th October, 1954.

CONTENTS.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

CHAMBERLAIN INDUSTRIES LTD.

As to Manufactures, Sales, Bounty, etc.

Hon. A. F. WATTS asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) How many types of—

(a) kerosene;

(b) diesel

tractors are now being manufactured by Chamberlain Industries Ltd.?

(2) How many employees were there at the end of the year 1952, and how many are there now?

(3) How many tractors were sold during the financial years 1951-52, 1952-53, and 1953-54, giving if possible separate details of each type and what numbers were sold in Western Australia and elsewhere, respectively?

(4) What was the amount of bounty paid by the Commonwealth in respect of these sales?

(5) What types of farming implements other than tractors are now being manufactured?

(6) How many of each were sold during the financial year ended the 30th June, 1954?

(7) Is the bounty referred to in No. (4) paid by the Commonwealth in respect of other tractors manufactured in Australia, and if so, can he state in respect of which other tractors it is paid?

(8) Since the 1st March, 1953, has the amount of the indebtedness of the company to either the Rural & Industries Bank, or the State Government been reduced or increased?

(9) Who are the present directors of the company, and has any change been made in the directorate since the 1st March, 1953?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Two of each.

(2) 31/12/52—646.

(3) 20/10/54—724.

The particulars are—

—	1951-52.		1952-53.		1953-54.	
	40KA.	60D.	40KA.	60D.	40KA.	60D.
W.A.	84	1	77	66	113	96
S.A.	49	....	46	2	52	14
Victoria	132	....	161	6	120	20
N.S.W.	58	....	45	4	77	10
Queensland	45	....	6	....	9	10
Total	368	1	335	78	371	150

(4) Bounty is paid on tractors produced under 55 h.p. Bounty paid:—

1951-52—£52,128.

1952-53—£53,376.

1953-54—£86,144.

(5) Scarifiers, 20 and 24 tyne.
Plows, 14 disc.
Plows, 18 disc.
Seedbox, 14 run.
Seedbox, 18 run.

(6) Sales for financial year 1954:—

—	W.A.	S.A.	Vict.	N.S.W.	Q'sland.	Total.
Scarifiers	181	119	59	112	32	503
Plows 14 Disc	156	23	33	90	19	323
Plows 18 Disc	395	50	23	145	16	629
Seedbox 14 Run	5	....	....	....	....	5
Seedbox 18 Run	14	....	....	....	....	14

(7) (a) Yes.

(b) No.

(8) Increased.

(9) (a) Mr. A. Reid.
Mr. N. Fernie.
Mr. A. W. Chamberlain.
Mr. H. F. Chamberlain.
Mr. A. H. Chamberlain.

(b) Yes, Mr. Reid and Mr. Fernie were added.

CEMENT.

As to Shortage of Supplies and Importations.

Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Housing:

Is he able to advise—

(1) Whether the current importations of cement to the 31st December, 1954, will be adequate to overcome the local cement shortage?

(2) Whether further cement importations will be necessary in the new year, and if so, whether negotiations are in hand to ensure arrival of such cement in this State to coincide with demand?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Inquiries made at the local cement works and from the Merchants Distributors Association indicate that there is some increase in local production and with the overseas imports now arriving, the supply should approximate the demand to the 31st December, 1954.

(2) A very thorough inquiry is under way to estimate what, if any, cement importations may be necessary in the new year and to this end negotiations are continuing with overseas import supply agencies.

EDUCATION.

(a) As to Co-educational High Schools.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Is it proposed to absorb Princess May High School in the new five-year co-educational high school to be opened in Fremantle shortly?

(2) If so, has he, or the Education Department, envisaged plans similarly to deal with any other girls' high schools, absorbing them into co-educational five-year high schools as these are built?

(3) If so, will he name the schools he plans so to absorb?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.
(2) Not as yet.
(3) Answered by No. (2).

(b) As to Site and Building of School, Redcliffe.

Mr. J. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Education:

(1) What is the location, and street names, enclosing the proposed new school site at Redcliffe?

(2) Have the formalities of acquiring this property from the Commonwealth been completed?

(3) In view of the urgency of increased school accommodation in this district, will he expedite the calling of tenders and the early construction of the new building?

(4) What type of building is it intended to erect?

(5) Will the new school be ready for the opening of the school year, 1955?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The site is between the Perth Airport and the Great Eastern Highway, bounded on the north by Kanowna Avenue (approximately 13 chains) and on the west by Victoria-st. (approximately six and a half chains), the site forming a rectangle approximately eight and a quarter acres in area.

(2) Action to acquire this site is complete except for the legal formalities connected with the transfer, and these are now in course.

(3) Treasury approval has been granted for the erection of a four roomed monocrete building on this site and the school is the next to be undertaken by the contracting company.

(4) Answered by No. (3).

(5) It is hoped that the school will be ready for the opening of the coming school year.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS.

As to Preference to Local Materials and Equipment.

Mr. J. HEGNEY asked the Premier:

(1) Where tenders are called for the supply of machinery, equipment and materials to service the departments of State, is it the policy of the Government to give preference wherever possible to—

(a) materials and equipment of Western Australian origin;

(b) materials, machinery, etc., of Australian origin?

(2) Was a directive given to the Tender Board and the various departments on this question of preference?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) (a) Yes. Government policy is to allot a preference of up to 10 per cent. for goods manufactured in Western Australia.

(b) No specific preference is accorded to goods of Australian origin which are not manufactured in Western Australia.

(2) Yes. A directive was given by Cabinet in 1922 for the preference of up to 10 per cent. for goods manufactured in Western Australia.

VELDT GRASS.

As to Research for Eradicating.

Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Is he aware of the alarming spread of veldt grass on the outer fringes of the metropolitan area?

(2) Is this grass likely to kill off the more succulent pastures of metropolitan holding paddocks?

(3) If the answer to No. (2) is in the affirmative, has the Agricultural Department done any research into the possibility of eradicating this grass?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes, but the spread is not necessarily alarming.

(2) Under many conditions veldt grass is a desirable component of pastures but the difficulty is to maintain it under grazing conditions. Generally it would be a welcome addition to pastures in the metropolitan area.

(3) Answered by No. (2).

TRAFFIC.

As to Crosswalks Near Schools.

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

(1) What is the policy regarding the provision of crosswalks across main thoroughfares in the proximity of schools?

(2) Does he consider it desirable to site a crosswalk across Beaufort-st. at the Second Avenue intersection, to enable the children attending the Mt. Lawley School to cross Beaufort-st. in safety?

(3) If the answer to No. (2) is in the affirmative, will he take steps to have a crosswalk provided at this intersection?

(4) If not, why not?

The MINISTER FOR POLICE replied:

It is not considered that the provision of pedestrian crossings for the specific use of schoolchildren is warranted. Schoolchildren would use them for short periods on school days only, and not during weekends and school holidays, while motorists

would be legally liable to observe the crossings at all times. It has been found that pedestrian crossings tend to lull children into a false sense of security.

ROYAL PERTH HOSPITAL.

As to Abolishing Visiting Charge.

Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Health:

In view of the fact that patients at the Royal Perth Hospital are now charged for hospitalisation, will he take steps to abolish the sixpenny visiting fee so as to bring this institution into line with private establishments?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Health) replied:

This matter will be considered by the Minister for Health on his return to duty.

ELECTRICITY AND GAS.

As to Increased Charges and Basic Wage.

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What increase in the cost of electricity and gas to consumers has taken place since the 1st February, 1953?

(2) What increase has taken place in the basic wage in the same period?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) In the metropolitan area—

(a) Electricity—.01d. per unit.

(b) Gas—.011d. per unit.

(2) 8s. per week.

BUSH FIRES ACT.

(a) As to Language Warnings for New Australians.

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Lands:

Will he arrange to have warnings of penalties under the Bush Fires Act for deliberate or accidental lighting of fires, issued or made in languages understandable by new Australians?

The MINISTER replied:

There are 28 European nations covered by the term new Australians. I will have the position examined to see what can be done to carry out the suggestion.

(b) As to Death of New Australian and Ignorance of Penalties.

Mr. BRADY (without notice) asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Following my previous question and the Minister's reply to it, I now ask the Minister: Is he aware that a new Australian lost his life yesterday in a forestry fire in the South-West?

(2) Is he also aware that new Australians are lighting fires in this State, not being aware of the penalties involved?

The MINISTER replied:

I am not aware of the facts contained in either of these questions, but it does not alter the situation in any way. What I did in introducing the Bill was a guarantee that we would have for distribution thousands of copies of a brochure, couched in simple language any individual could understand, that would set out not only the conditions that were laid down under the Bush Fires Act, but also the penalties.

However, when it comes to a question of making available to new Australians that information in their language, it could become a very difficult matter, if not impossible. We will endeavour, nevertheless, as far as is possible, to meet the requirements of the hon. member in this matter, but we must give consideration to the best method of achieving that objective. Personally, I think new Australians are pretty quick on the uptake and they do not take long to find out what is what. I assure the hon. member that I will do what I have promised him.

WATER SUPPLIES.

(a) As to Completion of Kalamunda Scheme.

Mr. OWEN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Will the £30,000 of loan money made available by the Treasurer for the Kalamunda water supply enable the surveyed scheme to be completed this financial year?

(2) If not—

(a) what areas will be reticulated this year;

(b) is it proposed to complete the scheme next year?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) (a) The central section of the town roughly bounded by the old Railway Reserve, Windsor and Alpine-rds and the Perth-Kalamunda-rd.

(b) Yes, subject to funds being available.

(b) As to Provision for Sister Kate's Home.

Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

When will work be commenced on laying the larger main from Albany Highway to Sister Kate's Home at Kenwick?

The MINISTER replied:

It is unlikely that this work will be commenced before March, 1955.

SWIMMING POOLS.

As to Providing Grant for Kelmscott.

Mr. WILD asked the Premier:

(1) In view of the grant of £10,000 to Merredin for the construction of a swimming pool, will he give consideration to applying a similar sum of money for a new pool to be provided at Kelmscott?

(2) If not, why not?

The PREMIER replied:

Kelmscott is close to the seaside, and in any event no practical approach of any kind has yet been made to the Government on behalf of the Kelmscott people.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.

As to Roleystone-Pickering Brook Connection.

Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Works:

Is it intended to commence work on the erection of the transmission line between Roleystone and Pickering Brook this financial year, thus connecting up many market gardeners and one of the largest fruit orchards in the State?

The MINISTER replied:

Yes. Work will be commenced this financial year. All farms and orchards on the route will be connected where it is economically possible to do so.

FREMANTLE HARBOUR.

(a) As to Tabling Report.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Railways:

Will he place on the Table of the House the File No. R/234/38 from which he quoted when speaking on the harbour development motion moved by the member for Fremantle and which dealt with Fremantle harbour development and the bridge over the Swan River at Fremantle?

The MINISTER replied:

I would point out to the hon. member that I did not quote from File No. R/234/38 on this occasion, but from File No. 9728/50. The report on the file from which I quoted is here, and I ask that it be laid on the Table of the House for a period of seven days.

(b) As to Tabling File.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN (without notice) asked the Minister for Railways:

Will he lay on the Table of the House File No. R/234/38? I am not interested in what the Minister quoted the other evening, but in the things he did not quote.

The MINISTER replied:

I take exception to the imputation by the hon. member that I made any quotation from the particiular file which he asked for. That file was not in my possession and I made no quotation from it. He asked for a file which I did not quote from. The file which I did quote from has been laid on the Table of the House for a period of seven days, and it contains the report from which I did quote. If the hon. member wants another file and makes a request for it, consideration will be given to his request.

MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR.

(a) As to Number of Stoppages, etc.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY (without notice) asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) How many stoppages have occurred at Midland Junction abattoir since the 1st July last?

(2) What has been the cause of each strike?

(3) Is the Minister aware of the serious concern among producers over the backlag and the uncertainty in handling livestock for slaughter?

(4) Is he aware of the serious loss resulting to farmers because of restricted competition at today's auction sales?

(5) What is the Government doing to end this highly unsatisfactory state of affairs?

The MINISTER replied:

As the hon. member made available to me a copy of his questions at 3 p.m. today, I have not been able to obtain information in respect of some of the questions. If he still requires information as to the number of strikes and their cause, I will supply the answers if he places that part of the question on the notice paper.

As to what the Government has been doing in connection with this matter, I might say that when a strike occurred a couple of months ago, the Minister in charge arranged for a conference of both parties, and the result was a stable arrangement with which both parties, management and men, seemed to be happy at that time. Not only that, but it also confirmed a six months' agreement under which both parties were in honour bound to agree to the arrangement until the expiration of that time, when one or both could appeal to the court for a permanent award.

That arrangement has been highly satisfactory until now, but unfortunately there are one or two items which the men—labourers, in this instance—think should be improved. I refer to one or two conditions relating to clothing, which could be granted at this juncture, and one or two conditions of work. In my opinion, where the matter has got out of the Government's hands is that the items in respect of increased wages are a breach of the agreement which was to last for six months.

Only this afternoon, officers of the Department of Labour were in touch with the president of the Arbitration Court who, from now on, will handle the situation as it develops. The fact that those officers were in consultation with the president this afternoon made it impossible for me to secure the information desired by the hon. member. However, he can rest assured that the Government is aware of the disabilities created and the dissatisfaction in the minds of farmers and others as a result of the present position. No Government can be blamed for the existing circumstances unless the seed of the trouble goes back to 1952 when the hon. member himself caused to be introduced in this House a Bill, which, in my opinion, has created an impossible situation at Midland Junction, one which we attempted last year to correct to some extent when, unfortunately, we did not receive the desired approval and support.

(b) As to Arrangements for Feeding Stock.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY (without notice) asked the Minister for Agriculture:

In view of the large number of stock at the Midland abattoir, will he state what steps are being taken to feed them properly and at whose expense they will be fed?

The MINISTER replied:

I assure the hon. member that the stock will be fed. I discussed the matter with the general manager this afternoon, and he is taking responsibility for feeding the stock. The question of payment will have to be considered.

(c) As to Functioning of Control Board.

Mr. BRADY (without notice) asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Is the Abattoir Board, which was appointed under the amending legislation passed in 1952, functioning and, if so, how often has it met in the last six months?

(2) Is there any significance in the fact that there have been more disputes at the abattoir since the new board was appointed?

(3) Does he consider that industrial relationship would be improved by the appointment of a controller with union representation on the board?

The MINISTER replied:

I ask that this question be placed on the notice paper, but in reply to the last portion of it would remind the hon. member that we attempted to have that done last session but failed through lack of support.

(d) As to Reference of Dispute to Arbitration Court.

Hon. D. BRAND (without notice) asked the Minister for Labour:

(1) What steps have been taken by (a) the Minister, (b) the board at the Midland Junction Abattoir to bring the question of repeated strikes under the notice of the Arbitration Court?

(2) If no steps have been taken, why not?

The MINISTER replied:

The dispute mentioned by the member for Greenough has been referred to the Arbitration Court by the Abattoir Board.

(e) As to the Time of Reference to Court.

Hon. D. BRAND (without notice) asked the Minister for Labour:

In view of his answer to my question, and following the answer given to the Leader of the Opposition, that the president of the Arbitration Court was being interviewed by the officers of the Department of Labour this afternoon, do I understand that this dispute has just been referred to the Arbitration Court? Could he tell me when it was referred to the Arbitration Court?

The MINISTER replied:

As far as I am aware, the dispute was referred to the Abattoir Board. I just cannot give the time. It may have been late this afternoon or early this morning. In accordance with the provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act, the Abattoir Board is the responsible body and I understand that it referred the matter to the Arbitration Court some time today.

HOUSING.

(a) As to Land Resumption at Hamilton Hill.

Mr. HUTCHINSON (without notice) asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Has he seen the Press report in today's issue of "The West Australian" in which the Mayor of Fremantle attacked the State Housing Commission's resumption of 267 acres of land in the Hamilton Hill area belonging to the Fremantle City Council?

(2) Was he aware that the council proposed to utilise this area for recreational purposes and as a "breathing space"?

(3) Is it the intention of the Government in the resumption to conform to the council's proposal, or is the land to be utilised for building purposes?

(4) Is it his policy not to consult with local governing authorities prior to such resumptions?

The MINISTER replied:

I think, first of all, that the Mayor of Fremantle would have been well advised to have sought some information before rushing into the Press with a statement. Both he and the hon. member who has asked the question may rest assured that there will be ample provision made for playing fields, parks and open spaces generally in the area to be developed in the Fremantle district by the State Housing Commission.

(b) As to Consulting Local Authorities re Resumptions.

Mr. HUTCHINSON (without notice) asked the Minister for Housing:

Is his policy not to consult local governing authorities prior to resumptions being made by the State Housing Commission, as mentioned by me in my previous question?

The MINISTER replied:

The member for Cottesloe has picked on a loser in this question because the endowment land, the subject of his question, is in the district of the Fremantle Road Board, strangely enough, and that local authority, I am informed, welcomes the action of the State Housing Commission.

(c) As to Consulting Proper Local Authority.

Mr. HUTCHINSON (without notice) asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Was the proper local authority consulted prior to the resumptions by the State Housing Commission?

(2) If not, is it his policy not to consult with local authorities?

The MINISTER replied:

I am unable to say, with any degree of certainty, whether, in respect of this particular area, there were negotiations or discussions between the State Housing Commission and the local authority concerned. As a general rule, local authorities welcome the action of the State Housing Commission because it means, at a much earlier date, development is undertaken not only in respect of building houses but also in regard to all the services that go with them. If the hon. member cares to place this question on the notice paper, I will be only too happy to supply him with the information he desires.

NORTH-WEST.

As to Formation of Developmental Committee.

Mr. ACKLAND (without notice) asked the Premier:

Does he remember that some weeks ago both this House and another place passed a unanimous resolution requesting that a committee of three should be formed to prepare a case to place before the Commonwealth Government with reference to financial assistance for the development of the North? Has that committee commenced to function and, if not, when does he anticipate that it will do so?

The PREMIER replied:

I think the hon. member has misquoted the motion that was agreed to. As finally carried, the motion was not to set up a committee for the purpose of drawing up a programme. It was a motion calling upon the Government to draw up a programme which, when completed, was to be presented to a committee, the members of which were to have the right to amend the programme if the majority of its members thought that would be the wise thing to do.

The Government has placed in the hands of the Minister for the North-West the responsibility of obtaining from the various Government departments proposals which they have developed for the North-West and that Minister is to collate those proposals and also add to them any additional proposals which he thinks would be helpful. That programme, as a whole, will then be considered by Cabinet and when finally approved by it will be submitted with expedition to the committee.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Limitation Act Amendment.
Introduced by the Premier (for the Minister for Justice).

2, Married Women's Protection Act Amendment.
Introduced by the Premier.

BILLS (3)—THIRD READING.

1, Fauna Protection Act Amendment.

2, Mines Regulation Act Amendment (No. 2).

3, Traffic Act Amendment (No. 2).
Transmitted to the Council.

MOTION—EXMOUTH GULF OILFIELD.

As to Parliamentarians' Visit.

MR. LAWRENCE (South Fremantle) [5.1]: I move—

> That members of this House desire to place on record their appreciation of W.A. Petroleum Pty. Ltd., in inviting, transporting and so generously caring for, and informing them during the visit to the oilfield at Exmouth Gulf, and request you, Mr. Speaker, to convey their appreciation to the company, and to express to the Minister for Mines (Hon. L. F. Kelly,

M.L.A.), through whose offices this visit was brought to such a successful conclusion, their grateful thanks.

The purpose of the motion is quite evident. It is designed to convey the thanks of the members of this House—members of another place have already done so—to W.A. Petroleum Pty. Ltd.; to enable some members to give the impressions of their visit to less fortunate members who were not able to make the trip; and to convey thanks to the Minister for Mines for making arrangements for the visit to the oilfield. Members of this House are indebted not only for the hospitality provided, which was par excellent at all times, but also for the accommodation that was provided for them in this hinterland area and for the food and refreshments which were afforded us.

We are also indebted for the opportunity of hearing about the methods adopted by world experts in the search for oil and about geological matters generally. We must thank the executive for their generous comradeship; in fact, we must thank all the personnel of W.A. Petroleum Pty. Ltd. It was interesting to note the air of confidence displayed at all times by the chief executives of the company. This conveyed to our minds that if, in fact, there is oil in the Exmouth Gulf area, this company will find it.

On the Saturday evening of our visit the executive explained in detail about the plans; the amount of money and the great hordes of machinery that were being thrown into this effort; about their realisation of the magnitude of the job, and their determination to find the oil if it is there to be recovered. The machinery used at the drilling plants interested me very much. In my time I have seen, especially on the waterfront, equipment that is equal to any used in the maritime field in the world, but I have never seen such lifting power as was shown us at No. 1 Rig, Rough Range. Not only was the machinery used of great power, but the way in which it was used and assembled, its mobility, etc., were features which appeared to be miraculous.

I would like to compliment the company on its policy as evidenced by the answer given by Mr. Morgan to one question. He said that if traces of other minerals were found in the drillings, the company would not be interested in them and the information obtained by the company would be handed over to the Government. I laud this statement because the information that can be provided by the company will be invaluable in the exploration of other minerals in this State in places where this company has carried out, and will carry out, oil drilling operations. There is no doubt that the discovery of oil in commercial quantities would strongly affect not only the economy of the State, but also the defences of Australia, as well as the British Commonwealth of Nations. This adds further praise to the effort of the company.

Personally, I extend my thanks to Mr. Morgan, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Walkley, Mt. Stewart and others. Mr. Walkley treated us as his equal; he may be so in the flesh, but in the knowledge of his subject, he is by far our superior. Their camaraderie was something to be marvelled at. Nothing was left to be desired in the treatment of the company's staff. In fact, this treatment could be an object lesson to other companies and industries throughout Australia. The quarters are excellent, and their mobility is probably an added advantage.

The food provided is equal to any I have partaken of in any of the leading hotels or at banquets which I have attended in this State. The men are provided with the same food as the executive. There are also other amenities provided up there such as a picture show, which I think is conducted four times a week. My thanks are also extended to the Minister for Mines for his far-sightedness in bringing before the members of both Houses of Parliament, the development undertaken by this company in the Exmouth Gulf area and for that matter in other parts of Australia.

Everyone will realise that with the development and search for oil in Western Australia, the Minister will in future have to take on additional onerous duties, and he will have to make decisions respecting the control of the industry if oil is found. I hope that oil will be found. I thank again the executive and staff of the W.A. Petroleum Pty. Ltd. and the Minister for Mines for the opportunity to see the comprehensive set-up of oil search operations at Exmouth Gulf, and for the many pleasures that were accorded us. I ask members of this House to carry the motion unanimously.

HON. D. BRAND (Greenough) [5.10]: I join the member for South Fremantle in support of the motion which has, as its object, a vote of thanks to the company through you, Mr. Speaker, from members of Parliament who were privileged to visit Exmouth Gulf over a recent week-end. Firstly the trip was made at the expense of the company and everything was arranged for us, as you well know, being one of those who made the trip. Nothing was spared in the way of hospitality.

Although we were so far from the metropolitan area and from settlements, we enjoyed the best of conditions during our stay. To sum up, one would say that the visit to Exmouth Gulf impressed one with the permanency of the work which was going on. It is quite evident that the company believes that it has come to stay, or

that the period of exploration for oil will cover a long period. The company is prepared to spend a large sum of money amounting to some £20,000,000 over four or five years.

As the member for South Fremantle said, not only were we shown the exact sites of drilling, not only were we told of the anticipated expenditure, but arrangements were made for us to hear lectures on the evening of our visit given by Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Morgan and other geologists who have come direct from America. They are highly qualified men with the very latest knowledge of geology and methods of oil exploration. One cannot help but be impressed by the fact that these men were not out to pull the wool over the eyes of the public with a view to increasing the interest from the share angle.

These men were impressed with the possibility of finding oil and were prepared to go ahead with the job. They were prepared to waste no time in setting up the machinery with a view to exploring the fields to the utmost degree. The company has imported the most modern machinery and no expense has been spared. Up to date some four holes have been drilled, one of which has revealed that there is some oil in these regions.

It was said by one of the geologists that the prospects of finding oil in the Kimberleys were, in his opinion, greater than those at Rough Range. We know that was the opinion of our own Dr. Raggatt, head of the Mines Department, or its equivalent in the Federal sphere. He did say to me on several occasions that if oil were found in Western Australia, it would be in the Kimberley area, in and around the leases which are now held by Associated Freneys. Although since our visit there have been no startling developments, I am sure that each and every member came away confident that before the company abandons hope of finding oil in Western Australia, every area will have been thoroughly surveyed and tested to a very great depth.

We were informed that the process of exploration and investigation would be very slow. It was by a process of elimination, together with certain systems of investigation and survey, plus drilling, that they would ultimately trace the oil, if it existed. The member for South Fremantle has also made reference to the valuable information which could come in other ways from the work at Exmouth Gulf. Going from the southern part of the State to the North, one was surprised to find septic systems, hot and cold showers, and no restrictions on water, each site being supplied with what appeared to be a plentiful amount of potable water.

Plentiful supplies of water are absolutely necessary if the oil exploration is to continue. What has occurred there could well apply to the southern parts of the State, namely, that if industry, whether secondary or primary, is to continue, the search for water must be proceeded with. The value of water can hardly be measured in terms of £. s. d. The employees of the company are well looked after—a tribute to private industry. The member for South Fremantle said that other companies and employers might well take heed of what is going on there. He could even have included State organisations and trading concerns.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I think the member for Greenough is getting away from the motion.

Hon. D. BRAND: I felt that the member for South Fremantle having said—

Mr. SPEAKER: I allowed the member for South Fremantle a lot of latitude. There is nothing about this matter in the motion.

Hon. D. BRAND: I bow, Sir, to your ruling.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Bad luck!

Hon. D. BRAND: At least I have been able to support the member for South Fremantle in that regard. We are very grateful for what was done. We appreciate that the arrangements were made through the Minister for Mines, and we know that we spent a most enjoyable and informative week-end in an area of the State which had previously been visited by very few members of Parliament. The fact that the company saw fit to make such an arrangement and met the expense of conveying members to that area, indicates that it realises that members of Parliament should be educated with respect to what is going on in this regard.

The attitude of the company supports the principle that has been expressed in the House that before legislation is discussed here, the Minister for Mines should make a similar trip to America and other countries for the purpose of learning what is done in those parts of the world in regard to the oil industry so that he will know what should be done to lay a proper foundation for the industry in this State, if oil is discovered here commercially. We could look forward to similar visits to other parts of the State, because I am certain that each and every member who had the opportunity of seeing what was going on at Exmouth Gulf was impressed with what he saw. I support the motion.

HON. A. V. R. ABBOTT (Mt. Lawley) [5.20]: It is fitting that I should not cast a silent vote on this motion. I want to express vocally my appreciation of all that the company did for us on that most instructive and interesting trip. What I most appreciated was that all the senior

executives of the company made their services available to assist us to gain a full appreciation of the work that was going on, and the technical nature of it. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion.

MR. ACKLAND (Moore) [5.21]: I support the motion and express my appreciation to the oil company for the manner in which it attempted to educate us by taking us north and allowing us to see some of the work it is undertaking. I have no doubt that we were subjected to a good deal of propaganda—propaganda, which I believe, was in the interests of the State as much as it was in the interests of the company. Those gentlemen who occupy the high positions as geologists and engineers, were very willing to answer our questions and tell us what they were doing.

Their attitude, I believe, is entirely different from that which exists in both America and Canada, because I understand that in those countries when an oil company is beginning to seek for oil and is putting down wild-cat bores, the greatest secrecy is maintained. Every effort is made by them to see that other companies, and the public generally, do not get any information until such time as oil has been struck and the wells have begun to operate.

The member for South Fremantle spoke about the relations which existed between the management and the men. The happy feeling existing at Exmouth Gulf may be the forerunner of happier relationships between employer and employee throughout this country. The set-up there was exactly the same as one saw on the oilfields and other industrial projects in Canada. We found there was no boss, and no worker as we know the respective positions here. It was a case of each one having a personal interest and incentive. It was to the interests of both that the project should succeed.

The incentive was easy to see at Rough Range, because the company was leaving no stone unturned to see that the men were supplied with everything possible. One could feel that the company's efforts were appreciated and that value was given for the salary which each man received. I again request the Premier to see that the Minister for Mines, accompanied, possibly, by Mr. Telfer or some other competent person, goes to both America and Canada as soon as possible. I had hoped that the Minister would go there before any decision was made about legislation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is wandering from the motion.

Mr. ACKLAND: I express my appreciation to the management at Rough Range, and I trust that, as a result of the visit, the Government will be able to proceed intelligently with the supervision of the oil industry in this State.

MR. PERKINS (Roe) [5.25]: I formally support the motion, and I take this opportunity to say, "Thank you," to the company for its hospitality and for a most instructive trip. My main impressions are that Western Australia is being well served by this company, and that the thoroughness of the work at Exmouth Gulf and the quality of the experts in each particular sphere probably could not be bettered. I believe that no other organisation could make a greater effort to find oil in payable quantities. I think other members share these impressions, too. I support the motion.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. L. F. Kelly—Merredin-Yilgarn) [5.27]: I wish, on behalf of the company, to thank the member for South Fremantle for moving this motion, and I also thank those members who have supported him. I felt that this matter was one of tremendous importance to all members of this House and I derived great pleasure from being associated with the arranging of the trip. Never at any period did the company suggest that this trip might be possible, or that there was any likelihood of members being taken to the field, but it readily agreed that the idea, if it could be brought to fruition, was a good one.

The satisfaction felt by all who were able to see what had been accomplished at Rough Range fully justified the arrangements that were made. It is worth recording that of a total membership of 80 in both Houses, over 50 availed themselves of the opportunity to visit this oilfield. The fact that they undertook the trip should have a tremendous bearing when we bring legislation before the House because they will have a far better understanding of the position; they will have first-hand knowledge of the site, which should stand them in good stead. I think the motion of appreciation to the company is well directed, and deserves the support it has received.

Question put and passed.

BILL—CITY OF PERTH SCHEME FOR SUPERANNUATION (AMENDMENTS AUTHORISATION).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 13th October.

MR. COURT (Nedlands) [5.29]: I support the Bill which is essentially a domestic matter of the Perth City Council, but we have a responsibility which, I feel, is limited, firstly, to seeing that the scheme is a reasonable one both for the employees and for the council, and, secondly, that the scheme is soundly based and subject to the usual acturial supervision required of such a scheme. From my examination

of the Bill, and the supporting schedules, it appears that this scheme measures up to those two main requirements.

There are several points of interest about the scheme which I feel should receive some comment. First of all, I understand that the additional cost of this scheme to the council will be in the vicinity of £5,300 per annum. I am referring there to the actual portion of the scheme which is payable by the council as distinct from the contributions paid by the employees. This is no small sum, but it has as its object a most desirable purpose, namely, to ensure that the scheme is an equitable one, and aims at trying to bring about a degree of contentment, particularly with respect to wage employees.

As far as the actuarial side is concerned, I am advised that the consultant to the Perth City Council is Mr. Oswald Gawler, who is actuary, and I think, a statistician engaged by the Victorian Government, and also a consultant to the Government of this State. He made his last examination of the scheme in 1952 and found it to be entirely satisfactory; his next examination is due, according to the statutory requirements of this measure, in 1957.

A further point of interest is that the council has very wisely made some concessions to the long-term service employees. This is one of the problems that is encountered by superannuation schemes at this stage of the State's history when there is a transitory problem in getting schemes on a satisfactory and stabilised basis. There is always the problem of the employee who has given many years of faithful service, service which was probably given at a time when working conditions were not as satisfactory as they are today. It is, therefore, pleasing to see that the scheme includes provision for acknowledging this problem and making a concession to these particular employees. Consideration has also been given, as was explained by the member for West Perth, to employees who have retired and would otherwise be arbitrarily restricted to a very small pension if some relief was not envisaged by this measure.

The wages employees, as distinct from the salaried employees, are to receive a two-thirds contribution from the Perth City Council to augment the one-third contribution which they themselves make. When I first heard the introductory remarks, and first read the Bill, I wondered why the pension maximum for wages employees has been fixed at £3. Upon reflection it is easy to see why that figure was fixed; it has regard for the changing circumstances in this country wherein a more desirable system of social services has been developed. In the interest of the recipient of the pension, and of the community represented by the council itself, it is necessary to co-relate the maximum pension receivable by the employee to the permissible income which can be received without prejudice under the prevailing social service conditions.

Members will be well aware of the current rate of age pension of £3 10s., plus a permissible income of £3 10s. That income may be duplicated by the wife of the pensioner to allow them to receive a total income of £14 per week; that income does not attract tax. Therefore it will be readily appreciated by all members that in fixing a maximum of £3, it would permit a retired wages employee to receive his full pension, plus the £3, plus any small items of income he might have. That income could be duplicated by the wife. In addition, of course, he could own his own home, provided he lived in it, and he could also have some small investments.

Salaried staff have been limited to a fifty-fifty basis of contribution—one-half paid by the council and one-half by the salaried employee. This occasion has been used to increase the permitted ceiling limits of those pensions. I feel that the approach is in keeping with the times, the changing values of money and changing circumstances and it appears to have been intelligently covered. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Council and, on motion by Hon. J. B. Sleeman, read a first time.

BILLS (2)—RETURNED.

1, Administration Act Amendment. Without amendment.

2, Health Act Amendment (No. 1). With amendments.

BILL—LOAN, £14,808,000.

Message.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

Second Reading.

THE TREASURER (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [5.42] in moving the second reading said: This is the usual Bill introduced concurrently with the Loan Estimates each year. The measure provides the required authority to enable the

loan moneys for the financial year to be raised so that the programme of works can be carried out. The amount for which this Bill provides authority is £14,808,000. Members will find details covering the amount in the First Schedule to the Bill; they are set out on pages 3 and 4. The Second and Third Schedules set out the re-appropriations and give members the information which they require under that heading.

The condition of Loan Act authorities relating to each item is shown on pages 10 to 13 of the Loan Estimates which were introduced last week, and copies of those Estimates have been made available to all members. In addition to the money required for works and services, the Bill provides authority to raise money to meet deficits remaining in the Consolidated Revenue Fund after final adjustments, as recommended by the Commonwealth Grants Commission. An amount of £60,068 is involved under that heading for the year ended the 30th June, 1952. Preliminary steps towards funding that amount were taken in 1953-54 by transferring the amount mentioned from loan proceeds. For the year 1952-53 approximately £158,000 will have to be funded as the deficit for that year, and those two amounts together make up the provision of £220,000 in the schedule. Full information was given to members in relation to the Loan Estimates in the speech I made last Thursday, and I do not propose to take up any further time on this measure. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir Ross McLarty, debate adjourned.

BILL—ARGENTINE ANT.

In Committee.

Mr. J. Hegney in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Interpretation:

Mr. YATES: I move an amendment—

That the words "and includes, where an extension is made under Subsection (2) of this section, the extension" in lines 12 to 14, page 3, be struck out.

The reason for the amendment is that the local government authorities, together with the Road Board Association and others concerned with the proposed scheme, were promised that it would not last longer than five years. The Minister was good enough to defer the Committee stage of the Bill to permit me to obtain certain information. Unfortunately I have not been able to see Mr. Gostelow who is very ill. I telephoned the hospital a few minutes ago but the doctor was in attendance and I could not get through. I made other approaches, and they are still adamant.

The Minister for Agriculture: Who do you mean by "they"?

Mr. YATES: The members of the Road Board Association and others working in conjunction with Mr. Gostelow.

The Minister for Agriculture: Do you mean to say that the whole of the Local Government Association is in favour of what you are suggesting.

Mr. YATES: I would not say they all are; I can only go on what those who are running the Local Government Association in the city say. They are in favour of the Bill but not in favour of extending the period to more than five years. An assurance was given that it would not be extended beyond that period and they were happy to accept the scheme for five years. I have discussed this matter with members of both parties, and they agree that a five-year period is generous for the conduct of the campaign, especially when the experts claim they can eradicate the ants in four years.

If the experts find it is necessary for the legislation to be continued at the end of the fourth year and advise accordingly, then further legislation could be introduced, and I have no doubt it would be passed. If the Minister sees difficulty in presenting a new Bill after the session has concluded, it might be possible to move an amendment which will give the Bill a life of five years, or until such time as Parliament meets and no longer. That would continue the measure until Parliament meets again and the Minister could introduce a further measure to continue the legislation. I hope the Minister will give the matter serious consideration because of the assurance to local authorities.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: We had some discussion on these lines yesterday, and the idea was that the member for South Perth would meet his advisers and see what they thought of the proposal and the points I suggested. If there is any objection among the local authorities, I do not know of it—other than what the hon member has mentioned—and I feel that that objection arises because they have not had the Bill explained to them carefully. It is true that earlier we felt that five years would be ample time in which to complete the job. But now we do not know whether it will or not. But the Act itself will become inoperative at the end of five years unless local authorities desire an extension. I can see nothing wrong with that.

As an ex-serviceman, the member for South Perth knows that he should not leave any isolated enemy pockets. They should all be mopped up, and the Bill makes that provision. If the hon. member's amendment is carried, it will not have that effect at all. As I explained yesterday, in the event of some isolated

pockets still requiring attention, it would be the responsibility of residents, at their own expense, to do the work; there would be no Government contribution whatever. During the whole of the five-year period, the Government is prepared to contribute money to help in eradicating the ants. If it takes two or three months over the five years, I think the Government should continue to make a contribution. The member for South Perth, however, wants the Government to stop contributing at the end of five years.

Mr. Yates: That is not so.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: That is the effect of the amendment. It will be for the committee provided for in the Bill to say whether the scheme should be extended. If it is terminated, it will mean having to get all the committees together again in order to obtain unanimity because some of them may have obtained complete eradication and will no longer desire to contribute to the scheme. We must be prepared for that eventuality. We wish to ensure that the committee appointed under the Act when this measure becomes law will have power to conduct mopping up operations, while the Government of the day contributes its share.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I think the Minister is losing sight of the real point of this objection. It is that the proper authority to decide whether the impost shall be continued on the ratepayers or taxpayers is Parliament itself. Nobody loses sight of the fact that we might want an extension of time, in order to conduct the mopping up to which the Minister referred. If the present Minister or any other Minister, came to Parliament and said, "We have done a very good job over four years; our experts have looked into the position and we feel we cannot guarantee to complete this work in five years; we must have an extension of 12 months or two years," I feel sure that Parliament would not refuse to grant his request. I suggest the odds would be very heavily in favour, in those circumstances, of all parties being prepared to grant the necessary extension.

The Minister for Agriculture: What is wrong with its being in the Bill?

Hon. A. F. WATTS: Because the proper place to have the extension given is in Parliament.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is in Parliament.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: It is not; under this Bill, Parliament will not be consulted. The committee to be set up might say the time ought to be extended and the Minister could extend it for one, two or four years without Parliament being consulted. The Minister does not constitute Parliament and he cannot take that upon himself.

Dozens of measures have been brought before this Chamber, and many of them have been passed in the first instance for only one, two, or three years, and they have been extended because of the circumstances established by the Government of the day, or by the person who moved the Bill, and because it has been shown that an extension of the measure was necessary. It is rare indeed for an Act to provide that some authority other than Parliament can extend the term of legislation. No matter how great the justification may be, the principle is entirely wrong. This is the place to extend legislation which this place creates.

I do not know what undertakings were given to the representatives of the local authorities, but I do know that the Road Board Association understood it was for a period of five years and therefore presumed—whether the presumption was right remains to be seen—that if an extension were required, Parliament would grant it. I would not mind compromising to the extent of providing that Parliament should consider the matter during the fifth year, but I cannot agree to a proposal whereby some authority external to Parliament can decide whether legislation which imposes a tax upon a large section of the community is to be continued without reference to Parliament. Therefore I support the amendment.

Mr. COURT: I support the amendment as I consider that the authority for determining the duration of the measure must remain with Parliament, regardless of the expressed views of the local authority. I would adopt the same attitude if the whole of the local authorities had informed the Government that they favoured an extension of the period. If, at the end of three or four years, it is the opinion of the committee that the scheme should be extended, there would be ample time for Parliament to determine whether the provisions, particularly the financial provisions, should be continued.

The measure commits not only the Government but also the people to some expenditure. Unanimity has been reached between the local authorities and the Government as to the best method for attacking the problem. It is a condition in the minds of most local authorities and particularly the smaller ones that there would be a statutory limit to the period of the scheme. I understand that the qualification giving the machinery for an extension of the period was made subsequently to the original determination that the scheme should be for five years.

The local authorities with whom I have discussed the matter have assured me that they are whole-heartedly behind the scheme on one condition, namely, that the period is restricted to five years with an understanding that, towards the close, Parliament would consider the need for

extending it. In the interests of a principle as well as commonsense and safety, this extension machinery should not be retained.

Mr. JOHNSON: I support the amendment. It could happen that, at the end of the period, there would be isolated pockets of the pest requiring to be cleaned up and it might be almost impossible then to obtain agreement between the great body of people covered by the measure who are at present in agreement. Under the Bill the power to extend the scheme and the charge lies not with the Minister but with the committee. That would be moving away from the authority that should rest with Parliament. The Minister has said the experts feel sure that they can complete the scheme in five years. I believe that by the end of the fourth year, the experts would be in a position to say when they could complete the scheme. If they then desired an extension, I am sure that Parliament would grant it.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I fail to see what valid reason there can be for opposing the amendment. The Minister knows that Parliament has not refused to extend the operation of an Act where its continuance was necessary. We are all in complete agreement as to the necessity for this legislation; nobody objects to the main principles of the Bill. If the matter were taken out of the hands of Parliament, it would become one for departmental recommendation to the Minister.

The Minister for Housing: Parliament virtually means the Legislative Council.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Departments have been trying for a long time to short-circuit Parliament.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If members opposite are correct in the statement that local authorities are in favour of the principles of the Bill, excepting the provision for the extension, I point out that no extension would be possible. The committee would consist to the extent of four-fifths of representatives of the local authorities.

Mr. Yates: They could put up a recommendation to the Minister.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: We should not regard the members of the committee as being out to make the period as long as possible.

Hon. D. Brand: They are the people who are asking for the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It is said that the local authorities approve of the principle of levying rates for the eradication of the ants for a period of five years and no longer.

Mr. Yates: Their desire is that the position then be reviewed.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I think members will agree that it is necessary to have continuity of work under this scheme until the job is completed. Should it require an additional four or five months, I believe there should be power for the scheme to be continued for that length of time. The question is whether to achieve that end by means of the Bill in its present form or whether so to arrange matters that Parliament is sitting in sufficient time to give authority for an extension. I think it would be safe to leave the matter in the hands of the committee to be appointed, but the member for South Perth and others think the period should be limited to five years. Judging by what is occurring this year, I think the scheme will finish on the 30th June, 1959, but it is possible that the last of the money for that financial year will be expended by the end of March, and normally Parliament does not sit till the end of July or the beginning of August, and then four or five weeks are usually taken up on the Address-in-reply.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: If it was 1958 you would know all about it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No. There would be possibly six or seven months before Parliament would be called together and could agree to an amendment. No one, at the 30th June, 1958, could tell what would be required at the 30th June, 1959, in regard to the eradication of ants. I think members will agree that if it were necessary to continue the scheme for a further four or five months, the legislation should contain the necessary authority for that to be done. I propose to move an amendment to Subclause (2) with the intention of making it possible to extend the life of the scheme by six months during which period Parliament would normally be called together and would therefore be able to give the matter consideration. I propose to ask the Committee to strike out the words "from time to time" and add at the end of the subclause the words, "for a period of six months."

Mr. YATES: In view of what the Minister has said, I am agreeable to what he proposes. I have already moved an amendment accordingly.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: There is no need for that, as the whole matter will be conditional on the amendment to Subclause (2).

Mr. YATES: Then I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

> That the words "from time to time" in line 26, page 3, be struck out.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I agree largely with what the Minister is endeavouring to do but am not quite satisfied with the amendment. I believe its effect might be to make the scheme period five years plus the extension, with the Minister having power to extend the extension for six months. If that were so, the Minister would have the right to extend the period for 12 months. The position could be cleared up by making reference to the fact that the scheme shall continue in operation for a period of five years, plus six months if the Committee recommends it and no longer.

The Minister for Agriculture: Then I will move to add the words "and no longer" at the end of the subclause.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I am agreeable to that.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I move an amendment—

> That after the word "period" in line 29, on page 3 the words "for a period of six months and no longer" be added.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3—The Argentine ant control committee:

Mr. OLDFIELD: I move an amendment—

> That the words "(a) the City of Perth" in line 8, page 4, be struck out.

I see no reason why the Perth City Council should receive preferential treatment above other local authorities participating in the scheme. I sometimes feel that the City of Perth is becoming more important in the legislation of this State than Parliament itself. If the amendment is agreed to, the City of Perth will still have representation through the Local Government Association of Western Australia.

Mr. YATES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I draw the Committee's attention to the fact that in Subclauses (3) and (4) the words "five" and "four" are used and if the hon. member's amendment is agreed to, Subclause (5) would deal with only three nominee members and it would then be out of line with the foregoing subclauses.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee is dealing with Subclause (5). The hon. member will be in order in striking out the words in the subclause, but he will have to substitute other words in their place, or else withdraw his amendment.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I move an amendment—

> That the word "five" in line 1, page 4, be struck out with a view to inserting another word.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not think the Committee should agree to this amendment. Members should realise that the Perth City Council is providing two-thirds of the money to finance this scheme. It is providing £26,000 of a total of £39,000. Therefore, it should have some voice in the spending of the money.

Mr. Oldfield: The Perth City Council is providing more money because it has more ants within its boundaries.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. YATES: I move an amendment—

> That after the word "Each" in line 1, page 5, the words "nominee member of" be struck out and the words "body represented on" inserted in lieu.

The reason for the amendment is that if a nominee member is appointed and cannot attend any meeting, he has the right to appoint a deputy to act in his stead. This deputy might not be a suitable person and the local governing authorities are not very keen about this provision. They suggest they should have the power to appoint the deputy. Initially, they could appoint, at the one time, one nominee member and two deputies. The amendment is reasonable and I ask the Minister to agree to it.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I agree to the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. YATES: I move an amendment—

> That the words "during his term of office as his deputy" in lines 3 and 4, page 5, be struck out and the words "as a deputy" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. YATES: I move an amendment—

> That the word "he" in line 5, page 5, be struck out with a view to inserting the words "the first nominee."

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I have no objection to the word "he" being struck out, but the words proposed to be substituted should not be used. There is no such thing as "a first nominee" now. The words that should be used are "its nominee member."

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. YATES: I move an amendment—

> That the words "its nominee membe" be inserted in lieu of the word struck out.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 12—agreed to.

Clause 13—Power of person authorised by the committee to enter and treat premises:

Mr. YATES: I would like an assurance from the Minister as to whether this committee will have power to authorise inspectors to enter premises and order work

to be done. In the programme that is envisaged it could so happen that inspectors could enter premises to carry out their investigations regardless of whether Argentine ants were present or not and they might be met with hostility by some person or come in contact with people who were indigent, such as old-age pensioners who could not afford to pay for the work that would be required to exterminate the ants. In such cases does the Minister propose that leniency should be shown towards such people, or will the inspector have power to deal with everybody on a set basis and order the extermination of the ants to be carried out regardless of the circumstances?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I can well imagine that some hardship could be created in some cases and the best thing I can do is to bring to the attention of the committee the remarks made by the hon. member together with my report because in necessitous cases I think some leniency ought to be shown. However, every case should be treated on its merits. I do not say that every old-age pensioner cannot afford to pay his share of the expense, but there might be a few cases that would merit some consideration.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 14 to 20—agreed to.

Clause 21—Duration of this Act:

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I take it that the member for South Perth will not move his amendment on the notice paper. An amendment to strike out the word "last" in the last line is required. I move—

That the word "last" in line 24, page 19, be struck out.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—NATIVE WELFARE.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 7th October. Mr. J. Hegney in the Chair; the Minister for Native Welfare in charge of the Bill.

Clause 50—*Section 50 repealed.*

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after Hon. Sir Ross McLarty had moved an amendment to the clause as follows:—

That after the word "is" in line 23, page 18, the following words be inserted:—

"amended by adding the following proviso after the word 'Act' in the sixth line of the section:—

Provided that nothing in this section shall render it unlawful for any holder of such licence to admit any native upon his licensed premises for the purpose of having board and lodging therein."

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Minister also has an amendment to this clause on the notice paper. In order that he may deal with his amendment first, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: I move an amendment—

That after the word "is" in line 23, page 18, the following words be inserted:—

"amended by adding the following proviso after the word 'Act' in the sixth line of the section:—

Provided that nothing in this section shall render it unlawful for any holder of such licence to permit any native exempted from the provisions of this Act to enter and remain on his licensed premises for the purpose of having food or lodging."

I am anxious to see that any restrictions to be imposed on natives, which are not imposed on other sections of the community, should appear in the appropriate Act, such as the Licensing Act. In order to dispel any doubt about the Government's intention to make widespread changes, it left Section 49 of the Act intact; that deals with the restrictions on natives to obtain liquor. Clause 50 proposes to repeal Section 50; even if that is done, the restriction in the Licensing Act would still remain. For that reason I have introduced my amendment.

In connection with this matter, I have received four or five telegrams, and last Friday I received a deputation from the Licensed Victuallers' Association. The deputation appeared to accept my explanation of the proposed amendment. I would point out that the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition which has been withdrawn would have enabled all natives to enter licensed premises for board and lodging, and that would have cut right across the provisions of the Licensing Act. Any restriction on natives entering licensed premises should appear in the Licensing Act and not in this Act.

Many persons, including some public men, who are concerned about this clause, do not seem to realise that the restriction appearing in the Licensing Act has been in operation for 17 years. The inference to be drawn from Section 50 of the Native Administration Act is that any native exempt from that Act is entitled to remain on licensed premises. The point has often arisen as to whether an exemption under Section 72 of the Act entitles a native to obtain spirituous and fermented liquor on licensed premises.

Section 50 of the Act we are dealing with entitles only an exempted native to enter licensed premises. The question then arises as to why an exempted native desires to enter licensed premises, and my amendment, which is more restrictive than the one withdrawn, clarifies the position.

Mr. Hutchinson: It does not clarify the position. An exempted native is not a native.

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: Any native who obtains a certificate of citizenship is entirely removed from the application of the Native Administration Act. Under Section 72, the Minister has power to issue a certificate of exemption freeing a native from the provisions of that Act. A certificate of exemption does not entitle a native to full rights of citizenship. In my view, when a native obtains a certificate of exemption he should not be subject to the restrictions of the Native Administration Act.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Would it not be better to repeal Section 72?

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: Not at this stage. There is some doubt as to whether a certificate of exemption enables a native to obtain liquor on licensed premises. I do not want to open up that question; suffice to say that this clause will enable a native who has obtained a certificate of exemption to enter licensed premises. The amendment makes it clear that it shall not be unlawful for any licensee to supply food and lodging to a native with a certificate of exemption. The existing Act prohibits a licensee from supplying food and lodging to such a native.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I, too, had a deputation from publicans throughout the country districts—mostly from the Great Southern—and they informed me that they were not happy about the amendment. A native with citizenship rights has all the rights that any of us hold. He can enter any part of a hotel to obtain liquor or to get accommodation. The Minister's amendment will mean that any native who has a certificate of exemption under the provisions of Section 72 will have the right to demand accommodation at any hotel, whether it be in the country or in the city. I can see some difficulty in this regard.

How many natives have been granted certificates of exemption, I do not know, nor do I know on what grounds a certificate of exemption is given. Is it given where it is considered that the position of a native is such that he should have the certificate but should not be granted citizenship rights? I am inclined to think that it would be better to leave Section 50 in the Act as it is, because there is so much confusion about the amendment. The hotelkeepers would have difficulty in knowing for whom they would be expected by law to provide accommodation. Would a native holding a certificate of exemption have to produce his certificate before the hotelkeeper would have to provide the accommodation?

The Minister for Native Affairs: He would have to prove that he was exempted from the Act.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: If a native qualified for exemption, why should he not qualify for citizenship rights? If an exemption is granted, I think the native should qualify for citizenship rights. What is the difference between the two? The Minister says there is some objection on the part of some natives to applying for exemption under the Native Administration Act? I cannot see that there is any difference.

I believe that in all the circumstances the Minister would be advised to retain Clause 50. Clause 49 still remains in the Bill, and it is still an offence for any person to provide a native with intoxicating liquor. The offence is regarded so seriously that a maximum penalty of £100, or 12 months' imprisonment, or both is provided; and the minimum penalty that can be imposed is a fine of £20. This is one of the few Acts in which a compulsory minimum fine is provided. The hotelkeepers who have seen me are very perturbed about this.

The Minister for Native Welfare: When did they see you?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Before they saw the Minister last week. They say this proposal will cause them considerable difficulty, and that Clause 49 will create an almost impossible position for them. I suggest to the Minister that for the present, at least, he give favourable consideration to the retention of Clause 50.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: When the Leader of the Opposition stressed his intention of moving the amendment which was in his name on the notice paper, I said I would support the amendment as being better than the proposal in the Bill to repeal Section 50, but that I intended to oppose the clause as amended, if his amendment were carried because I would prefer to see Section 50 remain as it is. The Minister's amendment has not caused me to change my mind. I will support his amendment because it is better than the repealed section, but when it comes to deciding whether the clause, as amended, is to be carried, I shall be in the same position of having to vote against it in order that Section 50 may remain in the Act.

The hon. gentleman made a considerable point about the provision in his amendment whereby a licensee is enabled to permit any native exempted from the provisions of the Act to enter and remain on licensed premises. He pointed out the difference between his amendment and that of the Leader of the Opposition, because of

those words. I can imagine circumstances in which there might not be any difference, because Section 72 does not limit the number of exemptions that can be granted, nor does it specify the conditions on which they shall be granted.

The Minister for Native Welfare: Yes.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I do not notice them. No conditions are laid down in the Act to guide the Minister's opinion. It is purely a question of the exercise of ministerial opinion. Therefore, the Minister, if he felt so disposed, could exempt the majority of natives in a particular district. I feel the position could well be left as it is. When speaking previously in this Chamber, I pointed out that the first duty of the Government and the people of the State was to endeavour to elevate the condition of the native by education and training of one kind and another to a level where he could, without any conflict with himself or his fellow-citizens, co-operate with them and be assimilated socially without any difficulty.

In the circumstances, I venture the suggestion that, because we have not in recent years taken any great steps in this direction, we will not reach that desirable state of affairs for another 10 or 15 years. It was not until comparatively recent times that any real effort was made to educate and elevate the native population, with the result that the majority of those who today are of adult years are unable to take their place in any modern community. In my opinion, it is only by getting hold of the younger generation and educating them that they will, in 10 or 15 years' time, be ready to be assimilated into our community. Because we did not take the right steps 25 or 50 years ago, we can wisely wait for the period I have mentioned.

Mr. BRADY: It is obvious that the Leader of the Opposition wanted to try to help natives, and on this occasion there is a greater spirit of co-operation in this regard. But probably the Minister's objective is the more laudable one. I think all members received a letter from the Licensed Victuallers' Association, and, in my opinion, it was intended to clinch the deal for ever and anon and exclude natives, who are exempted or otherwise, from getting the benefits of the amenities provided in an hotel.

We are desirous of doing something to help the natives and it would appear that somebody will have to be hurt whichever way we go about it. Over the years I think licensed victuallers have done fairly well. Over the same period people in the outlying districts of the Great Southern, Eastern Goldfields, northern districts, the North-West and, to a lesser extent, the metropolitan area, have done everything possible to assist the natives, but I have not heard of any licensed victualler putting himself out to help them. I did not hear of any licensed victualler doing anything to support the scheme to provide hostels in the metropolitan area to enable these people to have somewhere to stay while learning trades.

The Licensed Victuallers' Association wants to exclude natives from hotels; it does not matter how good they are or whether they are paragons of virtue. Yet a Chinaman, an Afghan, a Ceylonese or anyone else can go to a hotel and is not refused any of the amenities provided. There are some doubtful white men and women in the community but they are permitted to frequent hotels. Because our own people are black, they are excluded. As I said, somebody will have to be hurt and there is no one that can take it better than the licensed victuallers and those who frequent hotels in the country districts or metropolitan area. After all, those who stay at hotels remain there for only a couple of days and they would suffer little inconvenience, if it could be called an inconvenience. The natives at McDonald House and other such institutions are preparing themselves to take their places in the white community.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: As citizens?

Mr. BRADY: Yes.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: They can get citizenship rights.

Mr. BRADY: If a native boy from one of these institutions marries a native girl, why should not they be allowed to stay at a hotel at Albany or Bunbury in the same way as a Chinese couple or a low-class white couple? The station owner who wants to bring down his boy who has been around the house for years should be permitted the facilities of a hotel in the city. I strongly support the Minister's proviso.

Mr. RHATIGAN: I think the Minister has been most reasonable in his efforts to meet the desires of both sides. His amendment will merely legalise the position regarding an exempt native who wants accommodation at a hotel. At present there are doubts as to whether they are entitled to accommodation. I have received a letter from the Licensed Victuallers' Association and, in my opinion, its members do not understand the Native Administration Act. One of the hotelkeepers from my area told me that he is not a bit worried about it and there are many natives in his district who visit the hotels.

The granting of citizenship rights depends to a large extent on the outlook of the particular Minister. He may be lenient or he may take a strict view and it is possible for the Minister to withdraw exemptions. I know of cases where that

has been done. It is illegal for an exempted child to be brought down beyond the leprosy precaution line, and at present the Native Administration Act is one unholy mixup.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: I agree, but this will not help it.

Mr. RHATIGAN: The passing of the Bill will wipe a lot of it out and I support the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: I want to deal with two points raised by the Leader of the Opposition. Firstly, he asked why a native who would be entitled to a certificate of exemption is not entitled to a certificate of citizenship rights? Many natives will not apply for citizenship rights because they say they are not foreigners—they are not aliens.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: But they apply for permits.

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: They are Australian-born and they say "Why should we have to apply for a certificate?" That is their view and if I were in their position I would probably adopt the same attitude.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I doubt it.

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: Under the Native (Citizenship Rights) Act no person is eligible unless he or she has reached the age of 21 years. I have before me a file which deals with a young man about 18 years of age and, by virtue of his social habits and upbringing—he was one of the lads at McDonald House—he would, if he were of age, be eligible for citizenships rights. Now, if he goes to the country in the course of his employment, he cannot go into a hotel for a meal. It could be said "Why not issue him with a certificate of exemption?" That is one of the reasons why I am so anxious to have this proviso passed; it would give that lad the right to have a meal in a hotel and it would not be unreasonable for the publican to give him a bed and a meal. All that the proviso means is that it shall not be unlawful for the hotelkeeper to give such a person accommodation and meals if he so desires.

Let us consider the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition. He placed an amendment on the notice paper which would throw the hotel doors open to all and sundry. My amendment is more restrictive and clarifies the present Act.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: I do not think it does.

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: If the hon. member would utter his remarks later, I would be pleased. I asked the Leader of the Opposition when he met the hotelkeepers and he replied he did so when he was away in the country. I met the hotelkeepers on Friday last, and I invite any member to get in touch with the secretary or the president of the Licensed Victuallers' Association, or the representative of Kojonup, Katanning or Moora and inquire what their views are. I have the notes of the conference here. They put their case and I explained the position and the object of the amendment. They were quite happy and satisfied. That was last Friday afternoon.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: They certainly did not express that view to me. If they had changed their opinion, one would have thought they would have let one know.

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: They apparently met the Leader of the Opposition prior to Friday when I saw them. When I read the provisions of Section 50 of the Licensing Act which contains a different interpretation of the word "native" to that in the Native Administration Act, it was obvious that they were under the wrong impression because of their having read the abbreviated reports in the newspapers.

The Committee should agree to the amendment. It will not impose any further obligations on the publicans nor will it cause them hardship. It will permit the hotelkeeper to allow a native on his premises if he has obtained a certificate of exemption or a certificate of citizenship. Before he is able to obtain a certificate of exemption, a native must prove character and good habits. Let us give it a go for 12 months and if after that period we find it does not work, we can consider the matter again.

The other point raised was the difference between a person who holds an exemption certificate and one who holds a certificate of citizenship. The native who holds a certificate of citizenship is entitled to the same rights as any one of us here. A certificate of exemption does not give the native full citizenship rights. He cannot get past the provisions of the Electoral Act or certain provisions of the Licensing Act, and what is more, he is only exempt from the restrictions in the Native Administration Act. He cannot be ordered out of town by a justice of the peace at 5 o'clock or at sunset as a native can; he cannot be ordered from one district to another as a native can. It is hoped, however, to remove many of those restrictive provisions. I trust the Committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. ACKLAND: I oppose this amendment as much as I oppose the deletion of Section 50. It is one thing if a native is granted citizenship rights. This amendment is the thin end of the wedge, which will give all natives the right to enter hotels. It will be quickly followed by another amendment to the Act. Every hotelkeeper along the Midland line in the Moore electorate has asked that this matter be opposed.

Mr. Lawrence: How many of them are there?

Mr. ACKLAND: There are four of them.

Mr. Heal: Do you always take notice of what they say?

Mr. ACKLAND: I do in this case because it is entirely on all fours with my own views on how we should tackle the native problem. We should tackle the native problem properly.

Mr. Andrew: What is "properly"?

Mr. ACKLAND: In the case of those who are not fit to comply with the Act, I would take the children away from the parents at a very young age and bring them up as wards of the State, as is done now with white children. It would be the quickest and best way to absorb these people into the community. If natives are permitted to enter hotels, the travelling public will not frequent them.

I would not be very anxious to sleep in a bed, nor would I like somebody in whom I am interested to sleep in a bed, that had been slept in by a native. For the most part their habits are disgusting, the few exceptions being those who are entitled to citizenship rights. If we pass the amendment we will live to rue it. The position will become intolerable. It certainly will in Moora and Mogumber.

It has been said that the hotelkepers deserve no credit for the way in which they maintain their hotels. I agree with that because some of the hotels in the country districts could be improved considerably. If this amendment becomes law, the hotels will deteriorate in the country districts.

The Minister for Native Welfare: An exempted native can now go into licensed premises.

Mr. ACKLAND: I oppose the amendment as I would have the deletion of Section 50.

Hon. D. BRAND: The licensed victuallers' circular expresses the opinion that the standard of natives who would be permitted to demand accommodation at hotels would be such in certain cases as to create difficulty, and anyone who has lived in a country town where this problem exists and where there is only one hotel will appreciate that there would be a degree of anxiety on the part of the licensee if natives, apart from those with citizenship rights, were permitted to demand food and lodging. A letter on behalf of the commercial travellers is couched in similar terms. It points out that these men are earning their living by travelling from town to town and are concerned lest the standard of hotels be lowered if natives generally are permitted to demand accommodation.

A native possessing a certificate of exemption might demand accommodation although he might be well below the standard and if he obtained liquor, could create a real problem. I can appreciate the concern of commercial travellers that the standard of natives is not such that they should be admitted ad lib to hotels. I believe that the native problem will not be solved by giving these people entry to hotels because of their association with the liquor trade. Our desire to do something for the native might well be directed along other lines, as suggested by the Leader of the Country Party and others, in order as quickly as possible to improve his standard so that he may readily be accepted by the white population wherever he wishes to go. Therefore, I oppose the Minister's amendment.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: The Native Administration Act is an old statute, the drafting of which is not at all clear. Under that Act, any person with any native blood is defined as a native. The exception is any person who is a quadroon. Section 72 was inserted in the Act to enable the commissioner to say whether a native came within the exception or not. The Minister's proposal would empower the commissioner to say that, although a person was a native within the definition, he came within the exception. I do not think he has power to exempt such a person.

The legal opinion is that a doubt exists regarding the advisability of this amendment. The Minister has given us his interpretation of the amendment, but that is not correct. The second difficulty is that the amendment seeks to repeal a statute by implication. The statute book should not contain two Acts which have directly opposite provisions. The Minister's amendment makes it lawful for a licensee to allow a native to enter his premises.

The Minister for Native Welfare: I did not say that. If you read the whole amendment you will see the words "for the purpose of food and lodging."

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: The Licensing Act says that no licensee shall permit any native to remain or loiter on his premises. I know that one Act can, by implication, repeal another, but that is a very weak method to adopt. It is only adopted by courts as a last resort, and if they can apply both Acts they will do so. I do not know how any court can apply these two provisions in the Licensing Act and the Native Administration Act. In one instance licensees are permitted to allow natives to enter their premises, and in the other they will incur a penalty if they do so.

This amendment will cause a great deal of confusion if passed. I would ask the Minister to obtain an opinion from the Crown Law Department as to whether Section 72 gives the commissioner any authority other than to declare that a native under the definition is within the exemption. I would also like an opinion from the Crown Law Department regarding the difficulty of interpreting two statutes when

they contain absolutely conflicting provisions. It is much better to leave the Act as it is, and perhaps deal with it on some future occasion.

I admit that a weakness exists in the Native (Citizenship Rights) Act in that it does not provide for a native under 21 years of age to apply for exemption. The commissioner could apply because he is the legal guardian of every native under 21. In my view, he could apply on behalf of natives for citizenship rights. An amendment to the Native (Citizenship Rights) Act in this regard would receive my support, and it would have no difficulty in passing through this House without much debate. At present these difficulties exist—

(1) Which Act should the court follow?

(2) Should the court follow the Licensing Act or this amendment which is of more recent date?

(3) Does the amendment repeal the Licensing Act by implication?

(4) What privileges does a permit confer?

If it came to a conflict at law the courts would undoubtedly hold that natives exempted from the provisions of this Act are not those exempted under Section 72 of this Act, but those under the Native (Citizenship Rights) Act. That is the meaning of the Minister's amendment and it applies only to natives who are exempted under the Native (Citizenship Rights) Act. Section 72 could have no other meaning because anyone with even one drop of native blood in him is a native under the Act, except those exempted from the Act.

In my view it would have been better to allow the Bill to go through as originally suggested by the Minister. The only difficulty would then be that it would involve a penalty for a licensee who allowed a native on his premises, but it would not be an offence for a native to go on those premises. I propose to vote against the amendment because it will create difficulty and confusion.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: This amendment brings us face to face with a critical and controversial phase of the coloured problem. It is one that has been discussed at very great length in many countries and often very heatedly. We can discuss it here quite academically, much more so than in many other countries. The amendment will not help in solving the native problem. I know that the Minister does not intend that it should solve this problem altogether, but in no way can I see the amendment contributing to the welfare of natives. I am not so much impressed with the arguments, although excellent ones have been advanced from both sides of the Chamber, as with what could happen to the social problems of natives if this amendment were to become law.

I can envisage all sorts of social problems arising in which both white and coloured people might be deeply hurt. Were I thrown into the company of a native of unprepossessing habits, I would try desperately not to antagonise him and to avoid hurt on either side, but I do not know whether I would return to the hotel or not. The time will come when we will be willing to share our social life with the native, but that stage has not yet been reached and in the meantime I believe we must strive to educate the native race as well as ourselves. I oppose the amendment.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The amendment proposed by the Minister is more acceptable to me than that which I moved. I tried to protect the hotelkeeper and his employees. Clause 49 makes it an offence to supply a native with liquor and the Minister agreed that the hotelkeeper and his staff should not be placed in an invidious position.

A bar or lounge might be crowded and there might be present some natives who had citizenship rights and some who had not. The publican or his employees could then easily make the mistake of supplying liquor to a native who had not citizenship rights and would become liable to a penalty of up to £100 and imprisonment. My amendment would have provided that no native could enter a bar or hotel lounge but could enter hotel premises to obtain a meal or accommodation.

The Minister for Native Welfare: That applied to all natives.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes, and that is where the Minister's amendment is an improvement on mine. I was surprised to hear the Minister say that, as a result of his meeting with the hotel proprietors, they now agreed to the amendment.

The Minister for Native Welfare: They were quite happy about it.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I do not suggest that the Minister would say something he did not believe to be true, but in their discussion with me they were definitely opposed to the amendment.

The Premier: To which amendment?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Minister's. Members know it is not uncommon to have to share a room with another person at a country hotel. I have had the experience and on one occasion shared a room with a member of Parliament. For the greater part of the night I was attacked by mosquitoes and when they departed the member snored so loudly that I could still not sleep. The hotel proprietors were most concerned about the question of shared accommodation.

The Premier: The Minister's amendment would give the publican discretion.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I do not think it would.

The Premier: Read it.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I have done so. It would not overcome the difficulty. What if the publican refused a native accommodation because it would be shared accommodation?

The Premier: That would not be an illegal act. The amendment allows him the discretion.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I hope that is right. I do not think either the Leader of the Country Party or the member for Mt. Lawley could give the amendment the same interpretation as the Premier does, and I believe the publican would be committing an offence. I think a hotelkeeper would be committing an offence if he refused accommodation, even though it were shared accommodation.

Mr. May: How often do they refuse whites? Plenty of times.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Because they have no accommodation.

Mr. May: That is what they say. The licensee can use his own discretion.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I think he must provide accommodation if he has it. That was one of the points which hotelkeepers made to me. The Minister's amendment is more acceptable, but I believe he would be wise to retain Section 50 in the Act. The member for Mt. Lawley has raised a point to which I think the Minister should give some consideration. He says that the provisions of this Bill, if agreed to, will conflict with those of the Licensing Act, and he asked which Act would prevail. I do not know. I think if we accept the Minister's amendment it will make confusion worse confounded.

Mr. MANN: I do not intend to speak at length, but in my electorate there is a large population of half-castes. It is easy for people who do not live in country areas, where there are large populations of these unfortunate people, to say that we should do certain things. But these half-castes are gradually going back, and the main trouble is drink. What member of this Chamber would be prepared to share a room with some half-caste or native who had not washed for a month?

Mr. McCulloch: You would not share a room with some white men, either.

Mr. MANN: I agree, but let us keep to the point. I am not concerned for the hotelkeeper; I am concerned for the travelling public. People in the metropolitan area do not realise the position as we in the country do. The Minister has no idea. He has never lived in an area such as mine, although he may have lived up North.

The Premier: The Minister lived at Northam for years.

The Minister for Native Welfare: And at Narrogin. I travelled through Beverley and Nyabing as well.

Mr. MANN: The Minister's amendment will not solve the problem. There seems to be a weird idea that we can raise the standard of these people overnight. For hundreds of years our natives have led a nomadic life.

Mr. Andrew: The Minister did not say he would do that.

Mr. MANN: What does the hon. member know about the half-caste question? He, and many others, spoke to a similar measure last year when people were packed in the galleries. They did not know what they were talking about. I hope the Act will be left as it is. With the money that our half-castes are receiving today, they are indulging more and more in liquor.

Let the Minister feel his way before agreeing to a measure such as this. He has not been a Minister in charge of this department for long and he wants to raise the native population overnight to the same standard as our white people. It cannot be done in such a short time. Governments over the last 40 or 50 years are responsible for the native problem today. No attempt has been made over the years, and suddenly the Minister wants to lift them to the same standard as our white population.

How many half-castes with citizenship rights are anxious to go to hotels? They have their own camps and they would prefer to remain there. If this amendment is passed, a couple of half-castes will become boozed and will demand accommodation. The decent half-castes will not want this amendment to be agreed to. They do not want to stop at hotels because they will not stay in houses on farms at present. How long will they remain in their houses at York? Yet they were hand-picked.

The Minister for Native Welfare: That has nothing to do with the amendment.

Mr. MANN: It has everything to do with it. The only ones who will wish to go to hotels are those who will want to cause trouble.

Mr. Rhatigan: That is not right.

Mr. MANN: If the hon. member wants this amendment, let it apply only to those half-castes in the North. It would be criminal to allow this amendment to pass. I hope members will reject it.

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

Ayes	26
Noes	12
Majority for	14

Ayes.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Andrew	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Doney	Mr. Norton
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Heal	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hill	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Styants
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Watts
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Wild
Mr. Lawrence	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Ackland	Mr. Manning
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. North
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Owen
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Yates
Mr. Mann	Mr. Bovell

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	19
Majority for	1

Ayes.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Norton
Mr. Heal	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Styants
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Lawrence	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Abbott	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Brand	Mr. North
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Doney	Mr. Owen
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hill	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Yates
Mr. Mann	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Manning	

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Nulsen	Mr. Cornell
Mr. O'Brien	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Graham	Mr. Court
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Nimmo

Clause, as amended, thus passed.

Clauses 51 to 57—agreed to.

Clause 58—Section 61 amended:

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I move an amendment—

> That after the word "subsections" in line 14, page 20, the numeral and brackets "(1)" be inserted.

This clause proposes to strike out certain provisions in Section 61. That section relates to prosecutions against natives and the Bill proposes to provide that no plea of guilty shall be accepted from a native except with the approval of a protector. It does not propose to repeal Subsection (1) of Section 61, which reads—

> No admission of guilt or confession before trial shall be sought or obtained from any native charged or suspected of any offence punishable by death or imprisonment in the first instance. If any such admission or confession is obtained it shall not be admissible or received in evidence.

I will now quote what the Commissioner of Police said in his report regarding this provision. His remarks are as follows:—

> Four hundred and thirteen convictions were recorded against natives for receiving liquor or for drunkeness, including nine for being unlawfully on premises. One hundred and thirty eight convictions were recorded for supplying liquor to natives.
>
> Drunkenness is prevalent amongst natives and they resort to any means to obtain liquor. Native women are a menace about the streets of Perth at night, particularly in the summer months. They frequent the streets to a late hour soliciting for prostitution and they are abetted in this by male natives who are always on the lookout for the police and make detection of the offence extremely difficult.

He also said that white men often pick up native women and take them to parks and reserves, and pointed out that the general conduct of natives leaves much to be desired. He added, however, that it was very difficult to improve the position owing to the protection afforded to natives by Section 61, which does not appear to be justified when applied to educated natives.

That is the opinion of the Commissioner of Police, and we must admit that it is unbiased. He is charged with keeping law and order and when he says it is impossible to do so because of a particular provision in the Act, it is time that provision was repealed. Even with this provision, the native would receive reasonable protection because at law, if a confession is obtained by any inducement or threat, it cannot be produced in court.

On page 394 of vol. 9 of Halsbury's Laws of England, we find the following:—

> All statements relevant to the issue which are made by a party can be proved in evidence against the party who made them unless they are privileged from disclosure, subject to this exception, that admissions or confessions of guilt made by a defendant before his trial can only be proved against him if they were made freely and voluntarily i.e., without being induced by hopes held out or fear or threats caused or used by a person in authority.

> In giving evidence of such admissions or confessions, it lies upon the prosecution to prove affirmatively to the satisfaction of the judge who tries the case that such admissions were not induced by any promise of favour or advantage or by the use of fear or threats or pressure by a person in authority. . . . . .
>
> It is for the judge in each case to decide whether on the facts the confession is or is not admissable.

The judge takes into consideration the circumstances in which the confession is obtained and from whom it is obtained. He must judge the education of the accused, his intellectual capacity and his natural tendencies, and if he is of opinion that, having those aspects in view, there has been any inducement or threat, then he is not to allow the admission or confession to be used in evidence.

In the case of a bush native who makes a confession, the onus is on the prosecution to prove that there was no inducement and that the native was not influenced by fear. That would give a native full protection. As we know, natives are easily induced, and a judge would be aware of that. The prosecution would have to prove that nothing was said by the police constable or other person giving evidence that might lead to a native hoping for something which might have been an inducement. Why do we need this most difficult provision that is held to be extremely wide? The opinion of the Crown Law authorities is that the Criminal Court of Appeal in February, 1952, held that the words "admission of guilt or confession" as used in Section 61 (1) of the Native Administration Act are sufficiently wide to include any submission which is incriminating in a material particular and, that once a police officer investigated an offence punishable by death or imprisonment in the first instance, and there is suspicion that a native has committed such an offence, the police officer should cease from seeking from the native any statement on any material particular.

If a constable is suspicious that a native is guilty of an offence, he is not justified in questioning the native as to what he has been doing, where he has been, or anything else, and the Commissioner of Police says it is impossible for him to administer the law as it relates to natives. Surely, we should consider such a statement by the commissioner seriously!

Mr. May: Do not you think it should apply to whites in cases of consorting?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: They are just as bad.

Mr. May: They are worse.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I agree, but the whites can be successfully prosecuted.

Mr. Lawrence: If they were consorting with natives, would not the native be found guilty if the white was found guilty?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: No, because a native cannot be questioned.

Mr. Lawrence: Say the white is found with the native?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: If they were found in the actual commission of the offence, then, of course, he would be guilty. But people do not openly admit such offences. The police are hamstrung right and left. They cannot question a native about what he is doing or why he is there. That is what the Commissioner of Police says. My amendment will have the effect of repealing Section 61 (1).

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: In the last few years this matter has cropped up on two or three occasions. The member for Mt. Lawley, as Attorney General, introduced an amendment to repeal this subsection some years ago. I opposed it, as I do now. The Bill was defeated. Nothing has transpired since then to warrant a reversal of the decision of this Chamber. Section 61 (1) has been in operation for nearly 19 years.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: It has had a bad effect.

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: We must bear in mind the fact that there is a vast difference between the social status of the native on the one hand, and that of the member for Mt. Lawley on the other.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: The Bill proposes to repeal most of the restrictive provisions.

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: Those sections have not yet been repealed. Section 61 (1) was inserted to protect a native who might be charged with some heinous crime, and we ask that it remain in operation.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Did you see what the Commissioner of Police had to say?

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: I am dealing with this subsection on an ethical basis. The vast difference between natives and ordinary citizens is that whereas we are citizens of this country, they are not. The Commissioner of Police said that he could not do anything with educated natives who might be involved in offences. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned during the second reading that educated natives know as much about law as we do. If that is so, why are they not given the same citizenship rights?

After natives have received the same citizenship rights, then this subsection could be repealed until such time arrives

we should give them this meagre protection. A little while back the Chief Justice had this to say—

> It is abundantly clear from Section 61 that the legislature had in view the giving in full measure to natives, all the advantages which could be claimed by the ordinary citizen of the community whether the natives claimed those privileges to which ordinary citizens are entitled, or did not.

Natives in the metropolitan area who are involved in offences know what they are doing. They know the law and the police cannot get convictions. If they know so much about the law, are educated and live the way of the white people, why are they not given citizenship rights?

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Because, as the Commissioner for Police says, they do not behave.

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: In reading the newspapers we find that in cases where natives have been convicted for drunkenness, one man might have six convictions, so the actual number of offenders is considerably less than the number of convictions. I ask how many thousands of whites misbehave. The Committee should not agree to the amendment for the time being. If the position alters and there is an improvement in the status of natives, then attention should be directed to altering this subsection.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I know that for many years past the police have had difficulty in obtaining convictions. They may know that some person is guilty of supplying liquor, but they can do nothing. I am aware that there are whites who belong to a low class, who exploit the natives by purchasing liquor for them, and who charge an extortionate amount for this service. The police are also aware of this. The supplying of information by a native that he gave a white man a certain sum of money at a certain time to purchase liquor is of no value to the Police Department.

This Act first came into operation in 1905, nearly 50 years ago. The Minister said Section 61 (1) was inserted 18 years ago, but since then there has been a great change in the outlook of the natives. Many of them have been educated. Native children attend the State schools and mix with the whites.

Mr. May: Some of them went to the last war.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: They are working under the same conditions as the whites on public works projects and main roads. So I cannot follow the reasoning of the Minister that natives should still be given the protection of this subsection. I agree that it could apply to natives in the Kimberley or some outback districts. A native could rob a house or commit any other offence and be palpably guilty, but, unlike a white man in similar circumstances, a plea of guilty could not be accepted, even though he knew he was breaking the law. For years the police have complained of the extreme difficulty of obtaining convictions. I fail to see why we should retain the provision. A glance at the Bill shows that the Minister is proposing to delete section after section of the Act.

The Minister for Native Welfare: Because they are outmoded.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Nearly all of the Act is being repealed, and yet for some reason, the Minister says that this particular provision should remain. I do not agree that it inflicts any hardship on natives today, though years ago it could have had that effect. A native in the Kimberleys under pressure would make admissions of guilt when he was quite innocent.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: But they would not be accepted in a court.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: That is so. Nowadays the natives are just as well-informed as are white people with whom they are mixing and working. I consider that it would be in the interests of the natives to repeal the subsection.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	20
Majority against	1

Ayes.

Mr. Abbott	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Brand	Mr. North
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Doney	Mr. Owen
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hill	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Yates
Mr. Mann	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Manning	*(Teller.)*

Noes.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Norton
Mr. Heal	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Styants
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Lawrence	Mr. May
	(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Perkins	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. Thorn	Mr. Guthrie
Mr. Court	Mr. Graham
Mr. Nimmo	Mr. Hoar

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 59 to 62—agreed to.

Clause 63—Section 67 repealed:

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: This clause proposes to repeal Section 67 and I wish to repeal Section 66 also, which deals with the defrauding of a native by a trick. We are trying to clean up the Act and to bring the natives under the ordinary provisions of the law. This offence is dealt with under the Police Act and the Criminal Code, so why include it in this legislation? I move an amendment—

> That the word "section" in line 25, page 20, be struck out with a view to inserting the words "Sections sixty-six and" in lieu.

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: Will the hon. member be in order in moving for a repeal of Section 66?

The CHAIRMAN: He is in order in moving his amendment at this stage.

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: Then I am in agreement with the amendment, which will have the effect of repealing Section 66.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I move an amendment—

> That the words "Sections sixty-six and" be inserted in lieu of the word struck out.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I am not in favour of the repeal of Section 67—

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: The hon. member has risen on a point of order—

Hon. A. F. WATTS: No. I ask: Would I be in order if I moved to strike out the words "sixty-seven" after this amendment had been passed.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: Then I would ask leave to alter my amendment so that it will insert the words "section sixty-six."

Hon. A. F. Watts: I will still be in trouble.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: No, the hon. member could then move his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I think if the member for Mt. Lawley proceeds with his original amendment, that will overcome the difficulty.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I move an amendment—

> That the word "sixty-seven" in line 25, page 20, be struck out.

While the tribal existence of natives is probably confined now to portions of the State north of the twenty-sixth parallel or far to the east of the metropolitan area, there may be some natives still governed to a degree by tribal practices, and I therefore do not think it desirable that the Minister should be deprived of the right of taking such steps as he thinks necessary to minimise any injurious effect occasioned to natives by the existence of tribal practices.

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: This section is regarded as being out of date and the only places where it could operate would be localities where neither the Minister nor the commissioner nor his representatives could police it. I am advised that the position would be covered by other existing laws.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I have no doubt the Minister is right up to a point and that ordinary law would take notice of the result of injurious practices, but it would be like the position of a police officer who, knowing there is a bad relationship between a husband and wife, is unable to take action until the husband has done something to the wife, at which stage it is a little late. It may be that this provision could be used only on rare occassions, but I think the Minister should still have power to use preventive measures, and if this section is repealed he will not have that power. The retention of this section could harm no one and might conceivably and even probably do good to certain sections of the native population.

Mr. RHATIGAN: I do not think it makes a great deal of difference whether the section is retained or not, but I am inclined to agree with the member for Stirling that no harm would be done if it were retained. It would probably be of benefit to the bush natives who are out in the ranges, but there are not many of them who are not in contact with some form of civilisation.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to, with consequential alterations.

Clause 64—agreed to.

Clause 65—Section 69 amended:

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: This deals with the authority of the Governor to make regulations, and among others, appears the following:—

> Regulating the payment of wages payable to natives under agreements.

As the Act now stands, it regulates the conditions of wages under which a native may be employed and a person cannot employ a native without a permit. Natives will come under the provisions of the Arbitration Act where necessary and I do not think we need two authorities dealing with wages. As a matter of fact, I think it might cause difficulties because are the provisions of the Arbitration Act to be overridden by regulations made by the commissioner? The Arbitration Court may prescribe a certain set of wages and the commissioner says, "So far as natives are concerned, no. I will prescribe the conditions."

The Minister said that there are many natives who are not subject to the Arbitration Act because of the nature of their

employment, but I do not think the authority is necessary. If a native is employed he can make his own arrangements and I do not think the commissioner should have the authority with the Arbitration Court to make regulations governing conditions relating to natives. Therefore, I move an amendment—

> That after line 8, page 21, a new paragraph be inserted as follows:—
> "(b) repealing paragraph (h)."

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE: This would apply particularly to natives who were employed under permits and agreements, and the committee has repealed that section of the present Act. I suggest it would have application more particularly in the Kimberleys and there is no Federal award covering the cattle country. In the pastoral areas the Federal pastoral award operates, but it does not have any jurisdiction over full-bloods. All others would be entitled to the station hands award wages, and it is incumbent upon the particular employee under the Federal law to be a member of the union. I know it is difficult to regulate and police wages for full-bloods and female labour on some of the stations in the outback areas.

Some time ago the Commissioner of Native Affairs had discussions with the Pastoralists' Association to try to get some minimum standard observed by people in the pastoral areas and I think that in the near future there may be need for a further approach. On the public works and general labour side and in the shearing industry in the Great Southern areas, the people concerned are able to look after themselves and they get the agreement rates of pay. I do not propose to raise any objection to the amendment.

Mr. RHATIGAN: I think the member for Mt. Lawley is under a misapprehension. There is power under the agreement to regulate wages, but there is no power under permits. There are different books involved. I was once an officer of the Department of Native Affairs and, to the best of my knowledge, according to a Crown Law ruling, it is only under agreement with the commissioner that an employer can stipulate the amount to be paid to a native. The commissioner has no power to compel any wage to be paid to a native under the permit system but, as I have said, he can do so under agreement. Following a meeting between the Pastoralists' Association and the Commissioner of Native Affairs in 1950, it was agreed that the rate for stockboys should be £2 a month and 10s. for ordinary chaps who knock around the station, plus food, clothing, etc. Of course, since that time, the wage has been increased. I am speaking of full-bloods and not half-castes. I am not advocating any increase in wages for the ordinary full-blood natives on stations. Provided they are adequately clothed and are given a few shillings to spend in town, they are quite happy.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: Perhaps the Minister can help me here. The clause proposes to strike out the words "by natives, whether in a native institution or elsewhere," and the regulating power in Section 69 would then read as follows:—

> Providing for contributions to a fund for the general welfare and relief of natives .....

and so on. I do not know who is to make these contributions.

The Minister for Native Welfare: They willl be entirely voluntary.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: That is provided under the regulations to be made. What I suggest is to strike out the words "providing for contributions," and I then propose to alter the word "to" to "regulating." It would then read, "regulating a fund for the general welfare of natives." Therefore, I move an amendment—

> That after the word "words" in line 9, page 21, the words "providing for contributions" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I move an amendment—

> That after paragraph (b) a new subparagraph be inserted as follows:—
> (cc) substituting for the word "to" the word "regulating."

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 66 and 67, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 10.38 p.m.