

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 10th November, 1948.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Questions : Railway bus services, as to modification, cost, etc., of Cheetahs	2257
Water supplies, as to shortage at Brookton	2257
Bills : McNess Housing Trust Act Amendment (No. 2), 3r., passed	2258
Poultry Industry (Trust Fund), 3r., passed	2258
Justices Act Amendment, 3r., passed	2258
Western Australian Government Tramways and Ferries, 2r.	2258
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment, 2r.	2259
Stipendiary Magistrates Act Amendment, 2r., Com., (Council's requested Amendment)	2263
Western Australian Marine, 2r., Com.	2264
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, Com.	2267
Points of order	2272, 2274
Dissent from Chairman's ruling	2286

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

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAY BUS SERVICES.

As to Modification, Cost, etc., of Cheetahs.

Hon. A. L. LOTON (for Hon. H. L. Roche) asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) Is it a fact that one of the Cheetah or Landliner type road buses purchased by the Government last year has been extensively modified or remodelled by the Railway Department?

(2) Has this modification completely altered the design so that the vehicle is now similar to the semi-trailer vehicles operating in Perth, and have the two Ford engines been removed and a diesel engine unit fitted?

(3) Is it a fact that the other two vehicles of this type are to be similarly modified?

(4) Is it a fact that two of these vehicles originally cost the W.A.G.R. £5,454 each new ex works, Melbourne, and the other, a used vehicle, cost £4,350 delivered in Perth?

(5) Is it a fact that the modification referred to above will cost £4,000 for each vehicle?

(6) Is it a fact that owing to the high initial cost of these vehicles, the Government considered they should be put into service despite the adverse report of the Select Committee presented on the 2nd December, 1947?

(7) If the Government considered these vehicles safe enough for passenger transport in December, 1947, why is it now spending £4,000 per vehicle to modify them?

(8) Did the Government agree with suggestion (3) of the Select Committee "that an authority representative of the State departments primarily concerned with road transport and the Treasury be created to effect all purchases of vehicles"?

(9) If not, why not?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(1) Yes, and seating capacity increased by 14 per cent.

(2) Yes.

(3) Yes.

(4) Yes.

(5) Substantially correct.

(6) No.

(7) To comply with licensing requirements and to lessen running costs.

(8) and (9) No, because the present practice is for such purchases to be recommended to the Treasurer by the Minister concerned, acting on the advice of his technical officers, and finally determined by the Treasurer.

WATER SUPPLIES.

As to Shortage at Brookton.

Hon. A. L. LOTON asked the Chief Secretary:

In view of the acute shortage of water supplies in the township of Brookton both for domestic and railway use, will the Minister order an immediate investigation into the possibility of utilising the large quantities of potable water running to waste on A. Edwards's property and also inquire into other sources of water supply in the same area?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

The department has already made a preliminary investigation regarding the possibility of using water from Mr. Edwards's property to supplement the Brookton sup-

ply. If Mr. Edwards agrees, a supplementary cartage supply for Brookton will be arranged, if required. Equipment for this purpose has already been assembled.

BILLS (3)—THIRD READING.

- 1, McNess Housing Trust Act Amendment (No. 2).
- 2, Poultry Industry (Trust Fund).
- 3, Justices Act Amendment.

Passed.

BILL—WESTERN AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT TRAMWAYS AND FERRIES.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.42] in moving the second reading said: This Bill differs very slightly from a similar measure introduced last session. Members will recall that the main reason the previous Bill was defeated was that a Royal Commission was then inquiring into the railways, and it was apparently thought better to wait till the Royal Commission had finished its sittings, although no inquiry was being made into the tramways. At present, the Commissioner of Railways is in charge not only of the railways but also of the tramways and ferries.

The railway system extends throughout the State but the trams and ferries are confined to the city of Perth and its environs. It has, therefore, been deemed advisable that the trams and the ferries should be run by a separate organisation. It is, however, intended that both the Railway Department and the Tramway Department shall be brought under the State Transport Co-ordination Act, and in due course a Bill will be presented in this House to give effect to that desire. The Bill I am now submitting to the House provides for the setting up of a separate management for the tramways and ferries. It will not have any authority over private transport services, which are now, and will continue to be, subject to the direction of the Transport Board.

Under the existing law the Commissioner of Railways has been able to extend bus, tram and trolleybus services without obtaining the authority of the Minister or of

Parliament; and there has been a good deal of discussion as to the reason for a certain amount of overlapping that has occurred. Under the proposed arrangement there will be a separate management for the tramways, and that management will be subject to the Minister. There has been considerable duplication of services, and it is hoped to introduce an amending Bill, the effect of which will be to place all transport under the Transport Board, which will not, however, be increased in size. The railways will be controlled in the manner set out in another measure which is before the House.

The metropolitan passenger transport system has been allowed to drift into a bad state. I am not blaming anyone for that, but am simply stating a fact. Our trams are out of date. They are slow and most inconvenient to board. Another factor which slows them down tremendously is that there are only 17 miles of double track as against 18 miles of single track. Members can appreciate how slow the tramway service is, and it is necessary to keep it up to date for the convenience of the public. The standard must be raised. Trams and trolleybuses are very expensive. It is estimated that to undertake reconstruction, an expenditure of £510,000 would be required for the tracks. On maintenance during 1947 the sum of £40,000 was expended.

To replace our present trams with those of a modern type would involve an expenditure of approximately £7,500 per car. The cost of overhauling a tram recently was £420. So members will readily realise the cost which the tramway system is to the State, owing to the condition into which the tracks and the vehicles have been allowed to drift. The only difference between this measure and the Bill brought down last year is the provision for placing the tramway system under a general manager. Members will notice that in the Bill the general manager is made a corporation sole, and so is the Minister. Because of legal difficulties, it is necessary to have certain entities with power to sue and be sued.

Last year's Bill provided for the appointment of three commissioners, but that is not deemed necessary now, and there is to be only a general manager, who will, however, have no control over private transport systems of any sort. Although

lengthy, this Bill, on examination, will be found to be practically word for word with that brought down last year, though, of course, there are alterations in some places. One provision of the measure that will have to be amended either here or in another place is that which has reference to the Navigation Act and other statutes, because there is now proposed a Marine Act which will repeal those earlier statutes, and it will be necessary for that measure to be on the statute book first. Penalties are provided in this Bill for certain offences.

Perhaps the most important provision is that the accounts are to be placed under the Auditor General instead of being left, as at present, under the Railway Department. On many occasions I have been asked questions in this House, but have been unable to give satisfactory replies because the accounts have not been kept, as one would expect, in such a form as to enable one to find out what each particular service costs and earns. Provision is made for a general running audit, and, as I have pointed out, the Auditor General will have charge of the accounts. The Bill is undoubtedly an improvement on the existing legislation and, when it becomes an Act, we should obtain a far better service from our tramways than is possible at present. It will enable a man with the right temperament and knowledge to run the tramways, specialising in that work only. When this legislation takes its place on the statute book, there should be a vast improvement in our tramways transport system. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. E. H. Gray, debate adjourned.

BILL—MOTOR VEHICLE (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. L. A. LOGAN (Central) [4.53]: Actually, this Bill originated in 1940, but lately the Gnowangerup Road Board got busy and circularised the majority of the other road boards in the State. Most of them were in favour of some method of simplifying the present system of taking out third-party insurance on motor vehicles.

In its wisdom, the Government has worked out a plan which I think should achieve that result. Previously it was necessary to have a receipt showing that one had taken out third-party insurance before the vehicle could be licensed. If that receipt was inadvertently left at home, one could not license the car with a road board, and that often caused inconvenience.

There seems to be some controversy as to the amount of extra work this measure will impose on road boards and municipalities, but I feel that it will make it easier for all concerned. All that will take place under the measure is that, when wishing to license a motor vehicle, the owner will take out third-party insurance, together with the license. Both will be on the one form and the only extra work entailed will be the filling in of two extra lines on that form. Each month the road board concerned will forward to the pool a cheque for the receipts, together with a list of names of those who have licensed their vehicles.

Hon. G. Bennetts: It will mean more work for the clerks.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The only extra work entailed will be the sending in, once a month, of a list of those who have licensed their vehicles, together with a cheque for the premium receipts. There will be no trouble attached to the road board banking any extra money it receives for the insurance, as it already has to bank its own receipts.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: But they will have to send out these lists and cheques each month.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: A road board will have to send in a cheque and a list once a month, but that should be quite easy. This measure has been sought by the local authorities, and I see no reason why objection should be raised to it. If I thought it would entail extra work for road board secretaries, I would agree that they should receive some remuneration for that added burden, because I know from experience how much more work was placed on such men during the war years. I do not think this measure will place any additional work on them. I was not present when the Minister made his second reading speech, but I fail to see how the implementation of this legis-

lation will make the lot of road board officials any harder. I support the second reading.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [4.57]: It is due to us to give credit to the originators of the idea to be implemented by this Bill. The Minister in another place mentioned Mr. Thomson as having brought this scheme forward eight years ago in this Chamber. As the result of his suggestion at that time, a Select Committee was appointed and eventually brought down its report, but unfortunately the war intervened and prevented any action being taken along the lines recommended. The Gnowangerup Road Board is in Mr. Thomson's territory and he must have explained his ideas fully to that board, which is close to his own headquarters. That road board got busy and, with the support of about 50 other local authorities, persuaded the Government to introduce this measure.

The provisions of the Bill will be of great assistance to all concerned with the third-party insurance of motorcars and other motor vehicles. I do not agree that local authorities should be given any remuneration for receiving premiums from their ratepayers. Mr. Thomson pointed out that the new method would cost nothing extra if done through the local authorities and the Police Department. People are apt to forget that local government is a part of our system of government, and that it has responsibilities and duties to perform. The licensing of motor vehicles and the collecting of license fees by road boards give them large sums of money with which to construct roads and so on for the convenience of the ratepayers. The third-party insurance legislation protects the ratepayers themselves, and I am sure that this measure will give assistance and protection to the ratepayers of every local authority in the State. Therefore, by assisting to cheapen the premiums under third-party insurance, they are actually helping one another.

The suggestion that a five per cent. commission be granted is ridiculous. I do not consider the local authorities are entitled to any commission because the whole business is for the purpose of assisting their own people. The only persons who will receive benefits will be the ratepayers and the residents of a particular district. Any

attempt to provide commission, thus increasing the cost of the administration of this form of insurance, will nullify the saving that will accrue from the new method and the formation of a trust fund. I would like members to consider that point. It would be a mistake and wrong in principle to pass an amendment to give commission to the local authorities.

The Gnowangerup Road Board and other local authorities should be well satisfied because the Government has agreed to their request to introduce this legislation. We should therefore pass the Bill as it is and not consider any form of commission; but if it is considered, it should be very small and not more than two per cent. The legislation is a step forward and will be of great assistance to everybody concerned.

HON. W. B. HALL (North-East) [5.2]: I support the Bill but not in its entirety. The measure is a good one, but I am afraid that I cannot altogether agree with the remarks of Mr. Gray regarding the payment as commission of a percentage of the money which would be received by various local authorities by way of third party insurance payments. There are 127 road boards and 12 municipal councils in Western Australia.

Some of those road boards are very small and have little revenue. However, with a road board such as Kalgoorlie Road Board, which has a revenue of approximately £8,000 a year obtained from the licensing of motor vehicles, this legislation will place a heavy burden on the board's office staff. I well remember the extra work involved when the war damage insurance administration was imposed upon road boards. Much work was entailed in making inquiries and so forth in connection with that particular form of insurance.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You cannot compare that with this legislation.

Hon. W. B. HALL: I can explain that to the hon. member later on. Although this legislation will add a great deal of work to that now performed by the office staff of my board, I still agree with it. Five per cent. is not a great amount, but it will compensate the boards to a certain extent for the extra work entailed. Actually, the work of the road boards can be taken collectively because quite often an amount re-

ceived by one road board from a person wishing to license his vehicle should rightly be received by another local authority. Therefore, it will be seen that each local authority will be assisting the other in the

Mention was made by Mr. Logan of the fact that by a person taking out his insurance policy at the same time as he licenses his vehicle, it would mean only a couple of additional lines on the traffic license or certificate. I hope that is correct because it will simplify the work of the office staffs of the various local authorities. At present it is necessary to fill in two separate documents, one to be kept by the owner of the vehicle and the other to be retained by the road board. If the Bill is passed, so far as the Kalgoorlie board is concerned, it will mean the employment of another person to cope with the extra work. Again, unnecessary work is placed upon road boards by the Public Works Department issuing only one licensing book.

Members fully realise the queuing-up that occurs at the offices of small local authorities in whose districts the issuing of licenses is not staggered. Such a position is emphasised with a large concern such as the Kalgoorlie Road Board. At the moment the position is that people have to stand outside the office because everyone must wait until all the matters concerning the Traffic Act and so forth are written out on the prescribed form. If all this information is placed on the one form it will not mean much extra work for the local authorities, and the vehicle owners will be more satisfied. However, if there are not two or three licensing books issued to the road boards for the purpose of handling a licensing revenue of approximately £8,000 or £10,000, it will mean a lot of work.

Hon. G. Bennetts: The form will have to be made out in duplicate instead of in triplicate.

Hon. W. R. HALL: That is done now. It means only another carbon copy. Under the Act any person can take out a license each quarter of the year and every time a vehicle is licensed a new certificate must be issued, which makes a lot of work.

Hon. L. A. Logan: It is all on the one piece of paper.

Hon. W. R. HALL: Yes, but the information required has to be written out each time. The Public Works Department is not simplifying the procedure for the issuing of licenses as the Traffic Department does in the metropolitan area. That department sends out a notice regarding the license fee a month or two before it is due, but that does not apply to local authorities.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It ought to.

Hon. W. R. HALL: Yes, and then there would be very little entailed. The work could then be done in advance instead of retrospectively. It means a lot to local authorities when a person can license his car each quarter for an extra cost of 1s. or whatever the fee may be. If we could do the same as the Traffic Department in Perth and issue the license ahead, each person would receive his license within a reasonable time and there would be no carry-over.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Has the Public Works Department ever been requested to allow you to do that?

Hon. W. R. HALL: If it has not, it knows the position full well. From time to time I have pointed out that one book on the counter of an office of a local authority is not sufficient. The position today is that vehicle owners in the country have to wait hours for their licenses whilst in Francis-street they are easily handled because the licenses are staggered. That principle should be adopted by local authorities and thus labour and cost would be saved.

By the pooling of insurance I think the Bill will mean a saving in administration costs. Recently the Kalgoorlie Road Board received quite a substantial rebate of about £30 or £40 as a result of the reduction in the number of insurance claims being made on the State Insurance Office during the last period. I had the honour of sitting with Mr. Fraser and Mr. Thomson on the Select Committee inquiring into third-party insurance and I know the feeling of the members of that committee. I am pleased to see that its efforts have borne fruit at last. The various Governments of the day and members of both Houses, however, gave little consideration to the report of the committee at that particular period.

For the information of Mr. Logan and other members, I can say it is true that the

State Housing Commission has foisted a great deal of extra work on local authorities. We now find that that commission sends out its inquiries to the local authorities on the Goldfields regarding applications which are made by the ratepayers in the various districts. That necessitates the secretary, who is the chief executive officer of the local authority concerned, going round the district making inquiries to ascertain whether the information stated on the application is in order and then making a report to the State Housing Commission. The local authorities receive no payment for that work and I am not happy about it.

Hon. H. Tuckey: That is only one of many.

Hon. W. R. HALL: If the authorities in Perth can get the local authorities to do anything for nothing, they will do it. The Bill will save a number of people a great deal of money and it will mean a saving for local authorities. Many road boards throughout the State that handle a revenue of only about £2,000 or £3,000 a year employ an inspector who is the traffic inspector and every other kind of inspector. Even today I am inclined to think that the secretaries of road boards are saddled with too much work. Many municipal councils also have a larger turnover in traffic license fees and will have extra work to do. Nevertheless, I am pleased the Bill has been brought down and I hope it will be passed. Even if an amendment is carried in Committee dealing with the percentage to be received by local authorities, I will still be in favour of the Bill because it is long overdue.

HON. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM (South) [5.15]: I wholeheartedly support the Bill, but I join with other members who do not subscribe to the opinion that no extra work or cost will be thrown upon local governing bodies if this proposal is adopted. The suggestion has been made that it will mean only an extra line, or perhaps two, on the existing form, in addition to a transfer periodically of the amounts paid to the local governing bodies.

The procedure is not quite as simple as those words would lead one to believe. This so-called one line each year, as has been pointed out by Mr. Hall, will in country districts involve the issuing of four separate

certificates. In my opinion, the Bill does not go far enough. Each time a payment is made a receipt is given, and I believe it is within the bounds of possibility that the number on the foil in the license book could be transferred to the quarterly receipt. That would constitute a satisfactory coverage for the person making the payment.

Whether this suggestion could be embodied in the Bill I do not know, but I cannot see any objection to it, and it would avoid making out a bill each time. I do not think I am making a misleading statement when I say that in country areas at least 50 per cent. of car-owners would license their vehicles half-yearly and that probably the other half would take out quarterly licenses, especially as petrol is now so scarce and they do not know whether there might not be another cut at the end of the year. They would not wish to license a vehicle which they could not use. With regard to the commission to be paid to the local governing bodies, I think the proposed figure of five per cent. is reasonable. Insurance companies invariably pay their agents a commission.

Hon. H. Hearn: The Taxation Commissioner does not pay us any commission.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I am not dealing with that point, but with the suggested five per cent. to be paid to the local governing bodies. If insurance companies pay their agents a commission, surely it is not too far from the truth to say that the local governing bodies will be the agents of this fund and ought to be entitled to some remuneration for the work which they will do. I point out that the Kalgoorlie Road Board, for the year 1947, collected premiums to the extent of £1,730. That is a considerable sum of money.

Hon. G. Bennetts: Do you mean the Kalgoorlie Road Board?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: No, the Kalgoorlie municipality.

The Chief Secretary: Did you refer to premiums on insurance policies?

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

Hon. W. R. Hall: You mentioned the Kalgoorlie Road Board.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: If I said that, I am sorry. I meant to refer to the Kalgoorlie Municipal Council.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I think there is some misunderstanding about the Bill.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: It was my intention to move to adjourn the debate. I had risen in my seat and noticed that the Chief Secretary had also risen. I wish to adjourn the debate until next Tuesday.

The Chief Secretary: Why next Tuesday?

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: Well, until the next sitting of the House.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If I may be permitted to say so, Mr. President, we have much business before us and shall be getting many more Bills shortly. This measure is really very simple. I do not wish to object to the adjournment, but I am afraid I must vote against such a motion.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: I must persist. I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion (adjournment) put and passed.

BILL—STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Order of the Day read for the resumption from the previous day of the debate on the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. G. Fraser in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 3:

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: During the second reading debate I indicated that there was a certain amount of dissatisfaction on the part of the five magistrates who are affected by this measure. They felt aggrieved that they, of all the people who receive their salaries under an Act of Parliament, will not benefit by the increase as from the 15th October, 1947, which was the date on which the salaries of the other persons to whom I have referred were increased.

Hon. W. R. Hall: Who are the five stipendiary magistrates?

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: I cannot tell the hon. member their names. Perhaps the Chief Secretary can.

The Chief Secretary: The one at Kalgoorlie is not affected.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: I am speaking for the group.

Hon. W. R. Hall: Collectively?

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: Yes.

Hon. W. R. Hall: I would like to see them get the increase retrospectively.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: I am glad to hear the hon. member make that remark. We cannot, under the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, move to amend the Bill. The only method to achieve the end I desire is to move that the Legislative Assembly be requested to amend the Bill. Accordingly I move—

That the Legislative Assembly be requested to amend the clause by adding at the end, the following words:—"That the increase of the annual salary payable as aforesaid shall operate as from the 15th October, 1947."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Before the increases were fixed, there was a consultation with the Public Service Commissioner. These stipendiary magistrates do not come under the Public Service Act, but he was consulted and the salaries fixed as set out in the Bill. The Treasurer decided that the increase should take effect, in the ordinary way, when the Bill is passed.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Were the salaries of the police magistrates increased?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes. The stipendiary magistrates are in a special class of their own; they need not retire until they attain the age of 70 years, whereas the police and other magistrates must retire at 65 years. The latter come under the Public Service Act and have received their increments under that Act. The salary range of the stipendiary magistrates is fixed by Parliament. Mr. Dimmitt's suggestion was mentioned to the Premier, who is not in agreement with it. The matter has been given every consideration by the Government and I must oppose the request.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: I do not wish to labour the point. The question we have to answer is simple. These five stipendiary magistrates, together with the judges, the Public Service Commissioner, and I think the Under Treasurer, as well as members of Parliament, all received an increase in salary on the 15th October, 1947. The stipendiary magistrates were the only officers

of those I mentioned who did not. I have nothing further to add.

Motion put and passed, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly requesting that the amendment be made, leave being given to sit again on receipt of a message from the Assembly.

BILL—WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MARINE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 3rd November.

HON. H. A. C. DAFFEN (Central) [5.32]: The Government is to be commended on its effort to consolidate this measure, because action in that direction is somewhat overdue. Living in a seaport town, as I do, I often hear comments on this subject, and particularly about the office of the administrative head. Having this point in mind, I looked through the Bill to see how it was treated, but found no direct mention of it. That is why I asked the Chief Secretary four questions at the last sitting. I wanted to see how this point was covered and to find out the Government's intentions regarding it. I was not reassured by his replies. Complaints have previously been expressed in this Chamber that meagre and evasive answers are given to questions, and I regard the replies given to me as good examples of evasions. The first question I asked was—

Is the Director of Navigation under the Commonwealth Navigation Act, 1912-1942, a qualified master mariner?

The answer was, "Yes," which was quite satisfactory. My second question was—

Is the present administrator of the Harbour and Light Department under the Western Australian Act, 1904, a qualified master mariner?

The answer to this question was in the negative, which also was satisfactory. My third question was—

Are the administrators of similar Acts in other States master mariners?

In reply I was informed that the information was not available.

The Chief Secretary: What do you suggest is evasive about that?

Hon. H. A. C. DAFFEN: The Chief Secretary cannot convince me that the department took much trouble to find out the answer.

The Chief Secretary: There was not much time. You asked the question one night and I had to answer it the next day.

Hon. H. A. C. DAFFEN: I would have been prepared to have the answer deferred. When I tell the Chief Secretary that the other States have master mariners in charge of the administration of their departments, equivalent to our Harbour and Light Department, perhaps he will have the matter checked and included in his reply. During the week-end, I made inquiries, without the facilities the Chief Secretary has, and I found that to be the position. My fourth question was—

Is it the intention of the Government that the Bill now before the Legislative Council viz., the Western Australian Marine Bill, 1948, is to be administered by a master mariner?

His reply, which was most evasive, was—

Clause 9 of the Bill before the House provides that the department shall administer the Act, subject to the control of the Minister, and Clause 14 provides for appointment of officials.

I asked that question because, on looking through the Bill, I realised there was only a bare reference to administration. It provides that the Minister is to administer the Act. Who, under the Minister, is to administer the department, and what are to be his qualifications? My question was direct enough, and I would like to know why the Chief Secretary accepted that answer from the department. I did not accept his reply as I already knew what was in the Bill in this connection. His answer told me, and incidentally, the House, nothing.

When we come to the Committee stage I intend to move an amendment to provide that a master mariner shall administer this department, as is the position in the Commonwealth and all the other States. It is a proper principle that a master mariner should deal with captains and senior officers on an equal footing. Non-technical men have no standing with technical men. Doctors, for instance, would not accept the medical testimony of anyone but a qualified medical practitioner; and engineers would not consider an opinion, on engineering matters, unless it were given by an engineer. Therefore, why should those transacting business with our departmental heads have to deal with men with lesser degrees and qualifications?

Suppose the Admiralty called for a report on Wyndham, Exmouth Gulf or Jurien Bay, the present occupant of the position, or anybody with his qualifications or lack of them occupying it in the future, could not supply the report over his own signature. Whilst the present occupant has been able to discharge his duties with credit to himself—as I believe he has—as much might not be able to be said for his successor, whoever he might be. This personal control is all right, as far as it goes, but we had an instance of it recently when the Bill dealing with the distribution of tractors was before us. I feel sure that measure went through mainly on the strength of the very good job done by the administrator, Mr. Linton, while in charge of the department. Unfortunately he died a few days later and left the burden of the job to his successor who, we hope, will be able to fill it in the same able manner. But this matter of relying on the personal equation is very foolish. I believe the present departmental head is doing a good job, but I am convinced the position is one that should be held by a master mariner, and in the Committee stage I intend to move in that direction.

HON. SIR CHARLES LATHAM (East) [5.38]: I have read the Bill thoroughly, but not being a seafaring man I am afraid I will not be able to render much help to the debate. As far as I can see, the proposal is to consolidate two Acts, namely, the Navigation Act, 1904, and the Boat Licensing Act, 1878, and the amendments made to each of those Acts. I listened to the speech made by Mr. Daffen, but really I suppose there would be few actions of any sort taken under the State legislation, because the Commonwealth controls most of the shipping. Our State Act deals only with shipping between the ports of Western Australia.

The Chief Secretary: And the railways control the big ports.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Yes, Geraldton, Albany—

The Chief Secretary: And Fremantle.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Not Fremantle. I thought the Fremantle Harbour Trust controlled that port.

The Chief Secretary: It does, subject to the Minister for Railways. There is a harbour master at Fremantle.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Yes, but the harbour master will not have a say under this measure.

The Chief Secretary: None whatever.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I think if action had to be taken, it would be taken principally under the Commonwealth Act or the Imperial Act, and those officers would determine what should be done. They can delegate their powers to a State officer, but they would do so only to a skilled man. I wonder whether there is any necessity, apart from the latter portion of the Bill, for any State law. There may be some reason, but not many actions have been taken under it. We do take action under our harbour-control legislation.

The Chief Secretary: The measure is necessary, but barely so.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I think that even if we did not have it, we would still have control under the existing Commonwealth and Imperial laws. I have read the Bill through, and it contains only one little mistake that I could find—a typographical error. I propose to support the second reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban—in reply) [5.43]: I was surprised to hear Mr. Daffen's remarks, because the answers given to his questions comprised all the information available. Unfortunately, at the moment the officer in charge of the Harbour and Light Department is in the Eastern States. I got the best information I could, and it was absolutely correct. I have from time to time told members, if they desire information beyond what is given in answer to their questions, to come to my office and I will get it for them if it is available. I would have done this for Mr. Daffen had he expressed a desire for further information. I do not know that what happens in another State affects us, or whether there are harbour masters elsewhere. We have harbour masters who are civil servants and come under the Harbour and Light Department. They are stationed at Geraldton, Bunbury and Albany.

The harbour master at Fremantle is under the control of the Fremantle Harbour Trust which, in turn, comes under the Minister for Railways. Wherever a port is connected to a railway, the Minister for Railways is in

charge of it. The whole question of whether the present administration is good or not is under consideration. As I pointed out, a Bill was drawn before the present Government came into power and that was done at the request of the harbour and light authorities. There is a rather peculiar departure here, in that this legislation is to be administered by a department and not by a harbour master. The department will select and appoint the officers. Where necessary, a harbour master will be appointed. A lot of the work under the measure will be connected with matters that do not concern a harbour master, such as river craft, collection of harbour dues, jetty dues, repairs to jetties—

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Safety in navigation.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes, and wharfage dues in North-West ports, lights, and so on. As Sir Charles Latham has said the Bill hardly seems necessary in view of the Commonwealth Navigation Act and the Merchant Shipping Act but it deals with intrastate shipping because the States still have the right to control shipping or boating—if I may put it that way—on their rivers. At the end there is power to take certain action even with small pleasure craft. The Bill is simply a consolidation measure and brings the law up to date. I do not think there can be any real objection to it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 13—agreed to.

Clause 14—Appointment of officials:

Hon. H. A. C. DAFFEN: I move an amendment—

That at the end of Subclause (1) the following words be added: "including the departmental manager who shall be a master mariner."

In replying to my statements on the second reading, the Minister said that he could not understand the reason why I mentioned the Harbour and Light Departments in the other States. It was done in order to make a comparison, especially as they work under the Commonwealth Act just as we do. It seems a strange thing to me that men with

master mariner's certificates are in charge at Geraldton, Bunbury and Albany and yet they will be expected to work under a man with lesser qualifications. The department has control of harbour and river craft and must have a lot to do with matters connected with the sea. It does not seem right that a man without a master mariner's certificate should be in charge. The Chief Secretary had a distinguished service in the Army and he should be the first to appreciate that he could hardly be expected to accept orders originated and handed out by non-commissioned officers. If the person in charge of the department were called upon to make a report he would be compelled to ask one of his officers, who was a master mariner, to do it for him.

Hon. G. FRASER: I hope the Committee will not agree to this amendment. We have continued for many years in the Fremantle district without having a man with the qualifications set out in the amendment appointed to this position. If the amendment be agreed to, it will restrict the scope for the selection of a suitable man whereas there are many men already in the department who have been there for many years and have graduated through the various phases of the work. If we agree to this proposal, it will mean that such men could go so far and no further. The Government can still do what the hon. member seeks if the Bill is left as it is.

Hon. H. A. C. Daffén: Yes, but will the Government do it?

Hon. G. FRASER: The Government will should the occasion arise. If a man has the qualifications of a master mariner he is not necessarily a suitable man for the job, whereas a man who has been right through the department would be ideal.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There has not been a harbour master or a master mariner in charge of the department for some time. This particular subclause was put in purposely so that the department could control instead of an individual. A master mariner may not be a suitable person for the job. If the amendment is agreed to, it will necessitate the Act being changed from time to time. Actually any work required to be done by a master mariner is carried out by arrangement with the Fremantle Harbour Trust. This job is not one for a master mariner at all but is one

which should be carried out by a manager. There are three master mariners employed at the moment, one at Bunbury, one at Albany and one at Geraldton as well as a relieving harbour master. The manager of the department is a very able gentleman, although he is not in possession of a master mariner's certificate, and he is carrying out all the office work and administration duties. A man with a master mariner's certificate should not be required to do that particular work.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 15 to 72—agreed to.

Clauses 73—Dangerous goods:

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I merely wish to draw attention to the fact that at the end of the clause the word "dangerous" has the letter "e" at the end.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a printer's error, and will be dealt with by the Clerk.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: That is so, but I mention it because I do not want it to be overlooked.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 74 to 206—agreed to.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

[Hon. G. Fraser took the Chair.]

Clause 207—Regulations:

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: I am representing a number of private boat owners who feel greatly concerned about the provisions of this clause. Paragraph (g), to which exception is taken, sets out that the Governor may make regulations providing for distinguishing words, letters, numbers, colours or marks being or not being placed on vessels, and "vessel" includes any ship or boat not propelled by oars, used for pleasure and not for hire or reward. Private owners see the possibility of irksome regulations and restrictions being imposed if some enterprising officer got the Government to prescribe that distinguishing marks should be placed on privately-owned vessels. We can imagine such an officer seeking to make a nice job for himself, and if the regulation were passed, every lad who owned a dinghy and everyone who owned a motor boat or sailing craft would have to provide a distinguishing mark.

What an amount of work that would involve!

From Esperance to Wyndham there are hundreds of pleasure boats, and with such a regulation in force, inspectors would have to be appointed to see that the marks were placed on the boats. The whole thing would be ridiculous. The retention of the paragraph would mean establishing another expensive bureaucratic control that would be irksome to boat owners and of no advantage whatever. If a boat changed hands, the registration would have to be changed and the new ownership would have to be marked on the vessel. Clerks and stenographers would have to be employed and thus a subdepartment would be built up within the department. I move an amendment—

That paragraph (g) be struck out.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The eloquence of the hon. member has convinced me that the paragraph should be deleted.

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

Clauses 208 to 221, Schedules, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day. Hon. J. A. Dimmitt in the Chair; the Honorary Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clause 11—Repeal of Sections 17, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32, and Sections 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42 and 43 added (partly considered):

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Chair is that the clause stand as amended, to which a further amendment has been moved to strike out subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (g) of Subsection (13) of proposed new Section 37.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I agreed last night, at the request of Dr. Hislop, to report progress in order to obtain some information as to exactly what was meant by "facilities"; what was in the minds of the sponsors of the Bill. Having gone into the mat-

ter, I am more than ever convinced that the amendment should be strenuously opposed. I have here a statement which deals with the main points and which I propose to read to the Committee. It is as follows:—

The main reason for establishing the Workers' Compensation Board was not to settle disputes which may arise between the employer and the employee, but to provide facilities for the better treatment of workers and to give the Board the necessary power to establish such facilities.

The amendment which is proposed by Dr. Hislop is apparently intended to retain the sanctity of the medical profession as it stands today, which means that the medical and surgical treatment of workers cannot in any way be improved.

The intention of subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (g) on page 35 is to enable the Board to provide special surgical treatment for injured workers if that is at all possible. Traumatic surgery is of a specialised nature and workers can only be properly treated by those who could concentrate on such surgery and by experience become far more competent than the general practitioner who deals with every class of surgery and sickness. At the Medical Congress recently held in Perth, the necessity for establishing a traumatic hospital, so that fully paid surgeons could concentrate on traumatic surgery with a view to giving the best possible treatment to patients, was stressed and I understand that in Victoria the medical profession is urging the establishment of some centre which will give effect to what in the opinion of many doctors, including those standing high in the profession and who attended the Congress, is absolutely necessary.

As a matter of fact, Dr. Hislop's amendment proposes to retain the status quo, so that any medical practitioner could continue to treat workers, but in actual fact the position now is that patients who are admitted to the Royal Perth Hospital cannot receive treatment by their own medical advisers, but must of necessity accept treatment from the honorary surgeons who are registered at that institution. It is not intended that the worker shall lose his right of selecting his own adviser, but it is desirable that the Board, if necessary and if practicable, should have the statutory right to improve on the present set up.

Under this clause it would be possible for the Board to establish a physiotherapy clinic which would be a considerable advance on what exists today. At the present time, doctors send their patients to masseurs who treat the patients without any medical supervision whatever and whether or not the treatment is unduly prolonged is open to question. The State Office alone pays over £2,000 per annum for physiotherapy treatment and the only way in which satisfactory results could be achieved is by having the patient treated under the supervision of a doctor who, by experience, is sufficiently qualified to know if the proper treatment is being administered.

In the light of the foregoing comments, I think that the amendment which appears on the notice paper should be strongly opposed. So also should any amendment which may be introduced with a view to deleting subparagraph (ii) from the Bill. Unless the provisions in the Bill giving the Compensation Board the power to take some action to improve treatment of the worker with a view to reducing the percentage of disability, if not enabling him to fully recover, are retained, then the main purpose for which the Board has been established will no longer exist.

I would have thought Dr. Hislop would welcome such an innovation as this to establish these facilities, which are very necessary.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: The other night when the Minister was asking us to approve of a clause relating to the board, we were invited to endorse that clause on his very definite assurance that the board was intended to be a court. Now the Minister says that the principal object of the board is not to be a court, but that it is to have a roving commission to engage in medical services and harass factories and goodness knows what!

I think that the manner in which the Committee has been asked to agree to this Bill, and the representations made to it, do not altogether reflect credit on the Minister. Some of the remarks he has just made might more properly have been made at the second reading stage, so that members, in considering the clauses, could have given attention to the various points which have just been raised. I would like the Minister to clear up one point. In the concluding part of the statement he read, he had reference to subparagraph (ii). I would like him to make it clear whether the principal part of his statement referred to subparagraph (i) or subparagraph (ii).

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Subparagraph (ii).

Hon. H. K. WATSON: Laudable as these provisions may be, they should not find any place in the Act. If this social service is to be provided, it should form the substance of a separate Act, and be a charge on the finances of the State. It should not be the plaything of a board which is collecting revenue from a limited section of the community. I hope the amendment will be carried.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I stand amazed now that the curtain has been drawn aside and

we can see the possibility of a deliberate attempt by the board to start a State medical service.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: If it is necessary.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I warn the Committee that this is in the minds of the framers of the Bill. When I first spoke on this question of depriving the worker of the right to choose his own medical attendant, I did so with the belief that that was something I had read into the Bill, and which the framers had no intention of carrying out. But I think that possibly I used more tact than wisdom in approaching the problem; because we must look back and realise what was in the minds of the framers, namely, that these three laymen were to be able to tell the medical profession how to improve its work and the worker where to go in his own interests. Every medical practitioner has the right to practise under the provisions of the Act. This Bill definitely states that the board may now have the right to say to whom the worker shall go and what medical men shall undertake workers' compensation work. So this was not something that I just read into the Bill. It was inserted by design. This is an attempt to enable the board, if it feels inclined, to set up its own medical services for the treatment of injured workers. I would warn workers to be very careful about that, because it could redound very greatly against them.

Hon. L. Craig: Do you not think that a man should be able to go to a specialist if he is instructed to do so?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: No; because many patients do not see a specialist but are treated by their own doctors. If we are going to take them away from their own medical practitioners and say, "You must have your injury treated by the people we decide upon—"

Hon. E. H. Gray: This does not say that.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: If the hon. member reads it carefully, he will see that that is the position. In the first place it was desired that this board, until we altered the position last night, should be able to choose which medical practitioner should carry out this work. Then under this provision with which we are dealing, it will provide all the facilities necessary for the treatment of the in-

jured workers, which means that it will conduct its own service. That is very unwise. This idea that everybody should be treated by a specialist will destroy the foundations of medicine. It is amusing to me to hear that a lay board of three people—a legal man, a man from the Trades Hall, and a representative of the Employers' Federation—is to be able to improve the standard of treatment of the injured worker. It is to set up a school of traumatic surgeons who will be more skilled in the treatment of the injured workers.

Hon. L. Craig: Suppose a man is not getting better under the treatment given him?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: He should be able to go wherever he is sent.

Hon. L. Craig: Wherever he is sent?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Yes, provided he is not making satisfactory progress.

Hon. G. Fraser: That is all this provides for.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: No, it does not. I warn Mr. Fraser to be careful that he does not injure the workers he represents. If the board is given power to introduce forms of treatment for the worker and to decide who is to do the work, the injured man will no longer have any choice in the matter.

Hon. L. Craig: Have not the insurance companies doctors who can examine the injured worker?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: He can be referred to a referee or to a specialist.

Hon. L. Craig: And who determines that?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The insurance company.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This conversation must cease. The hon. member will have opportunity of addressing the Committee later on.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The board should not be given power to set up its own medical service. The Honorary Minister for Agriculture has shown tonight that there exists a desire that the board should build its own hospital.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: I never said that.

Hon. G. Fraser: Where would it get the money?

Hon. H. Hearn: From the employers, of course.

Hon. G. Bennetts: Big business!

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Unless I am deaf or stupid, I remember the Honorary Minister reading out something about the necessity for traumatic hospitals. Who is it thought would build such a hospital? The board, of course, out of the funds got from increased premiums.

Hon. G. Fraser: The premiums would have to be high, for that to be done.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The Honorary Minister seems to have it in mind that the board would be better off with its own physiotherapy department, but that alone would involve heavy preliminary capital cost. Clinics such as are contemplated would require extensive and expensive staffs. I have already heard alarm expressed in the city as to whether these things can be afforded better by one section of the community than by the community as a whole. Members should be mindful of the great expenso entailed in proposals such as this. A hospital of 100 beds might easily cost £150,000, and the cost of providing physiotherapy and x-ray departments would be enormous. One of the district hospitals in Adelaide has now cost something in the vicinity of £3,000 per bed. If a man was not making satisfactory progress, the board would, in any case, have the right to send him to a specialist for report.

Four years ago I endeavoured to have the Act amended to give an insurance company power, if it were proved that a man was not making progress after a certain length of time, to have him treated by a doctor of the company's choice. The then Government would not accept the proposal, so I withdrew the amendment. The present proposal would give the board power to spend money ad lib in providing medical and surgical facilities. The Committee should be aware of such a proposition.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am afraid Dr. Hislop has been drawing the long bow. He destroyed his own argument by his statements on the question of cost. If the board held all the premiums collected over a period of years it would still not have sufficient money to build the first ward of such a hospital. I think the provision is necessary.

Hon. H. Hearn: Of course. It does not affect you.

Hon. G. FRASER: I think it is necessary. I do not think many doctors would prolong a man's visits unnecessarily, though it has been known to occur; but if the board decided that a man was not responding to treatment, it would be able to send him to another practitioner for a check up, which is all the provision really means.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: There is nothing in the clause to permit of the board interfering with the treatment of any man. It does not give power to transfer the treatment from one medical practitioner to another, because that would not be providing facilities.

Hon. G. FRASER: Dr. Hislop agrees that the board could direct a man to go elsewhere if the doctor treating him had not the necessary facilities. Would that not be taking the worker from one doctor to another?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No curtain has been withdrawn from the clause tonight. It has been quite clear all along; only last night members did not understand exactly what it meant. It says, "providing where necessary facilities for complete and adequate medical treatment for workers who have sustained personal injury . . ." Would such a board set up a hospital if there was sufficient hospital accommodation and expert attention already available? Surely not. Mr. Watson said no credit was due to me. I hope nothing offensive was meant by that remark.

At no stage have I said that the board would be only a court. I said the court was justified because it could act as a court, could carry out inspections of factories and take action with regard to research work. I am amazed that a doctor, rather than a representative of the employers, should object to the clause. I do not think Dr. Hislop's view is in accord with that of other doctors, who, I believe, favour the proposal with regard to the board's powers.

Hon. H. Hearn: Will we get all these improvements with the same premiums?

The Chief Secretary: You would pass the cost on, in any case.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The board would take ac-

tion only where it was really necessary, and here we are concerned simply with the injured worker and the question of compensation.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The Committee might have gained the impression that I have spoken tonight without the advice of my colleagues, while the Honorary Minister has had their advice. That is not so. I discussed the Bill with a committee selected from the profession, and asked advice on this matter. Those I consulted were most concerned that the worker should not be deprived of his right of choice of medical advice. It was at their suggestion that I moved the amendment in order to protect the rights of both worker and doctor.

I am giving the Committee the considered views of the profession in this matter. If an insurance company could show that any worker was being deprived of the correct treatment for his injury the position would automatically be righted, and that would be endorsed by the whole of the profession. To think that three laymen can, by being formed into a board, set themselves up to improve the status of medicine in this State is just laughable.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am sorry that Dr. Hislop has placed the construction that he has on this paragraph because we have to compare the Bill with the present set-up in Perth. We have a wonderful organisation of doctors and nurses treating all kinds of people. One would have a very vivid imagination if one thought that this board would interfere with the status of the medical profession. Having been associated with the profession as a layman for many years, I have a very high regard for it.

The services of doctors would be available in the various clinics to deal with, say, a stiff arm or some other trouble, and if facilities were required for special injuries the board would have the power to provide them. Surely we could get a doctor to work under the supervision of a man's own medical attendant. This clause does not mean the spending of £500,000 on hospitals or wasting employers' money. It will be of help to employers and not a hindrance. Instead of everyone being treated individually, the board will be able to do anything necessary in the way of establishing clinics in order to return the worker to industry

as soon as possible. I hope the subparagraph will not be interfered with.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I am always opposed to ambiguous legislation and there is no doubt in my mind that this provision could be stretched a long way further than in the manner mentioned in the Chamber this evening. I think anyone who wanted to use this piece of legislation for the establishment of any kind of clinic could do so. I have been associated with politics long enough to know how legislation is stretched by some people for their own purposes. All legislation should state clearly what it actually means. I can only see one limit in this clause and that is in regard to the board's powers for spending money.

Hon. L. Craig: What security will it have?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: It is a body corporate and will have the backing of the Treasury. If it has not that backing, it will have the benefit of all the premiums.

Hon. H. Hearn: And the backing of industry.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The provision can compel them to increase the premiums in order to provide adequate payments to the worker and facilities not mentioned here or clearly defined.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I would like an opportunity of giving a little further consideration to the statement read by the Minister. It is not easy to assimilate an involved statement which is read and if the Minister would postpone the consideration of the clause to give me an opportunity of studying the statement, I would be obliged.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: We have already postponed this clause once and I have given all the information that it is possible for me to obtain, so surely it is clear to members. I therefore see no reason for postponing the clause. Parliament has stated, by a substantial majority, that a board shall be established. Are we going to take away desirable powers of the board? I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I had no intention of speaking again on this matter, but I now intend to go through this extraordinary state-

ment line by line and thus give members the true facts. This is one of the most extraordinary documents I have ever read. Over the years I have been associated with workers in this State, the treatment of them has improved in an amazing manner and there are members of the profession who give hours upon hours of their time to study the question of industry and its relation to the injured worker.

This is one of the points regarding which the profession has absorbed more time and interest than possibly any other feature of medicine in this State over the last quarter of the century. It is suggested that under the present set-up of medical services, the treatment of the worker cannot be improved. This provision is just lust for power on the part of someone who has said, "Very well, we will now be able to control this profession." I do not think there is a single workers' representative in the State who would deny that the facilities made available to the worker by the medical profession have increased in a truly amazing way in recent times.

Point of Order.

Hon. G. Fraser: I do not desire to burke discussion, but I can see we shall be quite a long time. I raise the point whether Dr. Hislop is complying with Standing Order 253.

The Chairman: Dr. Hislop is commenting upon remarks made by the Honorary Minister for Agriculture. Those remarks were read from a sheet which was handed to the hon. member. The matter therefore deals with the clause under discussion and the motion before the Committee to delete subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (g). The argument that has been adduced as a result of the discussion has been put on paper, and I think Dr. Hislop has the right to refute it, if he can.

Hon. G. Fraser: The point I raise is that a member may speak more than once but must confine himself to the subject matter of the amendment.

The Chairman: I rule that Dr. Hislop is in order. I shall restrict him if I feel he is overstepping the mark.

Hon. G. Fraser: But this is a second reading speech in Committee!

The Chairman: I am afraid other members have offended in the same way. I

would like Dr. Hislop not to make a second reading speech. If we are to spend one hour on each amendment, it will take us weeks to pass the Bill. I am prepared to allow a good deal of latitude.

Committee Resumed.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I will not ask for latitude. The statement is so extraordinary that I feel it needs little reply beyond what I have already said. It emphasises two facts; first, that it is in the minds of those in authority to build a traumatic hospital, if they possibly can. By doing so they will attempt to control the worker in his admission to that hospital. Secondly, they will attempt to build clinics and place them in charge of their own medical appointees. The extraordinary statement is made that doctors now refer their patients to masseurs, who treat them without any medical supervision whatever.

Hon. H. A. C. Daffen: Who prepared that statement?

Hon. W. J. Mann: I have a good idea.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: It should be realised that doctors do not send patients for massage other than to trained masseurs. These persons carry out work for which they are trained, and then refer the case back to the medical man. More often than not, the actual treatment to be carried out by the masseur is dictated by the medical man who sends him the case. Now we shall find that every patient needing physiotherapy treatment will be sent to this physiotherapy clinic, which will be under the control of a doctor who is the servant of the board.

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

Ayes	12
Noes	9

Majority for	3
--------------	----	----	---

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. H. A. C. Daffen	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. H. Hearn	Hon. O. H. Simpson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. Sir Chas. Latham	Hon. H. Tuckey

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. E. M. Davies
Hon. W. R. Hall	(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES. Hon. F. R. Welsh Hon. J. M. Cunningham	NOES. Hon. L. A. Logan Hon. R. M. Forrest
--	---

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: For the same reasons that I moved to strike out subparagraph (ii), I propose to move for the deletion of subparagraph (iii).

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I would suggest that the word "facilities" alone be struck out and that the remainder of the subparagraph be retained. I consider there are some grounds for retention of the sphere of activity denoted in this subparagraph. I have myself seen many occasions on which a man who has been injured has experienced the utmost difficulty in finding employment afterwards, and he has been retained on compensation long after the time he normally should be, for the reason that there is no method of rehabilitating him. However, I do not feel that it is the responsibility of the board to provide the facilities. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (g) of Subsection (13) of proposed new Section 37, the word "facilities" be struck out.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It appears that the Committee is not in favour of the word "facilities." Rather than lose the clause, I would agree to the deletion of the word. It is highly desirable that the subparagraph should be retained.

Hon. G. FRASER: I hope the Honorary Minister will insist on retaining this word. If it is taken out, the responsibility will be thrown on to someone else to provide for the rehabilitation of injured workers. The board should take the main responsibility and where possible it should provide facilities. We know the value of rehabilitation. Men who were on an invalid pension for years and had lost faith, returned to employment after a little sympathetic treatment. The first onus in connection with rehabilitation should be on the board. If the word "facilities" is struck out the board will have to go around the town looking for someone else to take care of the injured workers. I hope the Minister will fight to retain the subparagraph as it is printed.

Hon. L. CRAIG: This is a storm in a teacup. The word does not count.

Hon. G. Fraser: If it does not make any difference, leave it in.

Hon. L. CRAIG: We might save an hour or two by leaving it. Personally, I would throw out the whole subparagraph, but if it is to remain, let it be as it is.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I cannot understand anyone objecting to this provision. If there is anything commendable in the set-up of the board it is that it can take measures in respect of the rehabilitation of injured workers.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are dealing with the amendment to delete the word "facilities." I think the hon. member is speaking on the next amendment, which is to strike out the whole subparagraph.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: In my opinion the implications that have been attached to the word "facilities" do not exist. It will not make any difference whether we approve of the subparagraph with it or without it. It is a quibble on Dr. Hislop's part. Even without this word being retained, the board will be able to do quite a lot for the rehabilitation and re-employment of workers.

Hon. H. HEARN: I thoroughly disagree with Mr. Heenan. The word "facilities," so belittled by Mr. Craig, makes all the difference between the provision and non-provision of physical facilities for the work of rehabilitation, and its retention would give the board power to commence, if necessary, in business in order to re-employ workers.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

That subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (g) of Subsection (13) of proposed new Section 37 be struck out.

In reply to the Minister, I say I am not against the rehabilitation and re-employment of workers, and I am not against unemployment relief any more than I am against the old age pension or the maternity allowance. My point is that these are all social service items which should form no part of a Bill of this nature. That is why I ask the Committee to vote for the deletion of this subparagraph.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I shall support the amendment. The scale of compensation is laid down, and the premiums are based so as to meet full compensation that a worker

who is totally incapacitated is to get. Under this provision the insurer will be involved in the further expense of endeavouring to restore him to good health. That might cost a considerable amount. If the board determines that insurers shall contribute £100 or £300 a year for this purpose they must do so. This is not a function of insurance at all, but of social services or Government institutions.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Has not industry some responsibility?

Hon. L. CRAIG: The responsibility of industry is laid down. We cannot put unlimited responsibility on it. I can imagine this amounting to thousands of pounds a year. These men can receive the best treatment possible in this State by going to the Royal Perth Hospital. The cost of it then becomes a charge on the community and not on the insurer. That is all that would happen if the subparagraph were struck out.

Point of Order.

Hon. G. Fraser: Standing Order 131 provides—

No amendment shall be proposed to be made to any words which the Council has resolved shall not be left out.

We have resolved that the word "facilities" shall not be taken out, and now we propose to take it out.

The Chairman: My reason for allowing the debate on the motion to strike out the word "facilities" was that had we decided to leave the whole subparagraph in, we could not go back to delete that word, but now it seems as if the hon. member has raised a new difficulty. I think Mr. Fraser's suggestion is not a very practicable one. If we stuck strictly to the interpretation he suggests should be given to this Standing Order, the Committee could achieve the same objective by striking out all the words after the word "facilities" and so render the whole of the subparagraph completely inoperative and stupid. I think it would be unwise for the hon. member to press the point.

Hon. G. Fraser: I am satisfied with the ruling, but I raised the point to show that the Standing Orders Committee should meet to deal with these matters.

Committee Resumed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It seems to me that the Committee does not quite understand the meaning of the provision. Its

purpose is to get people who are receiving workers' compensation back into industry and so save weekly expenditure. The subparagraph deals with people on compensation and not people who have finished or been thrown out of employment.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Nobody suggested that.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Watson said that it was a matter that should be dealt with under social services. This is not a pensions Act or a social services Act.

Hon. H. K. Watson: The Honorary Minister just suggested that it was.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is the Workers' Compensation Act and it deals only with those cases receiving workers' compensation payments. If it is possible to help a man back into industry so much the better for all concerned and that is the object of the Bill.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: Back into full-time work or partial wages?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Full-time is the object.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: I cannot understand the views of some members in the business section of the community regarding the subsection as a whole. When a man is receiving compensation he is merely paid half or two-thirds of his wages, although if he is a returned soldier he gets a certain pension in addition to compensation. Men want to get out of that rut and be given a chance to get once again a "belly-full" of food.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. G. BENNETTS: This would be saving money for the people's pockets and that is the proper outlook.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I have listened to the Chief Secretary and from his remarks I gather that where a man is injured and unable to go back to his old occupation, provision is made here to enable him to be trained or assisted to do some other class of work.

The Chief Secretary: That is one of the objects.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The point is whether this is a claim for workers' compensation or a claim under social services. It seems to me that industry is taxed to provide compensation and

is also taxed to provide social services.

The Chief Secretary: This fund would have to pay as long as the man was unable to work.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I do not know whether compensation ends when a man is discharged from hospital for light duties.

The Chief Secretary: The provision is to facilitate his complete recovery.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Apparently it is to enable him to be trained or assisted to do some other class of work.

The Chief Secretary: It is an attempt to get him back to his former earning capacity.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I would like to advise Mr. Bennetts that the proposal in the Bill is to increase compensation to £6 per week and not half or two-thirds pay as he suggested.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This is one of the most important jobs the board will have to do. Surely the board should take an interest in a man who is receiving workers' compensation payments, to rehabilitate him and endeavour to get him into something to enable him to earn a further £1 or £2 a week. We hear so much about the expense of these things but surely no-one is going to quibble at the expense of getting a man from part-time work into some other employment and enable him to help himself and his dependants. Why should there be this continual objection?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: As far as I can see, the underlying motive of the Bill is to pay compensation to injured workers and to carry out research and investigations with a view to preventing accidents and, when accidents have occurred, to minimise their effects. It is to help unfortunate people injured in industry to get better as quickly as possible. That will effect a big saving to industry. If a man can be helped back into employment earlier than is possible under the present system, surely that is a laudable objective and that is what this proposed subsection will do. So far as the overlapping of the obligations of the fund and social services are concerned, surely we can rely upon the members in charge of the fund to utilise the money as they think fit.

On the Goldfields we have the Mine Workers' Relief Fund and the members on

the board administering that fund conserve it as much as possible by directing the workers who are eligible for old-age pensions or invalid pensions to apply for them; and surely that will apply in this case. I should imagine that it will be some years before there will be a fund large enough to be used for this purpose, but it is a goal for which we should strive.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I gather from the last two or three speeches that no effort has been made in the past to get men back to work. Every effort is being made, but, although I agree that this is a most laudable objective, it goes further than that. If members will read the Bill they will see that if a man suffers the loss of a right arm, he is entitled to compensation amounting to £1,000. To-day on the payment of that sum the insurer would be finished, but under the Bill it would appear that that is not the case.

The Chief Secretary: He is finished as soon as the £1,000 is paid.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I do not think he is.

The Chief Secretary: It is only the fellow on compensation that we are trying to get back to work.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: He might only have a bad back or something like that.

Hon. L. CRAIG: He might lose an arm and it gives the board power to provide rehabilitation and re-employment. I would like the Chief Secretary to inform me whether that contention is correct.

The Chief Secretary: Read the Bill!

Hon. H. A. C. Daffen: It says, "permanent or temporarily disabled."

The Chief Secretary: The limit is a certain fixed sum for a permanent injury.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The board will draw from the insurers to provide these facilities. It is wrong that the insurer should pay twice. It will be the money taken from the insurers that will provide the training, and if it is a psychological or a difficult case, it might take a year to train that man and make him useful in industry. I agree he must be trained and returned to industry, but surely the responsibility should not rest on the same people all the time.

Hon. H. HEARN: I agree with Mr. Craig's remarks. If a man is injured in a factory today and he loses an arm or any

other limb, he is treated by the medico and only when he is ready to return to work is the assessment of damages really settled.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I do not know that this is not going a long way further. I have had considerable experience in connection with the operating of this legislation and I can see what is likely to happen. If a man should suffer permanent disabilities, he will receive lump sum compensation and it will be incumbent upon the board to find him some suitable employment.

Hon. L. Craig: That is what I said.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: In many instances that could go on interminably and there would be no limit to it. The whole position needs readjustment. I can remember many cases where rehabilitation was desirable but extremely difficult.

Hon. L. Craig: There have been instances where a man has got full compensation three times.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: That cannot be done under this Bill. The whole position is difficult of interpretation as to where the responsibilities of the board will cease. I agree that the rehabilitation of some of these men is a dreadful problem. During the early part of the war years we hoped that the State Gardens Board would set aside its work for the employment of men who could not be suitably placed elsewhere, while the State Insurance Office has endeavoured over the years to place the men in industry in some suitable way, but has experienced the utmost difficulty in achieving its objective. I am just wondering whether this proposal is not going a little too far. There must be some means of rehabilitation for injured workers, but the whole matter needs a good deal more investigation and detailed control than is envisaged in this paragraph.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I am amazed at some of the extraordinary statements made about the Workers' Compensation Act as it stands. If a man loses an arm—Mr. Hearn should know this—he naturally goes into hospital and has to remain there for some time, during which he receives half-wages up to, I think, £4 10s. a week. When he leaves hospital he receives the full lump sum provided in the schedule for such an injury. The Bill sets out that the board will take such measures and incur such expenditure as

is deemed necessary or expedient with a view to providing facilities for pre-employment medical examination and occupational guidance to workers.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: That is the point members have lost sight of.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: That is all the board has to do in this respect and the power is not mandatory, as Doctor Hislop seemed to imply. Most members who have spoken against this provision started off with the assumption that the board will set out to muleet everyone in industry as far as possible. That is altogether wrong. We have reached the stage where we must broaden our outlook with regard to workers compensation. If a man contracts some industrial disease or meets with an accident during his employment, surely it is not going too far to expect industry to help in his rehabilitation.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I would remind Mr. Heenan that industry is also paying £80,000,000 per year by way of social service contributions, in common with other Australian citizens. I suggest that it is from that fund that these payments should be met.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am disappointed with Dr. Hislop's attitude on this point. Dr. Radcliffe-Taylor, without any suggestion from anyone, arranged for some of these men to undertake special work of a light character on prison farms and elsewhere in the South-West. She handled a large number of men, with the result that they were completely cured and re-established in social life. This provision will allow the board to undertake work of that description, and it will represent a saving to industry. The board will be able to undertake the work on a bigger scale than was possible for Dr. Radcliffe-Taylor. It will be a detrimental move should the amendment be carried.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I remind Mr. Gray that what he suggests is exactly what I wanted him to do in the first place. Dr. Radcliffe-Taylor used the facilities already available elsewhere in the State to rehabilitate some of these men, and I suggest that the same course should be followed by the board, which should look for avenues in this State without building up its own facilities to teach the men occupations for which they might not be suited. I recommend the

scheme that is adopted in England where industry sets aside light jobs for men totally unfit to engage in full-scale work.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is a good idea.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: That would be much better than spending large sums of money in erecting buildings where men could be taught jobs for which they were unsuited.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: You are only assuming that is the intention.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I think my assumption is fairly right if we may judge from the document placed before us this evening.

Hon. H. K. Watson: I am sure of it.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I want the Bill to be passed in a reasonable form so that rehabilitation will be carried out in a proper manner.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not know how Dr. Hislop can link up facilities with this question, because it deals only with re-employment and rehabilitation. The word "facilities" is used here in the sense of easing the position for these unfortunate men. It does not mean expenditure of large sums of money on buildings. To agree to the amendment would be a retrograde move.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	9
Majority for				4

AYES.

Hon. L. Craig	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. H. A. C. Daffen	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. O. H. Simpson
Hon. H. Hoern	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. Sir Chas. Latham	Hon. C. F. Baxter
Hon. A. L. Loton	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. W. R. Hall
Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. E. H. Gray	(Teller.)

PAIR.

AYE.	No.
Hon. R. M. Forrest	Hon. J. M. Cunningham

Amendment thus passed.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Watson has given notice of an amendment to strike out words at the beginning of subparagraph (iv) of the proposed new Section 37 (13) (g). This is a parallel case to the one referred

to by Mr. Fraser and I propose to repeat the procedure adopted previously.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: In order to allow Mr. Baxter to move his amendment for the deletion of the whole of the subparagraph, I do not intend to move my amendment.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I move an amendment—

That subparagraph (iv) of paragraph (g) of Subsection 13 of proposed new Section 37 be struck out.

The subparagraph proposes to empower the board to investigate employments and places of employment within the State and determine what suitable safety devices or other reasonable means or requirements for the prevention of accidents or disease shall be adopted. A huge staff would be required for this work. We already have inspectors of factories and machinery, inspectors for the goldmining, coalmining and timber industries and also under the Health Act, all of whom deal with the inspection of machinery and the provision of safety devices. Why import another inspectorial branch to humbug people? This will be another impost on industry.

On every occasion Labour members have supported provisions that will assuredly add to the costs of industry. I wonder whether they have thought of the future of industry or of future employment for the workers. There is no reason why this provision should be retained. The measure should be confined to the provision of workers' compensation and should not include all sorts of other things.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am amazed at Mr. Baxter's argument that this will be an impost on industry. If there is one provision in the Bill that will have the effect of lowering costs, this is it. Surely the prevention of accidents and disease must result in saving money to industry! Then, apart from the economic side, we ought to consider the humane side. The board should be empowered to make inspections.

Hon. L. Craig: That is already being done.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: But it is not done sufficiently. Would not this board be more concerned to see that it was done properly? The Royal Commission said it was impera-

tive that the board should take an active part in connection with compulsory safeguards for the prevention of accidents and disease in industry, this being one of the major avenues of reducing claims and consequently cost to industry. I cannot understand the objections being raised to the Bill. The measure having passed the second reading, it seems that attempts are now being made piecemeal to mutilate it.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: This is a very necessary provision. I consider that the board will make inspections only of places where trouble has occurred and heavy compensation has been paid. If a number of miners working in a certain part of a mine were found to be suffering from dust, it is reasonable to expect that the board would inspect that place to discover the cause of the trouble. In Kalgoorlie I was shown a photograph taken of a particular stope where dust trouble had occurred. That is the sort of place the board would need to inspect. It might also be necessary to check up on factories in the metropolitan area to ensure that proper safeguards were provided. Nothing but benefit would be derived from such inspections and I am satisfied that the result would be a saving of cost to industry.

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

Ayes	12
Noes	11
				—
Majority for	1
				—

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. A. L. Leton
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. H. A. C. Daffen	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. H. Hearn	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. Sir Chas. Latham	Hon. G. W. Miles (Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. J. G. Hislop
Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. E. H. Gray (Teller.)
Hon. E. M. Heenan	

PAIR.

AYE.	NO.
Hon. R. M. Forrest	Hon. J. M. Cunningham

Amendment thus passed.

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw attention to the fact that Mr. Watson has an amendment to strike out the whole of Subsection (14) of proposed new Section 37. Mr. Hearn has amendments to delete cer-

tain words in two places and to add other words. Does Mr. Hearn wish to proceed with his amendments?

Hon. H. HEARN: I am prepared to withdraw my amendments in favour of Mr. Watson's amendment.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am also prepared to withdraw the amendment I have on the notice paper.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

That Subsection (14) of proposed new Section 37 be struck out.

My reason is to be found in the first three lines of the subsection, which refer to giving effect to subparagraph (iv) of paragraph (g) of the preceding subsection. Inasmuch as there is now no such subparagraph, Subsection (14) becomes redundant. This is almost a consequential amendment.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I agree that it would be wasting time to argue about this matter.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I would like a little information as to the necessity for the board to engage in the work set out in Subsection (15). I see the necessity for instruction in accident prevention and first aid, but is that not already adequately catered for by the St. John Ambulance people? Would it not be better to subsidise that body so that it could give demonstrations, lectures and so on?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If the board wanted to co-operate with the St. John Ambulance people, it could do so. Parliament has decided that a board is necessary. Surely this Committee can give it some powers! Members are leaving it nothing and making the whole thing farcical.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of paragraph (a) of Subsection (1) of proposed new Section 38 after the word "Office" the words "two persons who shall be appointed as representing employers" be inserted.

This provision relates to the appointment of the premium rates committee and provides that the maximum rate shall be determined from time to time by the committee. My proposal is that, in addition to the persons whom the Bill says shall comprise the com-

mittee, there shall also be two persons—or one; I am not very particular—to represent the persons paying the premiums; namely, the employers. If that were done, the premium rates committee under this measure would be comparable to the committee appointed under the Motor Vehicles (Third Party Insurance) Act. On that committee the persons paying the premiums have two representatives along with the Auditor General and two representatives of the insurance companies. I suggest that the precedent established in the case of the premium rates committee under the third party insurance legislation could well be followed in this case.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not think it is necessary to have two representatives of the employers, because they do not necessarily know anything about insurance. Provision is already made for approved insurers to have a representative on the board. There are also to be on the board the manager of the State Insurance Office and the Auditor General. Such a board would keep premium rates to the absolute minimum. As the amendment would make the board too cumbersome, if agreed to, I must oppose it.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (a) of Subsection (1) of proposed new Section 38 the words "other than that section of such insurers known as the non-tariff companies, and also a person who shall be nominated by the non-tariff companies as aforesaid both of whom shall be appointed by the Governor and entitled while acting on the Committee to such remuneration and allowances as shall be prescribed;" be struck out.

Why should the non-tariff companies be represented? For the last 30 years in Victoria an insurance commissioner, the equivalent of the manager of our State Insurance Office, has worked in conjunction with the Government Statistician and a representative of the Underwriters' Association on the lines set out in this provision. That set-up has given complete satisfaction. The tariff companies, represented by the Underwriters' Association, are in a far better position than are the non-tariff companies to supply the necessary actuarial information.

Hon. G. FRASER: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. This

evening one of the reasons put forward by movers of amendments has been the desire to keep down the cost of insurance. Now, in the case of the premium rates committee, it is apparently desired to cut out the representative who could do most to keep down the cost of insurance to employers.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: You do not know what you are talking about!

Hon. G. FRASER: I know that, when I was a member of the Select Committee inquiring into the question of third party insurance, it was the evidence obtained from the non-tariff companies that we found to be most valuable. If Mr. Baxter compares the rates charged by the tariff companies with those charged by the non-tariff companies he will find that I know what I am talking about.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That still does not affect the position.

Hon. G. FRASER: We are trying to save industry as much cost as possible by setting up an efficient premiums committee. A representative of the non-tariff companies would be very valuable on such a committee and would approach the question from an entirely different angle.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I agree with what Mr. Fraser has said. I sat with him on the Select Committee inquiring into the third party risk, together with Mr. Thomson, and I know that the non-tariff companies gave us the most valuable evidence. In view of the large amount of business they do I think they should be represented on the premiums committee. The amendment would deprive members of the committee of their remuneration and allowances. Is that suggestion made in the interests of economy? I do not know the proportions of business done by the tariff and non-tariff companies respectively, but I know the non-tariff offices do a considerable amount of business and I think they should have representation. I oppose the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

That in line four of paragraph (c) of Subsection (1) of proposed new Section 43 after the word "workers" the semicolon be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

That at the end of paragraph (c) of Subsection (1) of proposed new Section 43 a proviso be inserted as follows:—

Provided that no scale of fees as in this paragraph mentioned shall be fixed unless and until a recommendation as to such fees has been received from the Board, and for the purpose of making such recommendation the Board shall be comprised in the same manner as is provided for the holding of an inquiry under subparagraph (i) of paragraph (c) of Subsection 13 of Section 37 of this Act.

The effect of that would be that the board, sitting to determine fees, would be the workers' compensation board, with which would be sitting two members of the medical profession. The board would come to a decision on the question, following which the Governor would determine the scale of fees. I believe that when professional fees are being laid down representatives of the profession concerned should sit on the board. That is done, for instance, where the Barristers' Board lays down fees for the legal profession. Unless this amendment is agreed to three laymen will advise the Governor as to the fees to be charged by members of the medical profession, because it says that these fees are not determined by agreement. In most cases, up to date, there has been agreement between the insurance companies and the British Medical Association, but the time may be visualised when an agreement cannot be reached. If this clause were left in it would be quite open always for an insurance company to say, "No, we are not going to discuss it with you at all" which, in itself, would not lead to harmonious working.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The further we go the more it appears that this is an attempt to study the medical profession. If there is anything that might increase the charges, then this is it. I obtained some advice on this amendment, which I will now read. It says—

At the present time the Governor is authorised to fix the fees and this should be done on the recommendation of the Minister. There is no reason to believe that the points of view of both parties would not be heard first, whereas to call upon the Compensation Board for a recommendation and this recommendation to be influenced by two medical practitioners forming for that special purpose part of the Board, could only be likely to result in pressure

being brought to bear upon the Board by the medical practitioners for the furtherance of their own case and at the same time virtually deprive the Minister and the Governor of any opportunity of satisfying themselves as to the bona fides of the proposal because if the recommendation of the Board were once made it is only to be assumed that no further inquiry would follow. It is a most important amendment and one which should be strenuously opposed. The suggestion is that when the Compensation Board is dealing with a question of fees payable to members of the British Medical Association, two members nominated by that Association shall sit with the Board.

I think that is a most outrageous suggestion.

In other words, the Board would, for that purpose, comprise five members—two of whom would represent a section of the community vitally interested in the decision of the Board. The provision in the Bill should be left as it is, under which the Minister will, after hearing evidence from both parties, submit a recommendation to the Governor. If then the board of three members should decide the issue after hearing evidence from both the employers' representatives and the B.M.A. representatives, without being in any way influenced by members of the B.M.A. sitting with the Board to determine the issue.

I think this a bad amendment. The safeguard is there to hear evidence from members of the medical profession and I hope the Committee will reject the amendment.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The further we go the more clearly we can see that this body of three laymen is going to control the Act completely, and is going to say to the medical men, "This is what you will charge and this is how you will work." That will not function. The fees to be paid to the medical profession are, by arrangement, considerably lower than those normally charged. By agreement with the insurance companies there have been cases treated by members of the profession for very moderate amounts, but if the amendment is not passed it will tend to break down the relationship existing between the companies and the profession. This board has been given powers over medical men which rightly do not belong to it. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I think if two medical representatives were on the board it would be an unfair advantage. The board is not going to do anything unjust. The chairman will be a man qualified to be a judge and I think the medical profession will obtain fair treatment. It would be too great an

advantage to the medical profession to allow it two representatives on the board for the purpose of fixing fees for its own members.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I support the Government on this amendment. I think it is wrong in principle that people should have the right to determine fees which concern themselves by exercising voting power. The board will have power to call evidence from the B.M.A. as to what the fees shall be, and the fixing of them can then be justly considered.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

That paragraphs (c) and (d) of Subsection (2) of proposed new Section 43 be struck out.

In the Prices Control Act passed by this Parliament a few weeks ago there was, for the first time, an extraordinary provision that neither House of Parliament could disallow the regulations made under that Act, or if they were disallowed, other regulations then existing would automatically continue. That provision was inserted because of some special circumstance which it is not necessary for me to detail, but it just shows how careful we have to be when agreeing to these special concessions. We now find in this Bill precisely the same clause, the effect of which will be that this House will not have the power to disallow regulations. My objection to the provision is that it strikes at the root of Parliamentary practice. Whilst the Chamber agreed to the principle on one special occasion, I suggest that that should not be taken as a precedent.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I am afraid Mr. Watson does not quite understand the provision. It is designed merely to tide over the transitional period. The present regulations will remain in force until regulations under this measure are promulgated.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I desire to be quite clear on this point. My interpretation is that the present regulations will remain in force until new regulations are laid on the Table. These will differ from the old ones, but will include also many new ones. The old ones will continue to apply, but Parliament will have the opportunity to disallow any of the new regulations with which it does not agree. Is that so?

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Yes.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The parent Act has been in force so long that we must agree that the present regulations are acceptable to us. Under the circumstances, my opinion is that the provision should stand.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: If that is really what is meant, the existing regulations will remain in force and the House will have the right to disallow any new regulations that may be promulgated.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Yes.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I think Mr. Craig's interpretation is right. If so, it does not matter whether this provision is in the Bill or not.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The advice I received from the Parliamentary Draftsman is that these provisions were inserted in order to maintain the machinery necessary for administering the Act until such time as the workers' compensation board could have its own rules and regulations approved by the Governor-in-Council. The board must be established immediately the Act is proclaimed, otherwise there will be no provision for administering the important sections of the Act; and it can readily be understood that there must be a lapse of time between the appointment of the board and the drafting of suitable regulations under which it must function. The clause which it is proposed to strike out merely provides for the continuance of the present machinery until such time as new regulations are gazetted. The Committee should act on the advice of the Parliamentary Draftsman.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: Is it the Minister's intention to bring down a new set of regulations governing the operations of the board?

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: There must be new regulations.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Will the other regulations go by the board?

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: I do not know exactly what will be done.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I agree with Mr. Craig that the parent Act has been in force so long that the regulations, as they now stand, must be regarded as acceptable, and

that nothing should be done to disturb them. In the circumstances I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 12—Amendment of the First Schedule:

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I move an amendment—

That in line 7 of paragraph (a) after the word "worker" the words "under the age of 16 years" be inserted.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The amendment is desirable and I hope the Committee will agree to it.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Under the parent Act, all the dependants of the worker receive payment under the First Schedule. In Clause 4 of the Bill we altered the term "illegitimate child" to "ex-nuptial child." It is a backward step to amend the Act to take away a benefit being paid to an ex-nuptial child.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That is not so. It is left to the board's discretion to make the payment.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Why should it be left to the discretion of the board? Why should it not be the same as in the original Act?

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: It would be very dangerous.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It was not dangerous previously. What is the danger if the ex-nuptial child is dependent on the injured worker?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It would be at the discretion of the board to say whether the child was a dependant. That is a good safeguard. A man might have half a dozen half-caste children and claim they were dependent on him.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The only fault I have to find is that the ex-nuptial child might be any age. We should stipulate that it should be under 16. On the other hand, we are leaving the matter to the discretion of the board.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: I think Mr. Baxter's amendment covers it.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: This deals with something different.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I move an amendment—

That after the word "parent" in lines 9 and 11 of subparagraph (v) of paragraph (c) the words "of the worker" be inserted.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: This is quite desirable. It clarifies the position.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I move an amendment—

That after the word "pounds" in line 5 of subparagraph (vi) of paragraph (c) the words "or four pounds in the case of a worker without dependants" be inserted.

A person without dependants should not get the same amount as a person with dependants.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I must oppose this amendment which, I think, is a vain attempt at some sort of economy. It would deprive a bachelor or single worker from receiving the same compensation a married man would get. That is not right. A single worker who was to be married in six months might meet with an accident. In due course he would probably have other dependants, but he would have a lesser amount of compensation than a married man suffering from a similar injury.

Hon. E. M. Davies: It is a departure from established principle.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It is all right for a man with dependants to receive £6, but a man without dependants should not receive the same amount. It would encourage him to remain off work as long as possible.

Hon. E. M. Davies: Would he not be required to have a medical certificate?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, but there are doctors and doctors. Some do not hesitate to help a person to malingering. Fortunately they are in the minority.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I disagree with Mr. Baxter. It would be wrong to penalise a section of the community because a small percentage might be regarded as inclined to malingering.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I do not think you can use the word "penalise."

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I am using it. The companies would be safeguarded to a certain extent because, firstly, the worker would be required to have a medical certificate and, secondly, only a small percentage of workers would be inclined to malingering. The amendment would penalise a large section of genuine workers.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: If we carry the amendment we will be sinning, if it be a sin, in good company, because in Victoria a maximum of £4 per week is provided for an adult worker without dependants, and £6 for a married worker with dependants, or the average weekly earnings if less than £6. That was introduced by the Labour Government that was defeated a little while ago. In New South Wales the maximum is £3 10s. for an adult worker without dependants, and £6 for an adult worker with dependants, or the average weekly earnings if less than £6. There is a minimum of £2 for adults with no dependants. In South Australia, the maximum is £3 for an adult worker with no dependants and £6 for an adult worker with dependants, or the average weekly earnings if less than £6. There is a minimum of £3 for adults. In Queensland the maximum is £5 11s. for an adult worker with dependants and a maximum of £2 7s. for minors with earnings of less than £3 11s. The minimum for adults is £3. In Tasmania the maximum is £6 for an adult worker with dependants, or 90 per cent. of the average weekly earnings, whichever is the less.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The important thing is: What is £4 10s. worth today compared to its value when it was arrived at for the purpose of the Act? The amendment will have the effect of raising the rate for a married man to £6 and leaving the unmarried worker on the rate that he received before. Money has depreciated considerably in value, and if it was right to provide a maximum of £4 10s. previously, the workers are entitled to something more today because of the depreciated value of money. Unless we continue to have the same rate for the single as well as the married man we shall be departing from the principle which we previously accepted. At the moment I am not prepared to support the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

That in paragraph (c) a new subparagraph be inserted as follows:—“(ii) By inserting after the word ‘pounds’ in line 16 the words ‘except when the Board is of opinion, having regard to the circumstances of the case, that such an amount is inadequate, in which event the Board may allow such additional amount as it deems necessary or expedient’.”

I am asking by this amendment that when the board feels it is justified, it may increase the amount of £100 paid as the result of the treatment of an injured worker. I am not worrying much about the medical costs, but about the fact that the hospitals are today carrying the burden of the increasing costs of treatment.

Hon. L. Craig: They are getting 8s. now.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Let me point out what is happening. We have felt for some time that it would be justifiable to divide the £100 in halves and make one half available for the medical expenses and the other for the hospital expenses. That would still cover the majority of cases, but when a man is seriously injured the story is different. In many such instances the hospitals have borne the burden of looking after the men for long periods. It is practically impossible to admit a worker to a large city private hospital except St. John of God. It is not possible for compensation cases to get into other hospitals for the reason that the amount allowed under the Act for hospital treatment of workers cannot cope with the rising costs. Even for the small private hospitals in the city today, the Price Fixing Commissioner has allowed an average minimum charge of £6 6s. a week, and under the present Act it is possible to pay £4 4s. a week only. The result is that St. John of God is the only hospital to which these cases can be taken. Even at that figure, the hospital suffers considerable loss. I have instanced to the Committee previously the amounts lost to this hospital, and I do not think we should expect it to carry on in this way.

It was mentioned by Mr. Craig that the hospitals now receive 8s. a day, and, provided workers' compensation cases are admitted to St. John of God Hospital and taken to the £4 4s. a week ward, then it is possible that the 8s. a day will just meet the present costs. On 6s. a day the result was a loss for the year ended June,

1948, of £83 on the treatment of workers' compensation cases. That takes into account the fact that the Commonwealth paid quite a considerable sum of money, and I think it is quite possible that the institution would have lost about £250 had that payment not been made. Yet these are the lowest fees in the metropolitan area! The time will soon come when the cost of admitting a man to hospital will be greater than it is today.

Many hospitals in the city refuse to take workers' compensation cases because such cases cannot pay the minimum amount allowed and the hospitals will not run the risk of having bad debts. Prior to the Government paying 6s. a day, St. John of God Hospital lost £497 in one year in the treatment of workers' compensation cases. It is possible that after a worker has exhausted his compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act, the doctor and the hospital can sue him for the amount that has not been paid. However, that is seldom done, and I do not know of an instance where any medical man has attempted to make a man who has been seriously injured pay the extra costs involved.

Hon. G. Bennetts: I have never heard of it on the Goldfields.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: No, I do not think it has ever been done. If the amount of £750 paid to a worker is proved inadequate and should be raised to £1,250, then it is obvious that the £100 for treatment should be raised in the same proportion. I admit that the £100 covers the great majority of ordinary cases, but there is the unfortunate man who runs up hospital accounts to an amount greater than is allowed. All we ask is that the board be given power to instance where a man was seriously injured, pay the increased amounts. I can give an instance where a man was seriously injured. He had multiple fractures and was looked after by a medical man for about 13 months. If I remember rightly, the man had a compound fracture of his right arm, a compound fracture and dislocation of the wrist, a fracture of the ankle and a fracture of the leg involving the knee joint. He was treated for 14 months and the doctor, at the end of the time, submitted an account for £57, and the doctor himself had paid for two general anaesthetics. He received in return £33. That is the type of

case in which I believe the board could increase the amounts.

In order to show the Committee how difficult some of these cases can become, I will quote the instance of a man who was, unfortunately, seriously injured. I admit there was considerable doubt later as to whether this man really had a claim for workers' compensation, but the insurance company took the view that the man's claim should be met, and it paid compensation. Difficulty arose because of the fact that after the man had been first attended to he appeared to have recovered, and his first claim was paid on the basis of £84 being distributed, leaving £12 in the general account. Before very long, this man developed a further condition consequent upon his injury and became seriously ill. The total amount used in fees on that occasion came to about £170 and had to be provided pro rata on the basis of £12. The unfortunate physiotherapist who was called upon to pay about 40 visits to the hospital received a cheque for 18s. 8d. as against an account for £20. The hospital, which had an account of £98, received £4 11s. 10d., but I believe some adjustment was afterwards made by the relatives. That proves that in certain circumstances the board should have the right to say that extra money can be paid.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I oppose the amendment, and I should get a lot of support from the advocates of economy. We have heard a lot about extra expenses, and I feel sure that I will get support on this occasion from the representatives of the employers. If the amendment is agreed to, it will mean that the sky is the limit. We have also heard a lot about powers being given to the board, but I do not consider that this power is necessary. I will admit that the Royal Commission did recommend a sum of £150, but the sponsors of the Bill kept it down to £100 in view of the fact that we are so far ahead of the Eastern States. I do not want Dr. Hislop to take any offence at my remarks, but I have known of a few cases—and very few, I am glad to say—where doctors have prolonged the treatment of patients. It has been found that £100 is quite adequate, and I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We must not lose sight of the fact that the

original Act contained provision for £100 and the value of the pound in those days was much higher than it is today, although it is true that hospitals are receiving assistance through social services.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: That balances it.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: It does help a little, but not to any great extent. However, I do not think we should be too miserly about seeing that men get back to good health. Last night the Minister accepted an amendment along these lines to provide that if medical advice were wanted, the £100 could be exceeded, and it seems that we are inconsistent. There is reasonable protection in the principal Act unless the doctors are called upon to render still further service or are required to provide artificial limbs or eyes and so on.

Hon. L. CRAIG: That is extra in the schedule.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I would like the Committee to be consistent. Last night we provided for extra payments and we should be consistent this time.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I support Dr. Hislop in this matter. The amendment is perfectly reasonable and we should take every step to see that the hospitals do not incur losses in treating these cases. In view of the report of the Royal Commission, I expected that the Bill would contain an amendment providing for an increase in medical and hospital fees up to £150. The amendment is merely a matter of ordinary justice.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I have been guided largely by the Royal Commission in this matter and it recommended that the amount should be increased to £150. I have been impressed by the case submitted by Dr. Hislop and it conforms to my own experience. I have known of many instances where the amount allowed under the Act did not cover the cost incurred in dealing with these rather rare cases. The amendment embodies adequate safeguards and should appeal to the Committee.

Amendment put and passed.

[Hon. J. A. Dimmitt resumed the Chair.]

Hon. L. CRAIG: I move an amendment—

That at the end of new subparagraph (ii) the following words be added, "but not exceeding £50."

That will permit the board to allow expenses up to £150, as recommended by the Royal Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not sure that the amendment can be accepted.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I am merely seeking to add words to the subparagraph as amended.

The CHAIRMAN: That can be done only upon recommitment.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I would have moved my amendment earlier but I wanted the Committee to decide the principle first.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot go back.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I am not. We have not agreed to the subparagraphs as amended and I am merely seeking to add words to it.

The CHAIRMAN: Other words have been inserted, and the hon. member cannot go back.

The Honorary Minister for Agriculture: Mr. Craig desires to go forward not backward.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Craig should have moved to the amendment proposed by Dr. Hislop. I rule that the amendment cannot be accepted now but can be dealt with upon recommitment.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I do not think we should accept that ruling, which would mean that we could never amend an amendment. I agree that we cannot go back and move an amendment to a part already agreed to, but Mr. Craig's suggestion is merely to add something to the end of the subparagraph as amended. We shall be in an extraordinary position if the ruling is allowed to stand.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Standing Order 131 reads—

No amendment shall be proposed to be made to any words which the Council has resolved shall not be left out, or which have been inserted in or added to a question, except it be the addition of other words thereto.

I emphasise those last few words—"except it be the addition of other words thereto."

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: And these are additional words.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not familiar with what led up to this point and I shall ask Mr. Fraser, who was in the Chair pre-

viously, to resume control of the Committee and carry on.

[*Hon. G. Fraser took the Chair.*]-

The CHAIRMAN: I understand the amendment is to add additional words to those already inserted. I cannot find the Standing Order which governs the position but the ordinary procedure when words are proposed to be inserted and it is intended to insert others, is to move an amendment on the amendment and then the question is decided as a whole. I rule that the amendment proposed by Mr. Craig is not in order and that it cannot be dealt with in this Committee.

Hon. H. A. C. Daffen: Cannot the clause be re-committed?

The CHAIRMAN: Not now.

Dissent from Chairman's Ruling.

Hon. L. Craig I move—

That the Committee dissent from the Chairman's ruling.

Standing Orders are really based on common-sense. What I did was sound in practice. I could not move my amendment before because I did not know what the Committee intended doing. Having decided that members favoured additional hospital and medical expenses, I wished to ensure that the increase is not excessive, and so I moved the addition of further words. In my opinion, Standing Order 131 covers the position.

The Chairman: Mr. Craig will submit his dissent in writing.

[*The President resumed the Chair.*]

The Chairman having reported the dissent,

Hon. L. Craig: Dr. Hislop moved to insert certain words and, after discussion, they were inserted. The object of the amendment was to increase the amount of money to be allowed for medical and hospital expenses. In order that there should be some limit, instead of giving the board absolute discretion, I moved the words "but not exceeding £50" as an addendum to his amendment. That was before the clause, as amended at the instance of Dr. Hislop, had been put. The Chairman ruled my amendment out of order, and I consider that he was wrong.

Hon. G. Fraser: I based my ruling on what I believe to have been the custom over many years. In the few moments available to me, I have not been able to look up a ruling, but I refer you to Standing Order 134 which reads—

Amendments may be proposed to a proposed amendment as if such proposed amendment were an original question.

I think that was intended as an indication that any proposed amendment on an amendment must be made prior to the amendment being put.

The President: Was any indication given of the proposal to move the addition of the words?

Hon. G. Fraser: None at all.

Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: I draw attention to Standing Order 131 which states—

No amendment shall be proposed to be made to any words which the Council has resolved shall not be left out or which have been inserted in or added to a question, except it be the addition of other words thereto.

Mr. Craig's amendment represented the addition of other words.

The Chief Secretary: Dr. Hislop's amendment was passed, but Mr. Craig proposed an addition, not an amendment. I have always regarded an amendment as an alteration.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: But you can amend a clause by adding to it.

The Chief Secretary: This is not an amendment on an amendment; it is an addition to an amendment. I think the words in Standing Order 131 "except it be the addition of other words thereto" covers the point. Suppose Mr. Craig had moved, "Provided that it shall not exceed the sum of £50," that would not have been an amendment; it would have been an addition to the amendment.

Hon. G. Fraser: Standing Order 128 says it is an amendment.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: So does Standing Order 123.

The Chief Secretary: The words proposed by Mr. Craig are not an amendment on the amendment; they are an addition.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Mr. Craig's proposal was an amendment to limit the amount.

Hon. G. Fraser: All alterations are amendments.

The Chief Secretary: Standing Order 131 contains the words "except it be the addition of other words thereto" and undoubtedly the amendment is an addition of other words thereto.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Standing Order 123 definitely defines what an amendment is. It says—

A question having been proposed may be amended (1) by leaving out certain words only; (2) by inserting or adding certain words; (3) by leaving out certain words and inserting or adding other words.

Mr. Craig proposed to add other words. Standing Order 132 states—

An amendment proposed shall be disposed of before another amendment to the original question is moved.

That is exactly what happened.

The Chief Secretary: What was the original question?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: The marginal note to Standing Order 131 is somewhat misleading because it says, "No amendments to words already agreed to." But the matter had not been finalised. The Committee will be severely restricted, Mr. President, if you rule against Mr. Craig.

The President: The usual procedure is as stated by Mr. Fraser. When an amendment has been incorporated in a Bill, any addition is usually inserted on recommitment, and I think the wisest course to follow would be for Mr. Craig to move for the recommitment of the Bill when the measure is reported and then submit his amendment. That would be a more orderly way of doing business than by trying to bring in the amendment now. Had Mr. Craig moved the addition of the words as an amendment on Dr. Hislop's amendment, he would have overcome the difficulty, but the other words having been incorporated in the Bill, it would be better for Mr. Craig now to proceed by way of recommitment.

Hon. L. Craig: I do not intend to disagree with your ruling, Mr. President, but should like to explain that I did not know how Dr. Hislop's amendment would be received. I was prepared to see it defeated, leaving the amount at £100, and I did not want to commit myself to moving an addition until I knew what was going to happen to his amendment. Had the Committee negatived his amendment, my amendment would have gone also, but the Com-

mittee having decided upon an additional allowance, I thought it desirable to move to limit the amount. I did so before the question "That the clause as amended be agreed to" was put. I thought that was the only time when I could move it. However, I submit to your ruling and will move or recommitment.

Committee Resumed.

Amendment ruled out.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 13—Amendment of Second Schedule:

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Following the amounts of compensation payable shown in the table, are these words,—

and in addition, when a medical practitioner certifies the injury to be total and incurable paralysis of the limbs, an attendant's remuneration at a rate not exceeding one pound per week.

I move an amendment—

That the words "when a medical practitioner certifies the injury to be" be struck out and the words "in the case of" inserted in lieu.

[Hon. J. A. Dimmitt resumed the Chair.]

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: If this amendment is carried there will be no certificate from a medical practitioner at all. If a special allowance is to be made for an attendant for somebody with a total and incurable disease a doctor's certificate should be supplied. If these words are removed what proof will there be that there is total and incurable paralysis?

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It is provided for.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Who is going to certify it?

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: What is the objection to the medical practitioner?

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I do not see that we need one in this case.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I cannot follow the hon. member. This provision says that there must be a medical certificate to the effect that an injury is total and incurable. That is most essential.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I think Mr. Baxter is wrong in moving this amendment. The table sets out the compensation

payable in respect of total and incurable paralysis of the limbs or of mental powers, and then provides that if a certificate is forthcoming from a medical practitioner, an attendant's remuneration of not more than £1 per week shall be payable in addition. If the amendment is carried, there will be no question of a certificate being provided at all, and the man will merely need to say, "I have a total and incurable paralysis," and the amount will be payable.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the table in Clause 13:—

"Total or partial loss of the genital organs.

Such amount, not exceeding £500, as the Board may determine."

This amendment is almost consequential upon a previous amendment that was accepted.

The HONORARY MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not know that the amendment is consequential, but I will accept it.

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

Clauses 14 and 15, postponed Clause 5, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 11.54 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 10th November, 1948.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Chairman (Temporary) of Committees ...	2294
Questions : Road Transport of wheat, as to Commonwealth recoup of cost ...	2288
Meat, as to exports to Malaya ...	2289
Avon River, as to improvements at Northam ...	2289
Railways, (a) as to Perth-Northam service ...	2289
(b) as to lunch hour addresses at workshops ...	2289
Public service, as to junior entrants, examinations, etc. ...	2290
Housing, (a) as to demolition at Victoria Park ...	2290
(b) as to provision of roads... ..	2290
(c) as to contract and day labour building of rental homes ...	2291
Horseshoes, as to shortage of supplies ...	2291
Hall's Creek, as to new townsite ...	2291
Member's questions, as to Press statements forestalling answers ...	2291
Bills : Country Towns Sewerage, 1r. ...	2292
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, 1r. Fairbridge Farm School, 1r. ...	2292
Administration Act Amendment, 2r. ...	2292
Stipendiary Magistrates Act Amendment, Council's requested amendment ...	2292
McNess Housing Trust Act Amendment (No. 2), returned ...	2294
Poultry Industry (Trust Fund), returned Justices Act Amendment, returned ...	2294
Western Australian Trotting Association Act Amendment, 2r. ...	2294
Land Act Amendment, 2r. ...	2294
Electricity Act Amendment, 2r. ...	2294
Mining Act Amendment, 2r. ...	2296
Annual Estimates : Com. of Supply, Votes and items discussed, dissent from Chairman's ruling, Speaker's ruling... ..	2299

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

QUESTIONS.

ROAD TRANSPORT OF WHEAT.

As to Commonwealth Recoup of Cost.

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister for Transport:

Following upon his reply to Question No. 5, as given on the 4th November, 1948, wherein he stated that should road haulage