

£9,000 per annum. The Lotteries Commission was generous to the same extent as the Government, but the remaining income had to be raised by public donations.

I would suggest a form of per capita subsidy—there are at most 25 inmates there at the moment—so that those responsible for the conduct of this institution can carry on with the work untroubled by financial worries.

I know it is the policy of this Government to help those who cannot help themselves, and this type of child certainly comes into this category. I therefore commend my suggestion to the Government.

Finally, I would like to thank the members of this House for the great consideration they have shown me on this my maiden speech.

On motion by Mr. O'Neil, debate adjourned.

### *Decorum of the House*

**THE SPEAKER:** There has been too much movement in this Chamber as soon as the Sergeant-at-Arms picks up the mace. The decorum of the House requires that members remain in their seats while the Speaker is in the Chair.

*House adjourned at 9.21 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 9th July, 1959.

### CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| <b>CROSSWALKS :</b>   |      |
| Disallowance of Regulation 231 ....   | 258  |
| <b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :</b>  |      |
| Cement—   |      |
| Establishment of industry at Coogee ....                                      | 267  |
| Selling price per ton ....  | 267  |
| Public Works Department, day labour in the North ....                         | 267  |
| Fremantle Gaol, number and maintenance of prisoners ....                      | 268  |
| "C" Class hospitals, number in metropolitan area, etc. ....                   | 268  |
| Public relations officer, tabling of agreement and papers re appointment .... | 268  |
| Western Australian goods, trade display ship ....                             | 268  |
| Native welfare, Commonwealth special grant ....                               | 268  |
| Coode-st. jetty, repairs ....   | 269  |

### CONTENTS—continued.

#### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—continued.

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Coal committee, investigation of W.A. resources ....   | 269  |
| Wittenoom water supply, details of investigations ....   | 269  |
| Albany gaol, increased accommodation ....  | 269  |
| War Service Homes Act, extension of benefits ....  | 269  |
| Locomotive staff, increase at Armadale and Southern Cross ....   | 270  |
| Albany police station, modernisation ....  | 270  |
| North-West homes, rentals charged by Commission ....   | 270  |
| Wyndham water supply, plans for provision ....   | 270  |
| Brown's Lake, drainage ....  | 271  |
| Osborne Park hospital, commencement, cost, etc. ....   | 271  |
| State Trading Concerns, principles for sale Metric system, use in hospitals ....                           | 271  |
| Black Rocks deep-water port, report by consultant ....   | 272  |
| Ants in "CHARON," identification and destruction ....  | 272  |
| Public offices, cleaning by private concerns Election advertising, use of State funds by Labour Party .... | 272  |
| Level crossings, opening at East Perth ....  | 272  |
| C.I.B. officers, presence at Parliament House ....   | 273  |

#### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE :

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Proprietary mine spur line, tabling of file                      | 273      |
| State trading concerns—sale, and protection of employees ....    | 273      |
| Laverton to Alice Springs, construction of national highway .... | 273      |
| Rural and Industries Bank—                                       |          |
| Cost of building ....  | 273      |
| Tabling of contract ....   | 274      |
| Betting inquiry, source of finance                               | 274      |
| Mills and Wares Ltd., dismissal of employees ....                | 274, 276 |
| C.I.B. Officers—   |          |
| Presence at Parliament House ....                                | 274      |
| Authority to enter Chamber ....                                  | 274      |
| Fibrous plasterers, tabling of information                       | 275      |
| High schools, comparative attendances, etc. ....                 | 275      |
| Election advertising, tabling of papers ....                     | 275      |
| Railway employees, retrenchments at Leighton ....                | 275      |
| Walcott-st. trolley-bus service, date of commencement ....       | 275      |
| Governmental undertakings, transfer to private concerns ....     | 275      |
| North-West homes, concession to occupants                        | 276      |

#### RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK :

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Contract for electrical installations .... | 276 |
|--|-----|

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY, FIFTH DAY

|                             |     |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| <b>Speakers on Address—</b> |     |
| Mr. O'Neil ....             | 277 |
| Mr. Brady ....              | 279 |
| Mr. Hall ....               | 285 |

#### ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL

The **SPEAKER** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

## CROSSWALKS

### *Disallowance of Regulation 231*

Mr. GRAHAM (East Perth) [2.18]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the member for East Perth to move forthwith, the motion standing in his name on the notice paper regarding the disallowance of new Regulation 231 made under the Traffic Act, and for the same to be dealt with by the House before the Address-in-reply is adopted.

I am forced into taking this action. This new Regulation 231 was laid upon the Table of the House on Wednesday of last week, the first sitting day of this Parliament apart from the formal opening day. Within a few moments of the regulation being laid upon the Table of the House I gave notice of my intention to move that it be disallowed. On the following day—that is, Thursday of last week—I gave notice of my intention to move that so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as was necessary to enable this matter to be debated forthwith.

On checking the notice paper immediately thereafter it was apparent to me that my second motion could not be considered as the arrangement of the notice paper was in the hands of the Premier. Therefore my appeal would have to be made to the members of this House. I spoke to the Premier on Tuesday last and asked him if he would be good enough to allow this matter to be dealt with as a matter of urgency because it is causing considerable public concern. The Premier—he was quite entitled to react as he did—refused to grant me that concession.

In the light of the circumstances, which were fair and reasonable, I decided to allow the debate on the amendment to the Address-in-reply to be concluded before I made any further move.

The Government intends that Parliament shall not sit next week, and if this matter is not debated and resolved today, it cannot be discussed, at the earliest, until 12 days from now and possibly for several weeks after that; that is, if the Government intends to wait until the debate on the Address-in-reply has terminated.

Even this afternoon the Attorney-General has given notice that he will move for the suspension of so much of the Standing Orders as is necessary to enable a further measure to be dealt with in a manner similar to that adopted when a previous Bill was discussed before this House only recently. If this practice continues, there could be considerable delay before my motion is dealt with; and it is a matter which is exercising the minds of the public because it is causing danger to life and limb in the opinion of many people. I therefore think it is a fair and reasonable proposition that this question should be

resolved as soon as possible so that the doubts in the minds of members of the public can be swept away.

At the present moment—and this gives point to my assertion that there is an urgency and a necessity for this matter to be dealt with—there is uncertainty on the part of both the motorist and the pedestrian; and as the consequences of that uncertainty can be either death or serious injury, surely we should apply ourselves to this matter at the earliest possible moment. Accordingly, I think it would be criminal for us that, because of a technicality—that is to say, the procedure of the House—or because the Premier feels he would prefer that private members, or Opposition members, should not encroach upon the preserves of the Government—we should allow time to pass without doing anything in connection with it. I emphasise the point that, at the present moment, many people are experiencing a sense of real fear.

### *Speaker's Ruling*

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand that the hon. member is endeavouring to have the motion standing in his name, as No. 7 on the notice paper, given priority over all other notices of motion.

Mr. GRAHAM: With this correction, Mr. Speaker: I have placed it on the notice paper with a view to moving it when the order of the day is called. But as it appears that that is some time distant, or is likely to be, I am now forced into the position of moving without notice.

The SPEAKER: What it really amounts to is that the member for East Perth is endeavouring to anticipate notice of motion No. 7 on today's notice paper. I can sympathise with the hon. member's desire to bring this matter speedily before the House; but unfortunately the rules of the House, supported by May's *Parliamentary Practice*, do not allow any such anticipation. The only course that is open to the member for East Perth is that which he has already taken; namely, to endeavour to arrange this matter with the Leader of the House; or else he could ventilate the matter—though perhaps not so satisfactorily to himself—by a motion for the adjournment of the House; or by debating the adjournment.

But unfortunately the time-honoured procedure is such that I cannot permit this motion to be debated without notice. I am, however, in the hands of the House, and the matter must rest there. I must rule this motion without notice out of order, as it already appears on the notice paper.

### *Points of Order*

Mr. GRAHAM: I am now seeking information, Mr. Speaker. Nobody knows whether the member for East Perth will proceed with the matter which is listed

on the notice paper. He may, or he may not. The fact at the moment is that the member for East Perth is moving to suspend Standing Orders for a certain purpose. I would like you, Sir, to advise me how it was possible for the Premier to move for the suspension of Standing Orders to enable him to deal with a certain matter; and this afternoon the Attorney-General has given notice of his intention to do exactly that.

No doubt it will be debated next time we meet. As you are aware, Sir, these things can be done on notice when a simple majority is necessary; but Standing Orders can, I understand, be suspended at any time on a motion being moved, and being agreed to, by an absolute majority of members. I emphasise I am not moving the resolution that is on the notice paper; I am submitting a resolution, without notice, to suspend Standing Orders, and I cannot appreciate the difference in the two circumstances. I was wondering whether you had taken the point I had outlined; and if so, whether you can explain the essential difference.

The SPEAKER: It appears to me that the member for East Perth—at least from the trend of his remarks—wishes to debate this question of Regulation 231, of which he has given notice. From the trend of his remarks it would seem to me that it is his intention now to debate, without notice, the question of whether that regulation should be disallowed or not. That is my assumption from the trend of the hon. member's remarks.

In other words, the hon. member is endeavouring to anticipate notice of motion No. 7 on today's notice paper. I feel that under the rules of the House I cannot permit that. As I mentioned earlier, however, I am now in the hands of the House; and of course it is competent for the House to make its own decision as to whether it will uphold my ruling or not. I have made that ruling and will leave the matter there.

Mr. HAWKE: Might I seek some guidance in this matter, Sir? Would the member for East Perth, after questions with notice, and without notice, are disposed of, be in order in moving that Orders of the Day and notices of motion Nos. 1 to 7 inclusive, be postponed till after consideration of notice of motion No. 8?

The SPEAKER: Yes, I think that would probably be a better way out of it, because it would then be left for the House to decide. If I permitted this motion to continue, there would be little point in having an order of priority at all on the notice paper.

#### *Dissent from Speaker's Ruling*

Mr. GRAHAM: I feel I have no alternative, Sir, but to move—

That the House dissent from the Speaker's ruling.

I appreciate that you have indicated to the Leader of the Opposition that some other steps might be taken; and therefore I might, if I desire, proceed by following another course.

What I am concerned about are the rights of members as a general principle, forgetting all about this particular incident. You, Sir, are now virtually maintaining a procedure under which nobody, not even the Government, can move for the suspension of Standing Orders without giving notice. Whilst I have not my copy of the Standing Orders before me to refresh my mind, my memory suggests to me that there is a special provision in the Standing Orders—

Mr. Rowberry: In Standing Order No. 418.

Mr. GRAHAM: —to allow a member, at any time, to seek suspension of Standing Orders, by submitting the matter to the will of the House, in order to determine whether a particular matter may be dealt with forthwith. Standing Order No. 418 states—

In cases of urgent necessity, any Standing Order or Orders of the House may be suspended on Motion duly made and seconded without notice provided that such Motion has the concurrence of an absolute majority of the whole Members of the Legislative Assembly.

I have moved under the provisions of that Standing Order. I was proceeding to give reasons why this matter was urgent. At that stage I was interrupted by you, Mr. Speaker. From the ruling you gave, you are virtually saying that, notwithstanding Standing Order No. 418, members cannot avail themselves of its provisions. On any future occasion, no doubt, the ruling given by yourself will be accepted, because the rulings of Speakers become our local May's *Parliamentary Practice*. Therefore, the right of members, whether ministerial or private, would be lost, if the House did not successfully challenge the ruling which you have given.

I repeat that this has nothing whatsoever to do with the matter I am endeavouring to foster or promote. It is a move to maintain a privilege which has been in existence for probably as long as there have been Standing Orders in the Western Australian Parliament. Surely you can envisage many circumstances under which, in an hour of crisis, there arises some serious matter which should secure the immediate attention of the House. In fact, all the members might be unanimously in favour of a certain matter being dealt with immediately; yet in your ruling you are suggesting, if I understand you correctly, such a course could not be followed.

My concluding remarks are these: I do regret that so early in your career as Speaker of the Legislative Assembly one of your rulings should be challenged. I am hopeful that, in the interests of principle, rather than on any particular matter, the majority of members in this Chamber will agree with me.

The SPEAKER: Personally I would assure the member for East Perth that I bear no resentment at all at his challenging my ruling. I realise it is one of the two ways out which have been suggested. However, I would correct one point taken up by the hon. member. I am not objecting to the suspension of Standing Orders without notice; that is clearly provided for in Standing Order No. 418. What I am objecting to is the principle of moving the suspension of Standing Orders to enable a matter, of which the hon. member has already given notice, to be dealt with immediately.

If that were a matter of great urgency, and he had given no notice, I think he would have been in order in proceeding under Standing Order No. 418. In view of the fact that he has already given notice, and that the matter is for the House to decide in the normal way under the notice paper, I feel that the normal procedure cannot be upset.

I was in error this afternoon when I referred to notice of motion No. 7; it should, of course, have been No. 8. No doubt the member for East Perth will not take up that point. My ruling is not an objection to the suspension of Standing Orders without notice. This move is an endeavour to enable a matter, of which the hon. member has given notice, to be dealt with ahead of the other items on the notice paper.

Mr. GRAHAM: Can I ask you, Mr. Speaker, a question in connection with this matter? What is your authority for believing that, because a matter is on the notice paper which might or might not be subsequently proceeded with, I am precluded from moving something which is the same in substance or in fact?

The SPEAKER: I have taken advice on this matter. I am assured that May's *Parliamentary Practice* rules in that direction.

Mr. BRAND: I support your ruling, Mr. Speaker. It is true that the member for East Perth did approach me and asked for some consideration in respect of moving the suspension of Standing Orders, in order that he might ultimately move his motion. I indicated to him that I did not agree, firstly, for the simple reason that if this concession were granted to the hon. member to move for the suspension of Standing Orders, then the Government would have to consider favourably the request of every private member to suspend the Standing Orders, in order that private

business might have some precedence over Government business, before the Address-in-reply had been completed.

This House has already decided that Government business shall take precedence, except during certain days specified, and Thursday (today) is not one of them. Standing Order No. 36 states—

No business beyond what is of a formal character shall be entered upon before the Address-in-reply to the Governor's Opening Speech has been adopted.

Mr. Graham: That was what I wanted—to suspend that Standing Order.

Mr. BRAND: If the member for East Perth is to be permitted to move his motion, he will, in fact, be permitted to move for private business to be dealt with ahead of Government business. It is not the intention of the Government to allow that concession at the present. I informed the member for East Perth that I did not think it was fair to set such a precedent, and that I did not consider the matter before the Chair and contained in this motion was one of urgency.

Mr. TONKIN: I regret that I have to disagree with your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I think it is obvious that when you gave your ruling you were unaware of the existence of Standing Order No. 418. That is perfectly clear. I myself was unaware of its existence, as were most of the members, and you were one of them. You believed that, when you were ruling, there was no Standing Order to cover the position which the member for East Perth sought to establish.

In an endeavour to support the ruling, which in my opinion you erroneously gave, you said that the reason was that the matter was already on the notice paper; and that being so, it could not be regarded as a matter of urgency. Surely you can appreciate that a matter which is placed on the notice paper one day as being just of ordinary urgency, can become a week later much more urgent than it was when first placed on the notice paper.

Are you going to suggest that the mere fact that it has been placed on the notice paper absolutely precludes any discussion on a matter which might have become so urgent in the meantime as to be vital? The member for East Perth had no other course open to him when he gave notice of his intention to move the suspension of Standing Orders in the way he did; and that is how it got on the notice paper. To penalise him now for having acted so quickly is, to my way of thinking, completely illogical. The Government proposes to adjourn the House next week for a full week, which will further delay the consideration of this motion.

Then, it may be that the Address-in-reply will continue for further weeks when we may have another adjournment. In

the meantime, the matter which the member for East Perth considers is of considerable public importance and urgency is delayed on your ruling, simply because he put it on the notice paper. That, to me, does not hold water at all. If a matter is urgent, it is urgent in fact; and the putting of it on the notice paper does not make it any less urgent. I submit you would have a hard job to find any authority to substantiate the viewpoint that this matter could have been raised in the ordinary way this afternoon if the member for East Perth had not placed it on the notice paper; but the placing of it on the notice paper precludes such a course of action.

Mr. Brand: What was the course followed by private members in the past for dealing with matters of urgency?

Mr. TONKIN: A suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr. Watts: Never!

Mr. TONKIN: I have seen that happen here a number of times by members standing up in their place.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Not this way.

Mr. TONKIN: There is no other way, because the member for East Perth, to start with, gave notice of his intention to suspend Standing Orders, and you have ruled that, because he gave notice, he cannot use Standing Order No. 418. That seems to me to be absolutely illogical. In other words, you are saying that if the member for East Perth had sat pat and had not given notice of his intention to move to suspend Standing Orders, it would have been competent for him to stand up and use Standing Order No. 418. However, because he gave notice to move the suspension of Standing Orders, he can no longer do that. It makes no sense to me; and if that is the position, then the sooner that Standing Order is altered the better.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Is it any more urgent now than it was when it was first placed on the notice paper?

Mr. TONKIN: It is obvious that the Minister does not regard this as a matter of urgency at all.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I am asking you.

Mr. TONKIN: What?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Whether it is urgent.

Mr. TONKIN: I never heard your question and I cannot answer a question I have never heard.

Mr. Hawke: The Minister for Health is always mumbling.

Mr. TONKIN: Standing Order No. 181 has just been brought to my notice, and it reads as follows:—

No Question shall be proposed which is the same in substance as any Question which, during the same Session, has been resolved in the affirmative or negative.

Mr. Graham: Yes, resolved.

Mr. TONKIN: Apparently that is the Standing Order to which you are making some reference in your ruling. It seems to me to be completely illogical and ridiculous to say that a Standing Order specifically put here for the purpose of enabling a matter of urgency to be dealt with is overridden simply because a member gave notice some time before of his intention to so move.

Mr. Brand: Simply because he says it is urgent.

Mr. TONKIN: Because the member for East Perth gave notice some days ago of his intention to suspend Standing Orders, the Speaker gave a ruling that Standing Order No. 418 could not be invoked. I suggest it is ridiculous, because Standing Order 418 was put here to deal with cases of urgent necessity so the House could be tested on the question of urgent necessity. By your ruling you are preventing the House from making a determination on the very question. Why? Simply because, a week ago, the member for East Perth gave notice of his intention to move for the suspension of Standing Orders. If that makes commonsense there must have been something wrong with my reasoning years ago.

Mr. Brand: It takes its place on the notice paper.

Mr. TONKIN: It is on the notice paper.

Mr. Brand: It takes its turn.

Mr. TONKIN: If it is intended that this Standing Order can be used only in cases where prior notice has never been given, I think the Standing Order should be amended to make it plain that that is so. I cannot accept that that is the position. In part, the Standing Order states—

In cases of urgent necessity.

Surely your duty in this House is to put the House in a position of determining whether a matter is one of urgent necessity or not. It is not for you to decide the question that it is not of urgent necessity because it was put on the notice paper some time before. I submit to you that a matter placed on the notice paper in the ordinary course a week ago may, because of subsequent developments, become so urgent as to merit immediate consideration. Suppose that because of this regulation, some person lost his life yesterday.

Mr. Brand: We will have complete chaos.

Mr. TONKIN: Supposing there had been a serious accident on a crosswalk yesterday, subsequent to the giving of notice for the suspension of this Standing Order, and we all felt, as a result, that it was a matter of urgent necessity to have this regulation altered, what would you then rule? That the fact that notice had previously been given to deal with this matter would preclude the House from dealing with it as a matter of urgent necessity?

I submit that so to rule would be most illogical and ridiculous. Because of that, I support the member for East Perth in his desire to suspend Standing Orders; and I disagree with your ruling.

Mr. BOVELL: I desire to support your ruling. If this sort of thing were to happen each sitting day, the business of the House would be delayed.

Mr. Hawke: What nonsense!

Mr. Graham: It is up to the House to reject the motion.

Mr. BOVELL: There is a procedure whereby this matter can be dealt with, and it has been raised by the Leader of the Opposition. If, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has stated, circumstances have arisen since the placing of this motion on the notice paper so as to make it urgent, a member could rise in his place at the appropriate time and move that "Item No. so-and-so be now taken". If we agreed to the procedure desired by the member for East Perth, we would never conduct the business of the House in a proper way.

Mr. Tonkin: You are suggesting this is not an urgent matter.

Mr. BOVELL: I am not suggesting anything of the kind. I am suggesting that Standing Orders provide a correct procedure if there is an urgent need for this matter to be dealt with. The Leader of the Opposition has suggested the procedure to take the business of the House out of the Government's hands if the member for East Perth so desires.

Mr. Graham: I do not want to attempt that.

Mr. Brand: You made a long speech about suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr. BOVELL: If the procedure suggested by the member for East Perth were allowed to continue, the business of this House would not be conducted in the manner which the Government desires.

Mr. Graham: You would vote against my motion, and now you are trying to stop me from moving the suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr. BOVELL: I am not. I uphold your ruling, Sir. I believe there is a way of dealing with matters of urgency once they have been placed on the notice paper, and the Leader of the Opposition has suggested that way. In my 12 years' experience in this House there has never been a move similar to this one.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister for Lands cancels out his first argument with his second, so his contribution is nil. I support the disagreement on the ground that your ruling, Sir, if upheld, would penalise or could penalise the member who had given notice, against the member who had not given notice. For instance, if the member for East Perth in connection with this matter had not given any prior notice,

then I understand, from your present ruling, that he would have been entitled to stand up in his place this afternoon and move for the suspension of Standing Orders to discuss a particular subject.

What the member for East Perth did do, as soon as the opportunity offered after Parliament met, was to place upon the notice paper a subject which he considered then to be urgent and which he was anxious to have discussed and decided as early as possible. Since the day on which he took that action, the subject-matter with which his action then dealt has become much more urgent. Consequently, he now desires to bring his subject forward in the House for discussion earlier than it would come before the House if he relied upon the normal processes of House procedure.

The Premier in the few words which he had to say, put forward the claim that the business of the House could become chaotic if a move such as the member for East Perth is now trying to achieve, were to succeed. I question very much the Premier's claim in that direction. After all is said and done, this House of Parliament is not a Government-run bureaucracy; it is a deliberative assembly.

Mr. Brand: It was for the last six years.

Mr. HAWKE: For the sake of not taking much notice of a silly interjection like that, we will let it pass.

Mr. Brand: Skip the facts, you mean.

Mr. HAWKE: I am saying that this is a deliberative assembly in which there are, including yourself, Sir, as Speaker, 50 members who were elected by their respective districts to be representatives of the people in Parliament.

Therefore, it is surely within the province of members to decide upon such motions as may be moved from time to time, and determine what is to be the procedure, and which subjects are to be dealt with ahead of other subjects. The Premier, in fact, said that private members' business was not to have any precedence over Government members' business except on the day which will be prescribed in due course, and which is Wednesday in each week.

Mr. Brand: And except for other channels which are open to them, and which we had to follow.

Mr. HAWKE: I say that priority of discussion and decision in this House should be related directly to the urgency of the matter irrespective of whether it is submitted by a Government member or private member on either side of the House.

Mr. Bovell: Who decides the urgency?

Mr. HAWKE: Here is the Minister for Lands asking who decides the order of precedence. For the benefit of his junior mind, or junior mentality, I would say that members of this House would finally

decide, after you, Sir, had given such guidance as you considered appropriate to any particular situation. This subject with which the member for East Perth wishes to deal urgently is, I think, a subject which—all members will agree—is associated with human life and the safety of human life on the crosswalks in the metropolitan area. In more recent times I have been having a look at the crosswalks, and at what goes on at the crosswalks.

### *Point of Order*

Mr. **OLDFIELD**: On a point of order, Sir, are we debating your ruling or the subject matter of the motion?

The **SPEAKER**: The member for Mt. Lawley has raised a very pertinent question. I was just on the point of bringing the Leader of the Opposition back to the question before the House; and that is, whether my ruling should be disagreed with.

Mr. **HAWKE**: I merely raised the matter to illustrate the urgency of the question. I am saying that this move by the member for East Perth is justified because of the urgency of the situation which has developed.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The question of urgency is not before the House at the moment. The question is whether or not my ruling is in accordance with Standing Orders; that is, whether the member for East Perth has the right to proceed under Standing Order 418.

Mr. **HAWKE**: I simply emphasise that human life is involved and endangered because of the situation with which the member for East Perth is seeking to deal. Therefore, the matter is extremely urgent and is becoming more urgent every hour.

### *Debate on Dissent Resumed*

Mr. **HAWKE**: To come back to the point I made at the beginning; your ruling, if upheld, would penalise a member who had given prior notice of intention to move along a particular line against a member who had given no notice whatever. It seems to me that a member who has followed Standing Orders and given notice should not be prejudiced because of having taken action in that direction.

Mr. **OLDFIELD**: It appears from the speeches made by members of the Opposition and members of the Government that they are deciding the issue before the House not on the merits of the Standing Orders but on what is to follow if your ruling, Sir, is disagreed with. The Minister for Lands gave as his reasons for supporting your ruling that the Opposition was employing delaying tactics. That can be done without notice. There is nothing to stop one member after another moving the suspension of Standing

Orders without notice, and that can be permitted. Therefore, I believe that destroys any argument raised by the Minister for Lands.

We are dealing entirely with Standing Order 418, and it states quite clearly that any member has the right to move the suspension of Standing Orders with or without notice. Standing Order 419 qualifies the position inasmuch as it states that if they are suspended with notice, a simple majority is required; whereas, if they are suspended without notice, an absolute majority is necessary.

I believe that the issue now before the House is one which we must firmly establish because it will be taken as a precedent in future cases. The issue is whether we are going to be allowed to use the privileges afforded us under Standing Orders. It is an issue which should not be decided on party lines and it is not whether or not we want this afternoon to have the suspension of Standing Orders or whether we want to deal with the motion which would follow. Members' rights should be established and we should know our situation under Standing Orders. When that has been decided we can refer to party politics and discuss the motion.

But at least give the hon. member the right to move his motion, even if it is eventually disagreed with. In other words, we should adopt the attitude of Voltaire who said that it did not matter how much he disagreed with what a man was saying, but he would fight to the death for his right to say it.

Mr. **WATTS**: I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is a great deal of confusion in the minds of certain hon. members—including the one who has just resumed his seat—in regard to this matter. Let us look back over the history of this Legislative Assembly for a few years. Some of us have been here for a considerable time, including the Leader of the Opposition, his deputy, and I. I think it will be found that in all that time, with the exception of a few occasional measures brought down by the Government, in the case of which the House consented to suspend Standing Orders, only the Supply Bill, at the appropriate time if it comes on during the Address-in-reply debate, has taken precedence.

Those are the only matters that have been dealt with in the manner that is now suggested. I have given notice of motion, on the opening day of a session, not only to disallow regulations but to do other things as well, and it has been the undoubted custom in this House that one has not been given a chance to debate such motions until the Address-in-reply has been adopted.

Mr. **Graham**: Then you didn't take advantage of your chance.

Mr. WATTS: One did not get a chance. If it had been suggested to previous Speakers, during the period I have referred to, one would have been told that one could not do it.

Mr. Heal: Bills were debated and passed before the adoption of the Address-in-reply last year.

Mr. WATTS: Simply because the Standing Orders were set aside for the purpose. It is sometimes done in the case of a Supply Bill, and sometimes in the case of certain other Bills.

Mr. Heal: Ordinary Bills.

Mr. WATTS: As I say, at times in the case of other Bills—ordinary Bills; and I suggest that very few extraordinary Bills come here.

Mr. Tonkin: We had one last week.

Mr. WATTS: That was not extraordinary, but very desirable. That has been the position, and every member knows it. A proposition such as has been put forward by the member for East Perth has, in the 22 or 23 years that I have been here, been unheard of; and I suggest it is not supported by Standing Orders; because except for Standing Order No. 418, to which so much reference has been made, there is no Standing Order anywhere—

Mr. Tonkin: But you want only one!

Mr. WATTS: Will the hon. member allow me to pursue my theme, as I allowed him to pursue his?

Mr. Tonkin: Provided you deal with the Standing Order.

Mr. WATTS: The member for Melville appears to be somewhat concerned that I was not dealing with the Standing Order, but at the stage I had reached I was about to deal with no less than three Standing Orders; and if the hon. member had not interrupted me I would have been well on my way by now.

Mr. Hawke: You are.

Mr. WATTS: Standing Order No. 418, in my opinion—and I think the right opinion—does not govern this matter at all; because, first of all, as has been quoted to the House, Standing Order No. 36 says—

No business beyond what is of a formal character shall be entered upon before the Address-in-reply to the Governor's opening Speech has been adopted.

Standing Order No. 212 says—

No member shall make any motion, initiating a subject for discussion, but in pursuance of notice openly given at a previous sitting of the House and duly entered on the notice paper.

That is exactly what you, Mr. Speaker, have been telling the member for East Perth.

Mr. Graham: It is because of these things that I have moved to suspend Standing Orders.

Mr. WATTS: The hon. member does not need to suspend Standing Orders, as the Speaker said; but if he can get the agreement of the House he will be a darned sight better off than he is in trying to suspend Standing Orders.

Mr. Graham: You are trying to get me to move virtually a motion of no confidence.

Mr. WATTS: The hon. member was told that he could not now start off with another motion, and I think that is a reasonable interpretation of what the Speaker said. The situation is, therefore, that the Speaker's ruling is undoubtedly correct. There can be no argument about it. I am sure. The Speaker has done what is perfectly right; and, what is more, he has been more generous, if I might be permitted to say so, than has been the practice in this House for the past 20 years, when private members have been properly and completely muzzled until the Address-in-reply has been adopted; and so, so far as I am concerned, I support your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that you know as much as—if not more than—I do about Standing Orders, but I believe that on this occasion you have made a slight mistake. Despite what the Deputy Premier has tried to inform the House, I think he has simply quoted Standing Orders and has not pointed out that there are certain Standing Orders specifically written into the rules of debate for the purpose of dealing with emergencies.

Mr. Tonkin: He dodged that one.

Mr. Watts: I did not.

Mr. Tonkin: You dodged it.

Mr. Watts: If I did, I followed the member for Melville.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The Deputy Premier conveniently forgot to follow up the purport and implications of certain Standing Orders. If the member for East Perth desires to secure debate on his motion earlier than he anticipated, the Standing Orders provide that only a simple majority is necessary; but what does Standing Order 418 provide? It provides something entirely different, and that is an absolute majority of members of the House. The Deputy Premier did not make any reference to that, but simply quoted that Standing Order No. 212 provides that no business shall be brought before the House other than in a formal way—that is by giving notice. But what is Standing Order No. 418 for? Just for adornment, or to meet certain emergencies? Obviously Standing Order No. 418 is there to deal with emergencies or special circumstances as they may arise.



Let us now deal with the other point on which I think you were in error, Mr. Speaker. You definitely stated that because in this case the member for East Perth had placed a certain matter on the notice paper, that precluded him or restricted him from taking any further action in this House until the appropriate Order of the Day was called by the Clerk of the House.

Standing Order No. 181 provides that the subject matter of a resolution, once having been dealt with during a session cannot be reintroduced. We have not reached that stage; the only stage reached by the member for East Perth is that the question has been placed on the notice paper. But he has very strong reasons, as probably other members of this House have, to believe that the subject matter of the motion he wants to deal with this afternoon is of sufficient urgency as to warrant Standing Orders being suspended.

I think the remarks of the Minister for Lands and the Premier were entirely uncalled for. They have suggested that if this motion is carried the business of the Government will be taken out of the Government's hands. In this case, as in every other case, the decision will rest with members of the House and not the members on one side or the other. The whole question that arises is whether it is a matter of urgency. The member for East Perth believes it is and so he has moved to disagree with the Speaker's ruling. In that regard I think he is quite in order and I very much regret having to disagree with the ruling you have given, Mr. Speaker. However, in the circumstances, I hope the motion to disagree with your ruling will be carried.

Mr. ROWBERRY: As a young member in this House, I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that I must disagree with your ruling on Standing Order No. 418.

The SPEAKER: I did not give my ruling on Standing Order No. 418.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I wish to give my reasons for upholding Standing Order No. 418. This Standing Order is part of our general Standing Orders and should be adhered to. It determines whether we, as the elected representatives of the people of Western Australia, shall have the right to stand up in our places and bring forward something which we consider is a matter of urgency. What the member for East Perth wishes to discuss concerns the safety of the people of Western Australia; and that is more important than any Government. The Government, as elected, is merely incidental to the business of the House. We have the inherent right of free speech and if we consider something is urgent we should be able to discuss it immediately. I am afraid I must disagree with your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

### *Point of Order*

Mr. GRAHAM: I understand I have the right of reply, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: No, there is no right of reply.

Mr. GRAHAM: Where did you drag that from, may I ask, quite respectfully? I refer you to Standing Order 122.

The SPEAKER: Standing Order 122 reads:—

A reply shall be allowed to a member who has made a substantive motion to the House . . .

Mr. GRAHAM: That is precisely what I have done.

The SPEAKER: This is a procedural motion because it deals with a matter of procedure. I do not wish to muzzle debate, but I would like to point out that some members would appear to be under the impression that my ruling will lead to the prevention of the member for East Perth treating this as a matter of urgency. Already the Leader of the Opposition has suggested how the matter could be dealt with this afternoon; therefore the suggestion that my ruling will prevent the matter from being dealt with as one of urgency is erroneous. I do not know whether the member for East Perth has anything further to say, but I cannot allow him to reply to the debate.

Mr. GRAHAM: I want some guidance here, Mr. Speaker. I want to move to disagree with the ruling you have just given on my right of reply. In order that you will appreciate what I am driving at, I want to submit this to you: Because the Clerk of the Assembly cares to put an adjective to the word "motion", that does not make it conform or not conform with the Standing Orders. After all, every motion before the Chair is a substantive motion as distinct from an amendment. A substantive motion can be called a procedural motion, a financial motion, a constitutional motion, or anything at all; but that does not interfere with the motion itself. A substantive motion is a substantive motion, and I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, to ponder on the point I have raised.

Mr. Brand: Has not this matter been debated? You, Mr. Speaker, have decided that there is no right of reply.

Mr. Tonkin: No.

Mr. Brand: If there is no right of reply, how does the member for East Perth have a second go?

Mr. Hawke: He is on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: He is raising a point of order.

Mr. GRAHAM: Without proceeding any further, I think I have made my point pretty clear.

Mr. BOVELL: I would like to know whether the member for East Perth is raising a further disagreement with your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Graham: Yes.

Mr. BOVELL: Then I would say the hon. member is not in order until the previous matter has been dealt with.

Mr. W. Hegney: It would be too late then.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the Minister for Lands had not jumped up, I would have submitted my proposition. I want to know at what stage I move to disagree with this recent ruling of yours, Mr. Speaker. I think it is fatuous to follow the line of thought of the Minister for Lands, because if you deny me the right of reply, and subsequently the House disagrees with your decision to do that, it is too late. The position will have been resolved and I will not have had the right of reply.

Mr. Bovell: Then why don't you raise a point of order?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am raising a point of order. I want to know when I should move to disagree with the Speaker's recent ruling.

Mr. Watts: Answer me this one: How can you have two motions before the Chair at the one time?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am without my book at this stage, but I think a point of order can be taken at any time.

Mr. Watts: A point of order, but not a disagreement. You wanted a motion to disagree.

Mr. GRAHAM: Before the Minister for Lands interrupted me, I was about to put the question to the Speaker. I disagree with his interpretation—I feel it is totally wrong because there is nothing to substantiate it—that the mover of a substantive motion—and that is what I submitted—has no right of reply. In order to protect our rights—if we have any rights left by the time we finish this debate—at what stage can I move to disagree with your recent ruling, Mr. Speaker, on the matter of a right of reply? I ask that because I intend to contest the ruling you have just given.

The SPEAKER: The member for East Perth has sought guidance on the question as to whether he can further disagree with the ruling I have just given. As I understand the position, there is already one motion before the Chair to disagree with my ruling, and now the hon. member has raised a point of order on a further ruling. My contention is that we can have only one motion before the Chair at any one time in view of the fact that it is a motion to disagree with the Speaker's ruling; if that were not so, the debate could proceed indefinitely. I think the question could well be dealt with by the Standing Orders Committee as a couple of other matters have been raised as well.

Mr. GRAHAM: But what is to happen in the meantime?

The SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member has the right to submit another motion before the first one has been dealt with.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would you care to consult with your advisers on that point, Mr. Speaker, because it is extremely important that it should be resolved? If you decide to do that they could possibly refer to various authorities on the question.

The SPEAKER: I am prepared to suspend the sitting until the ringing of the bells so that we may obtain further advice on the matter.

*Sitting suspended from 3.21 till 3.34 p.m.*

#### *Speaker's Ruling*

The SPEAKER: The member for East Perth has claimed the right of reply under Standing Order 122, which reads—

A reply shall be allowed to a Member who has made a substantive Motion to the House, or moved the second or third reading of a Bill, but not to any Member who has moved an Amendment or instruction to a Committee.

The question really hinges on the definition of "a substantive motion." In defining a substantive motion May says, at page 282—

#### *Substantive Motions*

A substantive motion is a self-contained proposal submitted for the approval of the House and drafted in such a way as to be capable of expressing a decision of the House.

Mr. Graham: Hear! hear!

The SPEAKER: The implication is quite clear, that there are forms of motions other than substantive motions, and at page 377 May says—

The term "motion," which in its wide sense means any proposal made for the purpose of eliciting a decision of the House, covers several distinct forms of proceeding. Motions may be divided into: 1. Independent or Substantive Motions; and 2. Dependent or Subsidiary Motions. The former term explains itself. The latter kind of motions covers (1) ancillary motions dependent on an order of the day, such as the motion that a bill be now read a second time, or that the House agrees with the report of a committee; (2) motions moved for the purpose of superseding questions, such as motions for the adjournment of a debate or for the previous question; (3) a motion dependent on another motion, such as an amendment. Stated generally, substantive motions require notice, whereas dependent or subsidiary motions do not. The rules

regulating the requirement of notice, however, depend more upon practical than upon logical considerations, and are set out below. When notice is required, the terms in which a motion is moved should be the same as the terms of the notice, or should at any rate be covered by them and without the importation of any fresh matter.

I think it is very clear from the quotation contained in May that there is a difference between a substantive motion and other motions, and my ruling is that the motion to disagree with the Speaker's ruling is one for which obviously no notice may be given, and accordingly it is not a substantive motion. This means, therefore there is no right of reply.

Motion (to dissent from the Speaker's ruling disallowing Mr. Graham's motion without notice) put and a division taken with the following result:—

## Ayes—24.

|               |              |
|---------------|--------------|
| Mr. Andrew    | Mr. Kelly    |
| Mr. Bickerton | Mr. Lawrence |
| Mr. Brady     | Mr. Molr     |
| Mr. Evans     | Mr. Norton   |
| Mr. Fletcher  | Mr. Nulsen   |
| Mr. Graham    | Mr. Oldfield |
| Mr. Hall      | Mr. Rhatigan |
| Mr. Hawke     | Mr. Rowberry |
| Mr. Heal      | Mr. Sewell   |
| Mr. J. Hegney | Mr. Toms     |
| Mr. W. Hegney | Mr. Tonkin   |
| Mr. Jamieson  | Mr. May      |

(Teller.)

## Noes—25.

|                |                   |
|----------------|-------------------|
| Mr. Bovell     | Mr. W. A. Manning |
| Mr. Brand      | Sir Ross McLarty  |
| Mr. Burt       | Mr. Nalder        |
| Mr. Cornell    | Mr. Nimmo         |
| Mr. Court      | Mr. O'Connor      |
| Mr. Craig      | Mr. O'Neill       |
| Mr. Crommelin  | Mr. Owen          |
| Mr. Grayden    | Mr. Perkins       |
| Mr. Guthrie    | Mr. Roberts       |
| Dr. Henn       | Mr. Watts         |
| Mr. Hutchinson | Mr. Wild          |
| Mr. Lewis      | Mr. I. W. Manning |
| Mr. Mann       |                   |

(Teller.)

Majority against—1.

Motion thus negatived.

Sitting suspended from 3.40 to 4.5 p.m.

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### CEMENT

#### *Establishment of Industry at Coogee*

1A. Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) What is the total amount of money made available by the State in connection with the cement producing industry at Coogee?
- (2) What was the total cost of establishing the industry?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) £800,000. The original agreement was for an amount not to exceed £1,250,000 on a £1 for £1 basis.

By mutual agreement between the company and the previous Government the State's commitments were reduced to £1 million. The State's contributions are by way of loans secured by mortgage.

(2) Approximately £2,250,000.

#### *Selling Price Per Ton*

1B. Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

What is the selling price of cement per ton—

- (a) in each capital city to the respective Governments;
- (b) in each capital city to the industrial users;
- (c) in each capital city to the general public?

Mr. COURT replied:

In the time available it has not been practicable to obtain all the interstate information requested, and the following is given to answer the question as far as possible without delay.

- (a) and (b) Price in Perth, £12 15s. delivered metropolitan area in 5-ton lots. Prices in other capital cities are not yet available.
- (c) Price in Perth, £12 8s. Prices in other capital cities are not yet available.

If the hon. member still desires the remaining information obtained, steps will be taken accordingly if he advises me. I give an undertaking that if I can get it before the House next assembly, I shall send the information to him before giving it to the House.

### PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

#### *Day Labour in the North*

2. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is it the intention of the Government to dispense with the day-labour force of the Public Works Department in the North?
- (2) If so, what plans has he in mind to replace this essential work force?
- (3) If not, can it be taken for granted that the Public Works Department in the North will not be affected by the implementation of the Government's policy as in the south?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) No consideration has yet been given to this proposal.
- (2) and (3) Answered by No. (1).

## FREMANTLE GAOL

### *Number and Maintenance of Prisoners*

#### 3. Mr. BRADY asked the Chief Secretary:

- (1) What is the weekly cost of maintaining individual prisoners at the Fremantle Gaol?
- (2) What is the value of individual production per week of prisoners at Fremantle?
- (3) What number of single prisoners were in Fremantle Gaol on the 7th March, 1959, and the 4th July, 1959?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) £7 10s. 6d.
- (2) No estimate can be given. Besides those employed in the various workshops, there are prisoners engaged on domestic and other duties which are non-remunerative.
- (3) The proportion of single and married inmates is not kept as a statistical return. I was able to ascertain today that the number of single prisoners in Fremantle Gaol on the 7th March was 209, and the number on the 4th July was 203.

## "C" CLASS HOSPITALS

### *Number in Metropolitan Area, etc.*

#### 4. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is it a fact that fees have been raised to £14 14s. per week in a number of the "C" class hospitals in the metropolitan area?
- (2) Are regular inspections made of "C" class hospitals, to ensure a good standard is maintained in these hospitals?
- (3) Is it a fact that one "C" class hospital was recently brought to notice, having only one toilet for male and female inmates?
- (4) What does the regulation require of "C" class hospitals in regard to toilet facilities?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) "C" class hospitals are not required to notify the department of the fees charged, but it is understood that the majority charge between £10 10s. and £16 16s. per week.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) No.
- (4) There are no regulations. The requirements in this connection are set out in section 174 of the Health Act, which requires these facilities to conform to standards as approved by the Commissioner of Public Health. These may vary

according to whether males or females or both are admitted and whether the hospital caters for bed or ambulatory patients.

## PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER

### *Tabling of Agreement and Papers re Appointment*

#### 5. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:

Will he lay upon the Table of the House, the contract agreement and all other papers relating to the engagement of W. W. Mitchell as public relations officer?

Mr. BRAND replied:

The contract will be laid upon the Table of the House. There are no other papers.

#### 6, 7, and 8. *These questions were postponed.*

## WESTERN AUSTRALIAN GOODS

### *Trade Display Ship*

#### 9. Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Is it a fact that the Government proposes to charter a Blue Funnel ship for the purpose of displaying Western Australian goods in Malaya, Indonesia, and other countries?
- (2) Was the possibility of employing a ship from the State Shipping Service for the project given consideration?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) No. From Press announcements it is understood the Perth Chamber of Commerce is negotiating the charter of a ship for trade display purposes in South-East Asia. An official approach by the chamber to the Government is expected in the near future.
- (2) Answered by No. (1).

## NATIVE WELFARE

### *Commonwealth Special Grant*

#### 10. Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) What is the present position in regard to the representations made to the Commonwealth Government for a special grant for native welfare in Western Australia?
- (2) When can a decision on the matter be expected?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) and (2) Although the original proposal is still before the Commonwealth Government, consideration is being given by the new Government to making a new approach to the Federal Treasurer.

**COODE-ST. JETTY***Repairs*

11. Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is he aware that the Coode-st. jetty, South Perth, is being permitted to fall into disrepair?
- (2) In view of the fact that only minor repairs are necessary at the present time to restore the jetty, and that it is extensively used by boys from Wesley College, and children and adults residing in the vicinity, will he have the necessary repairs effected?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) No. Present policy is to maintain the jetty in a satisfactory state of repair.
- (2) Minor repairs will receive early attention.

12 and 13. *These questions were postponed.*

**COAL COMMITTEE***Investigation of W.A. Resources*

14. Mr. MAY asked the Premier:

- (1) Is he aware the Commonwealth Government has agreed to appoint an expert committee to advise on research into the use of Australian coal?
- (2) If so, will he make representation to the Commonwealth Government to have the coal resources of Western Australia included in the forthcoming investigation?
- (3) Will he treat this as a matter of the utmost urgency?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1), (2), and (3) The Government is aware of this matter and the Minister for Mines proposes discussing the Western Australian angle with the Commonwealth Government while in Canberra next week.

**WITTENOOM WATER SUPPLY***Details of Investigations*

15. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) What amount has been spent over the last 12 months in an endeavour to find additional water for the Wittenoom water supply?
- (2) How many holes have been drilled?
- (3) What quantities of water (in terms of gallons per hour) have been obtained as a result of this boring?
- (4) What additional quantity is considered necessary to give the town adequate supplies?

(5) What is the future water prospecting plan?

(6) What was the analysis of water supplies taken last summer from the town supply?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) £6,845.
- (2) Six holes have been completed and one is in progress.
- (3) 1,000 gallons per hour.
- (4) (a) For the present population—20,000 gallons per day.  
(b) Allowing for anticipated expansion—60,000 gallons per day.
- (5) (a) To carry out further exploratory drilling for underground supplies on the Fortescue River flats.  
(b) To continue investigations into possible surface supplies, including Dales Gorge.
- (6) Total soluble salts—29 grains per gallon, including 5 grains per gallon of chlorides. Reaction was faintly alkaline (pH 8.1).

**ALBANY GAOL***Increased Accommodation*

16. Mr. HALL asked the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Is he aware that gaol facilities in Albany are inadequate to meet the demand placed upon same by the increased shipping and the growth in the population in the Albany agricultural zone?
- (2) If so, will he investigate the possibilities of increasing gaol accommodation to meet such circumstances?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.

**WAR SERVICE HOMES ACT***Extension of Benefits*

17. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister, representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Has the Government given consideration to approaching the Federal Government to amend the War Service Homes Act to extend the benefits of all ex-servicemen including U.K. ex-servicemen now resident in Australia?
- (2) If not, will he undertake to place such a proposal before the Federal Government and urge the adoption of it by that Government?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) No. This Act is a Federal measure for the benefit of eligible Australian ex-servicemen only. Applications are still being received at the rate of 23,000 per year for the whole of Australia; and, despite the fact that £35 million was made available for housing under this scheme last financial year, it has been necessary to continue to apply fairly long waiting periods to the various categories of assistance. Any extension of the Act, as suggested, would not only require amendment to the existing legislation, but would result in eligible Australian ex-servicemen being made to wait further periods for assistance.

The R.S.L. has previously made requests to the Commonwealth Government with a view to investigating possibilities of funds being made available through British sources to provide homes for Imperial ex-servicemen, but legal difficulties could not be overcome.

- (2) It must be kept in mind that British ex-servicemen's need for homes is being met under the State Housing Act and the Commonwealth-State housing agreements; and, in view of the above, it is doubtful whether any advantage would accrue by taking other action, at least for the time being.

### LOCOMOTIVE STAFF

#### *Increase at Armadale and Southern Cross*

18. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Is it the intention of the W.A.G.R. to increase the locomotive staff at Armadale and/or Southern Cross depots in the near future?
- (2) For what purposes are either or both of these increases to be made?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by No. (1).

### ALBANY POLICE STATION

#### *Modernisation*

19. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) Have plans been prepared to modernise the police station at Albany?
- (2) If not, would he have the matter investigated by inspection, if possible, with a view to having alterations made to bring the police station into line with those in other provincial towns of comparable size?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) No plans have yet been prepared.
- (2) The Principal Architect has advised that investigations are now proceeding with a view to erecting buildings on an alternative site, and it is proposed to list this work for consideration in the loan works programme for 1960-61.

### NORTH-WEST HOMES

#### *Rentals Charged by Commission*

20. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many State rental homes does the Housing Commission intend building during this financial year at—  
Broome;  
Derby;  
Halls Creek;  
Wyndham?
- (2) What is the rental for homes in the above towns?
- (3) What is the rental for similar types of homes in the metropolitan area?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Broome—3.  
Derby—8.  
Halls Creek—2.  
Wyndham—2.
- (2) Broome—£4 7s. 6d.  
Derby—£4 5s. 6d.  
Halls Creek—£4.  
Wyndham—£4.  
These rents are assessed on costs for a similar type home at Geraldton.
- (3) Broome and Derby type—£3 15s.  
Halls Creek and Wyndham types—£3 10s.

(These types are not built in metropolitan area.)

All rents charged are subject to rental rebates based on family incomes of tenants. In North-West cases, the first £5 of each income-earner in the family is discounted.

### WYNDHAM WATER SUPPLY

#### *Plans for Provision*

21. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for Works:

What plans are in hand to provide an adequate and satisfactory water supply to the new township of Wyndham?

Mr. WILD replied:

Proposals to provide the new township of Wyndham with an adequate and satisfactory water supply, at a cost of £6,400, will be considered when the 1959-1960 works programme is being determined.

**BROWN'S LAKE***Drainage*

22. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) When will the tunnel for draining Brown's Lake, Bedford Park, be completed?
- (2) What will be the total estimated cost of providing this tunnel?
- (3) Is it intended to provide a compensating basin in the vicinity of Collier-rd. and Walter-rd., Morley Park, this year?
- (4) Is it intended to drain the wet area of Shaftesbury Avenue into Brown's Lake during the current financial year?
- (5) If the answers to Nos. (3) and (4) are in the negative, when will these sections of the scheme be provided?
- (6) What is the estimated total overall cost of the scheme?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) Excavation will be completed by the 25th July; pipe laying, concrete and refilling, etc., by the end of November.
- (2) £70,300.
- (3) Yes, subject to availability of loan funds.
- (4) It is intended to commence this work towards the end of this financial year, subject to availability of loan funds.
- (5) Answered by Nos. (3) and (4).
- (6) Purely preliminary estimate—£500,000. Detail designs for the full scheme are being progressively prepared, but have not advanced sufficiently to enable final estimates of some of the sections.

**OSBORNE PARK HOSPITAL***Commencement, Cost, etc.*

23. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) When is a start likely to be made on the construction of a hospital in Osborne Park?
- (2) What will be the approximate cost of the building?
- (3) Will the work be carried out by the Public Works Department?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) I am unable to advise date of commencement. Plans and specifications are still under consideration.
- (3) No.

**STATE TRADING CONCERNS***Principles for Sale*

24. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Attorney-General:

- (1) Was he consulted either by the Premier or Deputy-Leader of the Liberal Party in connection with the Premier's statement of principles, appearing in the *Daily News* of the 15th June, 1959, in connection with the sale of State enterprises, viz.:
  - (a) a fair and reasonable price;
  - (b) the protection of existing employees;
  - (c) the continuation of the enterprise within the economy of the State?
- (2) For the benefit of members of the House, the employees of the State enterprises and the people of the State generally, will he give a concise outline of what the above principles actually mean?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The meaning should be sufficiently clear to any normal person.

**METRIC SYSTEM***Use in Hospitals*

25. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) What preparations has the Princess Margaret Hospital management made to change to the metric system for all measurements?
- (2) When is it expected that the change-over will take place?
- (3) Has any action yet been taken by the management of the Royal Perth and King Edward Memorial hospitals to switch to the metric system?
- (4) If the reply to No. (3) is "Yes," will he outline details of such action?
- (5) If the reply to No. (3) is "No," will he state when action is likely to be taken?
- (6) What is the position generally prevailing in country Government hospitals regarding the system of measurement?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) The proposed introduction of metric measurements at the Princess Margaret Hospital will apply only to medical, nursing, and dispensing techniques, and involves the replacement of existing imperial and apothecaries' measures and weights with their metric equivalents. Some metric

procedures have been in force for years, but these represent a small part only of the whole. The bulk of the new equipment required has already come to hand.

- (2) The tentative date has been set for the 1st September, 1959, but such depends upon the availability and distribution of the various conversion tables and ensuring that all members of the nursing staff are well familiarised with the new procedures.
- (3) No.
- (4) Answered by No. (3).
- (5) The matter is at present being given some consideration.
- (6) The same as in other hospitals—imperial, apothecaries' and metric.

## BLACK ROCKS DEEP-WATER PORT

### *Report by Consultant*

26. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is it a fact that no work would be done on the proposed deep-water port at Black Rocks near Derby until after an overseas consultant had reported to the Government on the proposal?
- (2) Is the Government satisfied that there are no engineers in W.A.—either in the Government service or private industry—who would be competent to advise the Government on the project?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) As the Black Rocks and other suggested deep-sea ports in the North have been the subject of much inconclusive evidence as to their suitability, it was felt inquiry should be made both within and outside Australia for a qualified consulting engineer experienced in tidal ports such as are found in the North-West.

## ANTS IN "CHARON"

### *Identification and Destruction*

27. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has he yet received any report in connection with the ants which were hidden in 50 tons of timber unloaded from the *Charon* at North Wharf on the 19th June last?
- (2) Can he state whether the ants were identified?
- (3) Have the ants which were landed been destroyed?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes. They belong to the genus *Pheidole* and are not known to be a major pest comparable with the Singapore or the Argentine ant.
- (3) They were destroyed in conformity with normal quarantine practice by departmental officers.

## PUBLIC OFFICES

### *Cleaning by Private Concerns*

28. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:

Is there any likelihood of the Government handing over to private concerns the cleaning of public offices?

Mr. BRAND replied:

No consideration has been given to any such action. I suggest the hon. member cease his campaign of stirring up doubts and fear in the minds of worthy and innocent people in order to serve his own political ends.

Mr. Graham: You are apologising for your policy.

Mr. BRAND: Not at all.

## ELECTION ADVERTISING

### *Use of State Funds by Labour Party*

29. Dr. HENN asked the Premier:

- (1) Will he advise the House if there is any truth in the rumour that a substantial portion of the Labour Party's election advertising during the recent State campaign was paid for from State finances?
- (2) If so, will he lay the relevant file on the Table of the House?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) and (2) The relevant papers will be laid on the Table of the House.

*Papers tabled.*

## LEVEL CROSSINGS

### *Opening at East Perth*

30. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What progress has been made in connection with the work and installations necessary for the opening for road transport of the railway level crossings at Lord-st. and Moore-st., East Perth, respectively?
- (2) What is the anticipated date when these crossings will be open for vehicular traffic?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) Boom gates equipment has been received and concrete foundations for gantry signals are in hand.



The Railway Department is still awaiting some signalling equipment from the United Kingdom, expedition of which is being pressed. The Railway Department is collaborating with the Perth City Council on the road-works required.

- (2) If all materials come to hand, it may be possible to open for traffic in January, 1960.

### C.I.B. OFFICERS

#### *Presence at Parliament House*

31. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) On whose authority or request, were C.I.B. security men present on duty in this House on the evening of the 7th July, 1959?
- (2) Can he assure the House that on future occasions, supplementary police aid, when required to keep order, will be in the form of uniformed personnel only?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) The Commissioner of Police.
- (2) The Commissioner of Police will use his discretion.

### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

#### PROPRIETARY MINE SPUR LINE

##### *Tabling of File*

1. Mr. MAY asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

Will he lay on the Table of the House the file dealing with the proposed extension of the Proprietary mine spur line to the new Ewington deep mine now in course of development?

Mr. COURT replied:

I would be pleased if the hon. member would place this question on the notice paper as the file he desires tabled is actively used at the present time and this House will not be sitting next week.

Mr. MAY: In view of the fact that this House is not meeting next week would the Minister make it convenient for me to inspect the file at the railway office?

Mr. COURT: Yes.

### STATE TRADING CONCERNS

#### *Sale, and Protection of Employees*

2. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Attorney-General:

Arising from the Attorney-General's reply to the second part of Question No. 24 in which he indicated that the meaning of the principles enumerated

in the question should be apparent to any normal person, will he, for the benefit of the normal members in the House, indicate whether the protection of existing employees in connection with one of the conditions of sale for State enterprise means that all the existing employees of State trading concerns will have their services retained and that the Government will see to that before a sale is commenced?

Mr. WATTS replied:

I would suggest this: That at the time when the transaction is being effected, the position of all employees then employed will be taken into consideration with a view to their being protected.

### LAVERTON TO ALICE SPRINGS

#### *Construction of National Highway*

3. Mr. BURT asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has he read in today's issue of *The West Australian* the matter raised at the biennial conference of the W.A. Road Board Association yesterday concerning the construction of a new road from the Warburton Ranges to the Blackstone Range area near the South Australian border?
- (2) In view of the benefits, both economic and from the tourist angle, to be derived from such road, would he give consideration to supporting any application made to the Federal Government to complete a national highway from Laverton to Alice Springs?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes.

### RURAL & INDUSTRIES BANK

#### *Cost of Building*

4. Mr. CROMMELIN asked the Minister for Works:

In view of the allegation by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the House last night that the figure quoted by the Minister for Works regarding contracts let for the erection of the Rural and Industries Bank building by the Public Works Department was an endeavour to mislead members, would he advise:—

- (1) What was the estimated cost the completion of the R. & I. Bank building?
- (2) Did this figure include the portion to the ground floor carried out by the Public Works Department, and sub-contracts?

- (3) What was the cost to take the building to ground level?
- (4) What was the tendered price for the work above ground level?
- (5) Did this price include all sub-contracts?
- (6) Are there likely to be any additional costs entailed in the completion of the bank?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) £800,000.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) £60,000.
- (4) £696,651.
- (5) Yes.
- (6) No.

I have here the electrical contract referred to by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

*The contract was tabled.*

#### *Tabling of Contract*

5. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Works:

Is it his intention today to lay on the Table of the House the R. & I. Bank contract? If not today, when does he propose to do so? I have read in today's *Daily News* that this is the Minister's intention, and I would like to know when we can expect to see the contract.

Mr. WILD replied:

It will be laid on the Table of the House the week after next.

#### **BETTING INQUIRY**

##### *Source of Finance*

6. Mr. HEAL asked the Premier:

Has the Treasury set aside an amount of money to finance the S.P. inquiry? If the answer is "No", can he give an approximate estimate of what the inquiry will cost?

Mr. BRAND replied:

All I am able to say in reply is that an amount will be included in the Estimates when they are presented to Parliament.

#### **MILLS & WARES LTD.**

##### *Dismissal of Employees*

7. Mr. O'NEIL asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) Does he know if it is true, as alleged by the member for Fremantle last evening, that Mills & Wares Ltd. have given notice of dismissal to 60 or more employees?
- (2) If the statement is true, will he ascertain why the employees were dismissed?

- (3) If the statement is not true, will he obtain the true facts for the benefit of the member for Fremantle?

Mr. COURT replied:

I was very distressed when I heard the comments of the member for South Fremantle last night. I took early action to check the accuracy of the figures, and I am assured by the management that one male and one female member of the staff have been paid off. It must be remembered that this company employs over 400 persons. The hon. member, when speaking last night, said that the information given to him might be subject to some query, and I think it is as well that the House should know the true facts; because these figures, when repeated, do have the effect of snowballing, with sometimes disastrous effects.

#### **C.I.B. OFFICERS**

##### *Presence at Parliament House*

8. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Police:

In connection with question No. 31 asked by the member for Beeloo, it is apparent from the first part of the answer that these people were in the House. What was the purpose of the C.I.B. security men being in Parliament House on that particular night? Was there any particular reason why they should be there that night and not another night? There must have been some purpose—

The SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please confine himself to a question?

Mr. BICKERTON: Thank you. I have finished confining myself.

Mr. PERKINS replied:

The Commissioner of Police uses his discretion in the disposition of the force whenever he thinks there is a need.

##### *Authority to Enter Chamber*

9. Mr. J. HEGNEY asked the Speaker:

In view of the answer in connection with the last question, is it not a fact that the Speaker has an authority over the precincts of this House and that the Commissioner would have to seek your permission before the C.I.B. could come into this Chamber?

The SPEAKER replied:

Yes.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: In view of the answer to that question, do I take it that the Commissioner did have your permission for two officers to come into this Parliament the other evening?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. Hawke: Why not take us into your confidence?

### FIBROUS PLASTERERS

#### *Tabling of Information*

10. Mr. WILD: Last evening the Leader of the Opposition asked me to lay on the Table of the House the relevant matter from which I quoted in connection with the fibrous plasterers. I have it here. *The tenders were tabled.*

### HIGH SCHOOLS

#### *Comparative Attendances, etc.*

11. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Education:
- (1) How many students are at present attending each of the following high schools:—
    - (a) Scarborough;
    - (b) Tuart Hill;
    - (c) Mt. Lawley;
    - (d) Belmont;
    - (e) Midland Junction?
  - (2) What are the estimated numbers for February 1960?
  - (3) Has any decision yet been made to convert Tuart Hill into a five year or senior high school as from next February?
  - (4) If the reply to question No. (3) is "No," when can a decision be expected?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1), (2), (3) and (4) The hon. member did send me a copy of this question; but unfortunately, through circumstances outside my control, I did not receive it until about 12.30 today. Therefore, I am unable to supply him with the particulars. If he cares to have them sent to him I will do so; or if he would like to place the questions on the notice paper, I will agree with him either way.

### ELECTION ADVERTISING

#### *Tabling of Papers*

12. Mr. HAWKE asked the Premier:

In connection with question No. 29 on today's notice paper, No. (1) asks for an opinion from the Premier and No. (2) is worded in such a way as to inquire whether he would lay the appropriate papers on the Table of the House, should the answer to No. (1) be "Yes." The Premier put both questions together and simply said he would table the papers. As No. (2) is so directly related to No. (1) in regard to tabling the papers, would the Premier indicate whether his action in tabling the papers is intended to be a "Yes" answer to No. (1)?

Mr. BRAND replied:

Not necessarily. I cannot give a more comprehensive answer than to lay all the relevant papers in respect of this matter on the Table of the House, so that they can become public.

### RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

#### *Retrenchments at Leighton*

13. Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Have approximately 30 men employed on railway work at Leighton been retrenched, or are they likely to be retrenched?
- (2) If so, could railway work, which I understand is planned at Cottesloe, or other similar work planned for the metropolitan area, be put in hand to re-employ those dismissed and to avoid the retrenchment of those who may be about to be dismissed?

Mr. COURT replied:

I thank the Leader of the Opposition for prior notice of this question. The answers are—

- (1) No men have been retrenched at Leighton, nor are any retrenchments pending, to the best of my knowledge.
- (2) Answered by No. (1).

### WALCOTT-ST. TROLLEY-BUS SERVICE

#### *Date of Commencement*

14. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Transport:

When will the new trolley-bus service along Walcott-st., Mt. Lawley, commence to operate?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

The date has not yet been fixed, but it is expected that the service will commence early in August.

### GOVERNMENTAL UNDERTAKINGS

#### *Transfer to Private Concerns*

15. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:

In view of his assertion that there is some concern and unrest in the minds of Government employees, which he alleges has been helped along by questions of mine or motives which are not in conformity with fact, would he set their minds at ease—and also mine—by outlining specifically what governmental undertakings and works it is intended the Government will pass over to private concerns?

Mr. BRAND replied:

In reply to the hon. member I might say, in respect of the question asked by him today concerning the cleaners,

who are elderly women who have been employed by the Government on such work for many years, I felt that any move which created a feeling of insecurity, when there was no intention on the part of the Government to change any of the cleaning arrangements, was creating an unnecessary feeling of insecurity. However, the Government has made it quite clear, time and time again, that it intends to let certain work by contract; and those decisions will be made at the time when opportunity arises, or when a certain work has been finished by day labour and a decision is called for as to what further action will be taken.

#### *Uncertainty Amongst Employees*

#### 16. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:

In view of the answer given by the Premier, will he agree that until such time as the Government has made up its mind in the various categories, of necessity there must be a feeling of uncertainty in the minds of all Government employees?

Mr. BRAND replied:

I believe there is no greater feeling of uncertainty among Government employees, at this stage, than there is among private employees of concerns, contractors, and private companies who have worked from time to time and have to rely upon obtaining work and obtaining contracts.

#### **NORTH-WEST HOMES**

##### *Concession to Occupants*

#### 17. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

Will he concede that the special concession granted to occupants of homes in the North-West of the State—namely, the first £5 of income of all occupants of the house being disregarded—was instituted by the previous Government?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

I am not prepared to concede that at this stage. It may in all probability be true; but if the hon. member would like to know for certain, I shall find out for him.

Mr. Graham: Thank you. I would like to know.

#### **MILLS AND WARES LTD.**

##### *Dismissal of Employees*

#### 18. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

With reference to the question asked of the Minister by the member for Canning, is he aware that I said in my speech last night that 61 employees of Mills & Wares had received notice

—not that they had been sacked—and it is quite possible that the ones who have received notice are in prospect of being sacked? He may have been misled by being informed that only two had been sacked?

Mr. COURT replied:

I can assure the hon. member that I checked carefully this question, because the words he used last night were "notice of dismissal"—I made a note of them at the time. There are not 60 people under notice of dismissal at Mills & Wares; but to enlarge on one point which might be causing misunderstanding, there are a few male and female employees of Mills & Wares who, in accordance with normal procedure, are on leave at the present time. But they will return, in the normal course of events, in a day or two to their work. They are not under notice of dismissal, and the leave they are taking at the moment is the normal seasonal procedure at that place of employment.

#### **RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK**

##### *Contract for Electrical Installations*

MR. TONKIN (Melville) [4.38]: I seek the indulgence of the House to make this explanation. I have read in today's issue of the *Daily News* the following:—

"Funds for the electrical installation will come from a provisional sum contained in the general contract," said the Minister.

That is, the Minister for Works—

"It would be interesting to know what the source of Mr. Tonkin's information was. I had only a few minutes before leaving for the House yesterday afternoon approved of the acceptance of a tender submitted by Rileys Ltd. of Stirling Highway, Nedlands, for £35,500 for the electrical installations."

It appears to me, from that, that officers in the Public Works Department or some other Government department might be under suspicion. As I did not receive my information from any Government officer or anybody in the employ of the Government, I think I ought to take this early opportunity to assure the Minister and the House that if any Government officer is under suspicion, it is entirely unfounded. The information came to me from a source completely outside the Government and in no way associated with the Government.

Mr. Wild: I am glad you said that, because as far as I am concerned no officer of the department is under suspicion.

Mr. TONKIN: Very well. The Minister made the point that only a few minutes before leaving for Parliament House he

had signed the contract. That does not leave much time for people outside to know, and it appeared to me that he had under suspicion some officers in the department who might have conveyed the information to me. That might have been natural enough, seeing I was associated with officers down there for six years. But I hasten to assure the Minister and the House that the source of my information was completely outside the Government service, and nobody in the slightest degree associated with the Government gave me the information. I obtained information of a figure—it was not the actual figure that I had, because I said that it was £35,000. I knew there were a number of tenders over a certain range, and the information was volunteered to me by a person completely away from any Government association.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

#### *Fifth Day*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**MR. O'NEIL** (Canning) [4.41]: At long last it appears that I will be given the opportunity of joining my voice with other members in congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, upon being elected to your high office. I can assure you, Sir, that I will probably echo the sentiments of all new members when I say that we will look to you often for assistance and advice in this our first term of office. I can be equally sure that you will grant us the benefit of your wisdom whenever we call upon you for such advice.

It may seem unusual, on this my first occasion of addressing such an august assembly, that I am inclined to be a little critical of the Government of which I am so proud to be a supporter—I can hear some clutching of straws. It is rather paradoxical that the reason I am critical is because I desire to congratulate the Government of which I am so proud to be a supporter.

**Mr. Graham:** No!

**Mr. O'NEIL:** I desire to congratulate it upon the forthright manner in which it has put into effect the policy so clearly enunciated prior to the 21st March, this year. In common with many new members—principally on this side of the House—I sought representation in this Assembly so that I could voice my objection in no uncertain terms to some of the acts of a socialistic nature, even though they be termed Christian Socialism—and whatever that means I am not quite sure—that have been perpetrated by the members now opposite.

As you, Mr. Speaker, and many other members present are aware, prior to obtaining my high office, with the approval of the electors of Canning, I was engaged

in a particularly absorbing and interesting profession, namely, that of schoolteaching. I have been told that I shall never be other than a teacher; and I hope that whoever told me that was telling the truth.

I believe that one of the principal duties in our community is undertaken by the profession of which I was so proud to be a member because in that profession we are dealing with the portion of our community which I consider to be the most important. I trust that my sojourn here will be long, and that in my contributions to the deliberations of this House I will be able to show that we are passing something worthwhile into the keeping of the future citizens of this proud State of ours, to which, in my new capacity, I shall be able to add some glory, shall I say?

In my few short days here I have had evidence that the assertion I made that I would never cease to be a teacher is quite true. As a teacher I realise that one of the basic principles of learning is repetition or, as the education psychologists would have it, frequency; and a member on the other side of the Chamber who many years ago belonged to the same profession has, without doubt, proved to me that he, by virtue of his continual repetition, was well trained, at least as a teacher,

Because of my previous vocation it would be most unusual if I did not have something to say about education. Firstly, I support the Minister for Education in his decision—made shortly after the election—to postpone the policy or proposal to raise the school leaving age to 15 years in three annual increments of four months. I fully support the principle of raising the school leaving age, but I think we must realise that with the lack of accommodation, and the shortage of teachers it is virtually impossible to put that policy into effect at this juncture. However, I would like to console him, because if my assumptions are correct we would find the school leaving age today to be quite a deal in excess of 14 years.

To support my assumption I would make two main points. Firstly, because of the facilities which exist for the majority of our children to spend at least two years in a high school in the city, or a junior high school in the country, there is an urge to continue on to the third or junior year. There is an urge to do that on the part of the children who have become accustomed to that type of education, and who enjoy it; and there is an urge, on the part of the parents, to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to keep their children at school for a further year.

The second point is an example of the adage that "It is an ill wind that blows nobody any good". Unfortunately over the last couple of years we have seen notices in the Press to the effect that the Director of

Education requests parents to keep children at school, when they are due to leave, because of the lack of employment opportunities. I trust, and I am sure, that under the administration of this Government that lack will disappear.

Becoming more parochial, and again on the subject of education, I would like to draw attention to the fact that in the area, part of which I represent, between the Kent-st. High School in Victoria Park and the John Curtin High School in Fremantle, both of which are five-year high schools, no five-year high school facilities exist. Both schools—Kent-st. and John Curtin—are packed to the “plimsolls.” I would urge the Government to give its immediate attention to an investigation into the practicability of erecting five-year high school facilities in the area between John Curtin in Fremantle and Kent-st. in Victoria Park.

There is one further matter which in my opinion needs to be given urgent consideration, and that is the provision of third-year accommodation at the Applecross High School. As members would know, this school has been in operation for 18 months—it is in its second year—and it has catered for an intake of children in the first and second year only from schools as far separated as Melville and Collier. At the moment I think the school attendance would be in the nature of 1,200 or 1,300 children, and the anticipated enrolment next year, at first year level, is an additional 600.

The school is now filled to capacity. Some of the classrooms are being used temporarily for manual training for boys and domestic science for girls. I understand that the next move is to build a wing to cater for those facilities. To me, the provision of such requirements is extremely urgent.

As to the training of teachers, I was extremely gratified to hear the announcement, during the Governor's Speech, that it was proposed to erect a third teachers' training college, because it is an urgent necessity. However, among other necessities is provision of adequate housing for those teachers who are transferred to the country. Although the State Housing Commission has been most co-operative on this need, I would hazard a guess that there are many teachers who would forgo the rigours of country service because of the high rents they are paying and the lack of amenities, and return—as I did—to the more congenial atmosphere of the metropolitan area; and look what happened to me!

I must express myself on what I consider to be the most important aspect in the overall development of our State. Whilst at present our economy is based on agriculture and primary production, I feel

that we are on the verge of great industrial development. I am sure we must all agree that the basic requirement for such development is the provision of adequate power supply, principally in the form of electric power, which is drawn from two main sources; that is, from hydro-electric schemes or from conventional power stations using large quantities of water and coal or oil.

At the moment this State of ours has no facilities to use water to create power from hydro-electric sources other than, perhaps, in the North; and, secondly, we have no great resources of either coal or oil. Further, none of our inland areas have an adequate supply of water. What, then, is the answer? In view of the fact that we are living in an atomic age, I have been extremely interested in the development of atomic energy and its conversion into electric power. Britain has led the world with the atomic reactor, but the principle employed is the use of heat from atomic reaction to heat water and convert it to steam to drive conventional steam turbines. Once again, our inland areas do not contain sufficient quantities of water which are suitable for the production of power from that type of atomic reactor.

However, for the last few months I have been following, with particular interest, the direct generation of electrical energy from atomic power which has been experimented on in America. Perhaps in this we may find our answer. I would urgently request this Government—I am sure it will—to keep its eye on this type of new electric power.

The area on the eastern side of the Swan River is poorly served with hospital accommodation. In the Stephenson Plan dealing with the regional development of the metropolitan area, I have noticed a suggestion that a 700-bed hospital be erected in an area which is close to the electorate I represent. Although I do not deny the necessity of erecting a first-class training hospital somewhere in the vicinity of the new Medical School, I appeal to the Government not to deny the people of that area the normal hospital facilities to which they are entitled.

I do not wish to take up the time of the House unnecessarily because we have far more important questions to deal with. So, in conclusion, I look forward to a long period of happy associations with members of this Chamber and the staff of Parliament House. Both members and the staff have, to date, made me feel at home; and, to my way of thinking, that is the greatest praise I can offer.

Mr. NULSEN: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

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

Ayes—23.

|               |              |
|---------------|--------------|
| Mr. Andrew    | Mr. Kelly    |
| Mr. Bickerton | Mr. Lawrence |
| Mr. Brady     | Mr. Moir     |
| Mr. Evans     | Mr. Norton   |
| Mr. Fletcher  | Mr. Nulsen   |
| Mr. Graham    | Mr. Rhatigan |
| Mr. Hall      | Mr. Rowberry |
| Mr. Hawke     | Mr. Sewell   |
| Mr. Heal      | Mr. Toms     |
| Mr. J. Hegney | Mr. Tonkin   |
| Mr. W. Hegney | Mr. May      |
| Mr. Jamieson  |              |

(Teller.)

Noes—26.

|                |                   |
|----------------|-------------------|
| Mr. Bovell     | Mr. W. A. Manning |
| Mr. Brand      | Sir Ross McLarty  |
| Mr. Burt       | Mr. Nalder        |
| Mr. Corneli    | Mr. Nimmo         |
| Mr. Court      | Mr. O'Connor      |
| Mr. Craig      | Mr. Oldfield      |
| Mr. Crommelin  | Mr. O'Neill       |
| Mr. Grayden    | Mr. Owen          |
| Mr. Guthrie    | Mr. Perkins       |
| Dr. Henn       | Mr. Roberts       |
| Mr. Hutchinson | Mr. Watts         |
| Mr. Lewis      | Mr. Wild          |
| Mr. Mann       | Mr. I. W. Manning |

(Teller.)

Majority against—3.

Motion thus negatived.

**MR. BRADY** (Guildford-Midland) [5.0]: I am not quite prepared to speak, Sir, but rather than see the Address-in-reply debate collapse, I shall address myself to it. The change of Government gives private members an opportunity to bring before the new Government any difficulties that may be associated with their particular electorates. One of the matters on which I will touch, straightaway, is the very subject that the member for East Perth was trying to get considered on the floor of the House earlier this evening. I refer, of course, to crosswalks, the danger to pedestrians, and the matter of road traffic generally.

I understand that in the last five years, in my electorate, in one area, about a quarter of a mile in length, four or five people have been killed. In another area, in a matter of 10 years, five people have been killed. Both these areas are very close to pedestrian crosswalks. I think it is high time the Main Roads Department, the Transport Department, the Police Department, and the State Electricity Commission had a conference to see what can be done to prevent this severe loss of life.

Mr. Roberts: What action did you take last year?

Mr. BRADY: I never stopped taking action while I was Minister for Police, but it is not sufficient for one department alone to take action. If the member for Bunbury will wake up, he will see what I mean.

Mr. Graham: You could not wake him up if you hit him over the head with a piece of 4 x 2!

Mr. BRADY: These accidents are taking place, and it is not uncommon now, while travelling from Fremantle to Perth, to see at least a dozen houses for sale on either side of the road. That indicates to me that the people in those houses have found the number of accidents so nerve-racking that they have decided to leave the area in which they are taking place.

As I said before, I am particularly concerned with my electorate at the moment. At the corner of Morrison-rd. and the Great Northern Highway, there is a crosswalk which runs from the convent school to the other side. In my opinion there should be four crosswalks—one on every crossing—at that particular corner, because I do not think it is sufficient to have one crosswalk at a corner. If four crosswalks were provided it would mean that the pedestrians would have a certain degree of safety, no matter in which direction they were travelling.

The position is a difficult one, but it is nevertheless serious. It has got completely out of hand, and I feel the member for East Perth should have been permitted to rescind the regulation in question. I am rather surprised that the Minister for Police should have said that the ex-Minister for Transport (the member for East Perth) was responsible for the regulation. It is a very poor, and shabby way of trying to get out of the difficulty. It is shabby to approve a regulation and, when it is challenged, to try to argue that the previous Minister was responsible for its institution.

Another matter which I wish to discuss tonight is the possibility of the Minister for Police, or the Minister for Transport—who in this case is one and the same person—taking the initiative with a view to convening a conference of the Main Roads Department, the Transport Department, the Police Department, and the State Electricity Commission in an endeavour to try to stop these accidents. I have only mentioned one corner that is dangerous. There is another in the vicinity of the West Midland station where there have been several deaths. Quite recently, the Midland Municipal Council arranged a conference in connection with the matter of another danger spot and discussed the possibility of placing flashing lights on the Helena-st. corner, where there have been 30 accidents—both major and minor—during the last three years. On one corner alone there have been 30 accidents: 10 major accidents and 20 minor accidents!

It is time something was done about it, and if this Government can achieve anything in that direction it will certainly add to its laurels, because it will be instrumental in preventing many deaths, and will also bring about a position where

elderly people, and those who are invalids, will be able to cross the road without risking their lives.

Another matter on which I wish to touch is that concerning the railway workshops at Midland Junction. An answer I received from the Minister for Railways to one of my questions, would indicate to me that in the last five years work to the value of approximately £2,500,000 each year has been done in the workshops on new construction and maintenance. I hope the Minister will not interfere with that work which has been going on, and which has been favourably commented on by all departmental heads of the Railways during the last five years.

There was a time when it was said that the railway workshops had neither the men nor the machinery to do the work required. That cannot be said today, however, because tradesmen from all over Europe are now employed in the workshops in various trades; and machinery to the value of many thousands of pounds has been approved over the last six years for this undertaking. Prior to that, the McLarty-Watts Government also introduced some new machinery.

I feel that the railway men employed in the Midland Junction Workshops can do all the work that is required of them, as well as handle any maintenance work that may be needed from time to time. I hope the Minister, in his efforts to save £600,000—which he envisages saving in the next 12 months—will not interfere with the production in the workshops, because it is now geared to the extent that the departmental heads, the tradesmen and the management of the Railways know exactly where they are going. They have everything streamlined in such a way as to obtain the best out of the workshops and the employees working there. I hope there will be no interference with the programme that has been in operation over the last six years.

I would also like to mention the necessity for the Main Roads Department to give some attention to the bridges across the river at South Guildford, and at Guildford. Both these bridges are taking a great deal more traffic than was envisaged at the time they were constructed many years ago. In my opinion both bridges should be renewed completely. Moreover, they should be widened to take the increasing flow of traffic; and they should also be provided with pedestrian pathways so that the general public—and the children who happen to be going backwards and forwards to school—can move with safety along the bridges in question.

I was pleased last night to hear the member for Gascoyne touch on a matter which has become a problem both in the metropolitan area and in the country. I refer of course to the fruit-fly; and I would point out that here again, if the

Government is seeking laurels, it has an opportunity to gain them by stepping up activity in connection with the eradication of fruit-fly. While on that question the Government could also give serious consideration to the eradication of mosquitoes and of the common house-fly. As one who has observed the team that has sprayed in an endeavour to eradicate the Argentine ant, I must say that it is a great pity that this team cannot be harnessed in such a way as to enable it to carry out this eradication work in the various orchards. They could also extend their operations to the swamps in order to get rid of the mosquitoes; and to the various rubbish dumps and tips in the metropolitan area to eradicate the house-fly. All these insects are a menace. I daresay that if Dr. Henn were in the House he would suggest that something be done in his electorate to get rid of the midges.

I will content myself, however, with saying that the Department of Agriculture should give some attention to the matter of getting rid of the fruit-fly. If it is possible to harness the same team to deal with mosquitoes and the house-fly, it would be a very sound move indeed. If the various departments co-ordinate their efforts in this matter, it will save a great deal of money, because otherwise it would mean that each department would require an individual team to contend with this insect menace.

It is about time that a little streamlining of the activities in the various departments was undertaken, to enable one section of men to perform a multiplicity of jobs, thereby effecting economy and eliminating the fruit-fly, which has become a real menace in the metropolitan area and is now causing such great repercussions in the South-West. I understand that the fruit-fly has been found in various districts where it was not found before. The menace appears to be spreading. My remarks also apply to the activities of the departments in the eradication of mosquitoes, house-flies, and other insect pests found in this State.

Another matter to which I shall refer concerns the Minister for Transport. He has intimated that there is a possibility of the license fees for motor-cars and other vehicles being increased, because this is a claimant State and if they are not increased the grant from the Commonwealth will be interfered with. If he is to bring about an increase he should give every consideration to the license fees payable by pensioners on their motor vehicles; he should leave their fees as they are today.

Many pensioners can get around only with the aid of their motor vehicles. Already it is very difficult for many of them to maintain their vehicles and to purchase petrol. It will be a grave hardship on them if their license fees are to be



increased; it will mean their going short of some domestic requirement. I appeal to the Minister for Transport, in considering this matter of increased license fees, to leave the pensioners on the existing scale.

Mr. Perkins: Did the previous Government consider giving concession licenses to old-age pensioners?

Mr. BRADY: I do not know whether or not it did. I know the previous Minister for Transport did give consideration to the matter. On one occasion two years ago, when a pensioner came to me in this House, I referred the matter to the Minister, because it concerned his department. I do not know what was the decision. It is possible that some pensioners did get a concession. The present Minister for Transport would be well advised to look at the overall picture so that these pensioners could be saved additional expenses.

Mr. Perkins: There is no indication that the previous Government did anything about the granting of concessions.

Mr. BRADY: I understand that some pensioners have received concessions, but I cannot stand up and argue the point about how many of the 2,000 to 3,000 pensioners have applied or what concessions they received. The fact is that some pensioners did make representations to me for the retention of their license fees on the present scale. I leave the matter to the Minister.

Mr. Perkins: A few free licenses have been granted to disabled persons, but no concession licenses have been granted.

Mr. BRADY: It is interesting to know that free concessions have been granted to disabled persons. It is to be hoped that they will be left as they are.

Mr. Perkins: They have been left as they were.

Mr. BRADY: It might do the Government a lot of good to have regard for pensioners who possess motor vehicles. Another matter which concerns me is bushfires and the tragedies resulting therefrom. It was only 18 months ago that a grave tragedy occurred in the South-West, and three or four forestry workers were burnt to death. Before that, one or two farming communities had been entirely burnt out in the same district. Nearly every year this State experiences bush and crop fires.

I hope the present Government will take steps to reduce the tremendous losses which result from forest and crop fires. On the one hand there are great losses to the Forests Department and the Government, and on the other to the farmers. Some people claim that the losses from crop fires are compensated for by insurance companies, but that is a very poor way of looking at the whole picture.

I would much prefer to see the premiums on fire risks payable by farmers in this State reduced. That would represent a large economic saving to primary producers, and at the same time prevent insurance companies from making huge profits as a result of primary producers insuring their crops and property.

This reminds me of the primary producer who, last year, wrote to the newspaper saying that he thought insurance premiums should be reduced, because of the introduction of some regulation banning the use of tractors during certain hazard periods. He thought that if the insurance companies were to be granted this additional protection, the insurance premiums should be reduced. I do not know whether the Farmers' Union is following up that matter. I think it does merit further action. If, because of this regulation, farmers are not permitted to harvest during the most suitable period, and the insurance companies obtain a benefit from less risk being taken, it is only fair that the premiums should be reduced.

I hope that the Minister in charge of the bush-fire activities will call together the various departments concerned with a view to taking steps to reduce the fire risk, by such means as the greater use of aircraft for spotting; aerial spreading of chemicals during hazard periods; and co-ordinating the efforts of the Forests Department, the primary producers, the bush fire brigades, the local fire brigades, and other departments concerned, so that the economic loss arising from bush fires, and the tragedies occurring therefrom to the people engaged in the industry may be reduced.

I now wish to touch on the question of adequate sidings for railway users. Last week the acting Minister for Railways wrote me a letter indicating that the request of the Bassendean Road Board, the Swan District Football Club, the residents in the vicinity of Eighth Avenue, and the people living round Eden Hill, for a new siding at Eighth Avenue could not be met. These people had been agitating for that siding for approximately three years, and had, through me, gone direct both to the Railway Department and to the Minister concerned.

The Minister has informed me that the Government has arrived at a decision that no siding is to be erected at Eighth Avenue. I am disappointed to learn that. I thought one of the first steps the Minister for Railways would take would be to look for additional revenue for the railways, as well as trying to curtail the bus services, thus streamlining the transport activities of this State in such a way that the department which was best suited to handle transport could be given the task.

I believe the Railway Department is best able to handle transport from the Bassendean area, and I was hoping the Minister would agree to see that a siding was built at Seventh or Eighth Avenue, Bassendean. When the matter is raised later on with the Minister for Railways, I hope he will have another look at it, because there is no questioning the fact that a siding is required at Eighth Avenue, Bassendean, similar to that at Lathlain Park to cater for the football patrons on the one hand, and the people living in the area on the other. It will cater for people in the new residential area of Eden Hill; and within a few years a new hospital for the mentally afflicted is to be built at Eden Hill.

It is absolutely essential that a siding be built to meet the requirements of the people going and coming from that particular locality. While on the matter of sidings I would like to say that some are also required in other parts of my electorate. In my opinion they should be erected at Guildford, and in the vicinity of Midvale near the marshalling yards. I believe a siding is required in Midvale near the marshalling yards, because many thousands of passenger fares could be obtained for the Railway Department whilst, at the same time, it would provide better facilities for the railway men themselves.

If a railway siding were erected in that area, the people in Midvale alone would give ample support; and a siding near the marshalling yards would prove a great boon to primary producers who go to the Bushmead abattoir. Members on the Government side of the House will realise that there are many thousands of people who, in the course of a year, visit the Bushmead abattoir to sell their stock. A lot of them are not able to go in their own motor vehicles; and if a siding were built near the marshalling yards, opposite Stirling Park, the Railway Department and the producers throughout Western Australia, would benefit.

It would be a permanent benefit to the people in Midvale and a great asset to the people in Bellevue, as well as to the railway employees in the marshalling yards. I hope that the Minister for Railways will have a look at the possibilities of putting in a siding in the Midvale area near the marshalling yards with a view to obtaining greater revenue for the Railway Department and avoiding the necessity for road transport in a part where the Railway Department could do the job more effectively.

I would like to make mention of the inadequate bus service which is being run by the Metropolitan Transport Trust in my electorate. I believe the service is not entirely satisfactory to the people in North Midland Junction, in Morrison-rd., Midvale, and Greenmount. I have already taken two deputations to the Transport Board; and, while I think the service may have improved, it is not as good as could

be desired. I hope the Metropolitan Transport Trust can be prevailed upon to give a better service; and that it will run its buses to the railway station to avoid an unsatisfactory transport service from the outlying parts of my electorate into Perth.

I believe that the Minister for Housing could give some attention to housing in my electorate. Unfortunately, the Minister is not in this House and he has to have his attention drawn, by the Minister who represents him in this House, to remarks made here about housing. I point out that the number of houses in Bassendean and Midland Junction is totally inadequate; and this applies particularly to Eden Hill, Guildford, Hazelmere, and Koongamia.

If the Minister for Housing happens to look at today's *Daily News* he will see a photograph of a queue which lined up in Barrack-st. at 6 o'clock this morning; and some people were even there as early as 11 o'clock last night. Some of them were from my electorate. This will give the Minister some idea of the housing requirements. There is a great demand for housing in the Midland Junction and Bassendean areas; and I understand the Bassendean Road Board invited the previous Minister for Housing to pay it a visit last year in an endeavour to impress upon him the necessity for building houses in the Bassendean, Eden Hill, and Ashfield areas.

The Road Board took this action in order to prevent hundreds of workers, who were locally employed, having to go to other areas in which to live. As the Minister for Housing and all members know, there has been a great stepping up of industrial activities in the Bassendean area in recent years. This, in itself, is one reason why more houses are required. I hope the Minister will give some consideration to providing extra housing in these areas.

Whilst speaking of my electorate, I would like to refer to the Swan River. In recent years, the Swan River has not been used to its fullest capacity in regard to tourists. This river from Fremantle to the Causeway, and the Upper Swan reaches, could be a great tourist attraction in Western Australia. Seeing that we are to have the Empire Games here shortly, I hope the Minister for Works will have some regard for the Swan River between Middle Swan and the Causeway, particularly in regard to dredging.

At one time, the "Val" line of boats which ran from South Perth to Perth could go up the Swan River as far as the Middle Swan bridge. Now, they would not be able to go any further than Bayswater; and, in many cases, a dinghy would not be able to go past Bassendean and Guildford. This has been brought about through the river silting up from various sources over the last 25 or 30 years. If the Minister for Works looks at the records,

I think he will find that at no time has there been any dredging of the Swan River between the Middle Swan bridge and the Causeway.

I want to stress that it is in the interests of the Government—and particularly the Premier, who is now in charge of tourist attractions—to do something about dredging the Swan River to reclaim very valuable land which is flooded every year because of the silting of the river. This would make it possible for boatcraft to go backwards and forwards as they used to do some 25 or 30 years ago, and would restore the river to the position it held many years ago in regard to swimming facilities and recreation generally.

A number of sea scout troops are now located along the river foreshore at Bayswater, Bassendean, Maylands, and other areas. They have craft on the river, but are not able to make the progress they would like because of silting from flooded areas. In addition, various timbers fall into the river. As member for the district, my attention was recently drawn to the fact that certain people were falling timber into the river and simply leaving it. In my opinion, that is entirely wrong. I wish to draw the attention of the department to this matter, as the timber is being left to get away by the best means it can. I hope the Minister for Works will give some consideration to the dredging of the river to get rid of the debris and the fallen timber.

I mentioned the tourist attractions. At this stage I could, perhaps, refer to the fact that in the Guildford area alone we have a magnificent school in the Guildford Grammar School, with a modern swimming pool and very fine playground. We have the St. Charles Seminary and the new Midland Junction High School, which is now serving about 1,700 students. Also back from the foreshore we have the de La Salle college which has recently been built. In addition, we have the Swan Homes and some magnificent grazing and vineyard country in that area. Apart from this, we have the early settlers' homes and buildings that were erected some 120 to 130 years ago when Guildford was first established. I am sure that the visitors here for the Empire Games from overseas, particularly from the Old Country, will find this area very interesting. For that reason, I hope, as I have said before, that the Minister for Works will consider the attractions of the Swan River from Guildford to the Causeway.

Last year I was in Queensland at the same time as the then Minister in charge of the Tourist Bureau (Mr. Kelly). I agree with him when he says that the attractions of the Gold Coast in Queensland are not as good as those of our own coast. Between the Moore River and Geraldton the beaches could be opened up

to advantage. Therefore, I do trust that, when viewing the tourist attractions of the State, the Minister for Works and the Premier will consider improvements along the Moore River-Jurien Bay-Lancelin area so that we might claim that we have in Western Australia a "Gold Coast" equal to that between Brisbane and New South Wales.

Mr. Jamieson: This Government would probably call it the Narrows Coast.

Mr. BRADY: I think it could be called the Golden West Highway. It would be a very adequate name for that road between Moore River and Dongara.

I wish now to direct my remarks to the Minister for Education. I understand that recently he has indicated that he intends to put in septic sewerage in areas where deep sewerage systems cannot be installed. In various places there is overcrowding of schools, and I feel it would be wrong to install septic tanks and septic systems in such areas while schools are overcrowded, such as Bellevue in my own electorate. The parents and citizens' association of that place has for some time been trying to obtain extra schoolrooms to avoid overcrowding. I know that the Minister, like his predecessor, wants to do the best for his department, but when it is a case of priority, the priority should be given to new classrooms for children in overcrowded schools rather than to the installation of septic systems which are used by the children for only about 10 or 15 minutes a day at the most.

Particularly would it be wrong if septic tanks and septic systems were introduced in areas where the same facilities are not available to private owners. Therefore, when the Minister is considering the question of improving educational facilities, I hope he will give priority to building new classrooms rather than to spending the money on these septic systems which are used for only a minimum time. The classrooms are used for five or six hours a day.

As my time is drawing to a close and I do not want you, Sir, to have to order me to sit down—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member still has 25 minutes.

Mr. BRADY: Thank you. I could go on for 25 minutes easily. The people in West Midland Junction are very concerned—as no doubt the Minister for Works has heard—about the proposed railway line from West Midland Junction to Welshpool. The idea of that line is to replace the chord line. The matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the Minister is that about a dozen people have been notified that their houses are to be resumed by the Government for this new chord line from West Midland to Welshpool, and they are very anxious to try to obtain new homes. One man has told me that, during the last 12 months, he has lost three opportunities of

securing a home at a reasonable price, because he has not been able to get the money for the resumption of his present home. I would like the Minister to investigate this situation.

I believe it would be cheaper in the long run for the Government to settle this matter now rather than continue the suspense that has been endured for the last two years. Only about a dozen people, including a few from Hazelmere, are involved.

Earlier this evening I referred to the fact that I was concerned that pedestrians were being killed in my electorate in at least three areas. There are no flashing signals on the road intersections as far as I know, north or east of the Causeway, and yet one can see all around the metropolitan area flashing signals on the various corners and crossings. There has been one at the railway crossing at Guildford for about 25 years, but there are none on the roadways and highways. I hope that the Minister for Works will ascertain why there are not more warning signals between East Perth and Mt. Lawley, and Midland Junction. I come in to Perth, sometimes, three or four times a day, and I can think of half a dozen areas where there should be warning lights. One place in particular is at West Midland Junction where 1,700 children attend the high school. There are trains running at various times bringing students from as far away as Perth, Mt. Lawley, Belmont, and Rivervale, and these children have to cross the road. An overhead bridge is required at West Midland to prevent a major tragedy.

Admittedly, there is a policeman on duty; but I think that in the long run it is bad economics to have policemen at crossings where an overhead bridge or overway could be utilised. It is a bad policy to have policemen using their valuable time in this way when they could be engaged on other essential work.

I think the time has come, as somebody intimated in a letter to the paper this morning, when we should have a modern conception of what to do in regard to pedestrians. I believe it is essential that an overway be installed at Barrack-st. near St. George's Terrace, and at other similar places.

I think the Minister for Railways, the Minister for Works, and the Minister for Transport should examine the possibility of building an overway or overhead bridge at West Midland Junction so that the school children could cross safely there. Not only are there children who are attending the high school, but also there is an infants school on the station side, and infant children must cross over the road to get to it. Only last year, a man on the pedestrian crossway, despite the fact that he was taking all the usual precautions, was knocked over. I do not want to wait until some child is crippled or killed,

before something is done to remedy the position; and I would remind the Minister that the Police Department has commented on the dangerous nature of the crossing at that spot. I live close to that crossing, and I feel that the Minister concerned should have regard to the great hazard it constitutes for children.

I understand that when the Railway Department puts in the chord line to Welshpool, it intends to shift the West Midland station; and that would be an opportune time to examine the possibility of providing an overhead bridge. It could be done when the new station is constructed. Such action would help not only the children attending the schools there, but also the general public who use the railways. I believe that ultimately the majority of the people at Midland Junction will catch the train at West Midland rather than at the main station.

When a new station is built in the vicinity of the marshalling yards at Midvale, near Stirling Park, I believe that most of the people from the east end of my electorate will catch the train there. So I hope that the department will examine the proposition I have put forward.

I understand that the Government intends, later this session, to introduce a measure dealing with industrial development. I do not know what the nature of the measure will be; but, as an ex-Minister who was in charge of State Building Supplies, I think the Government should see what can be done to save the 60 or 70 per cent. of our timber which is now not being utilised. I was amazed to see from 30 to 40 per cent. of the timber going over the fire chutes, and I think the time has arrived when that huge quantity of timber should be utilised to the economic advantage of the State. I think that could be accomplished either by chemical utilisation or by using the timber for the manufacture of hard-board.

I am convinced that no country such as Japan, Germany, Italy, or in fact any other country, would waste 60 per cent. of its hardwood timber—if it had any. The department should examine the possibility of exporting this surplus timber. I believe it could be used in the manufacture of utility furnishings, and so on, or treated chemically and used in the manufacture of hardwood or ply-board. I hope that, when the industrial development Bill is before the House, the Minister in charge of it will be able to tell us what can be done to utilise this waste of timber for the benefit of the State.

I trust the Minister in charge of State Building Supplies will have an inquiry made overseas—through a trade delegation, or something of that nature, to Near East countries—with a view to selling more timber there and, if possible, in that

way disposing of the surplus timber I have mentioned. I feel that the markets in Ceylon, South Africa, India, and the Near East countries have not been sufficiently exploited as regards the sale of timber for both building purposes and railway sleepers. I hope the Minister in charge of State Building Supplies will confer with the general manager of that department, with a view to organising a delegation overseas, with the purpose of disposing of surplus timber.

When the then Deputy Premier was in America last year, I dropped him a note and drew his attention to the fact that Tasmania was selling hardwood to America, and I hoped that before his return he might be able to investigate the possibility of selling our hardwood in that country. I believe the possibilities still exist there; and I hope the present Minister will give the American market further consideration. It may even be necessary to extend any trade mission to the Near East and send it to America in order to find a market there for our timber.

I have brought these matters forward in the hope that they will be given consideration by the Government; and I leave them to the examination of the Ministers concerned. I wish now to mention a position which is developing in this State, and which is not to the good of Western Australia; and certainly not good for politics and for the Labour Party in particular. I refer to the fact that nowadays practically all the machinery for publicity in regard to matters of importance, either in Parliament or outside, is in the hands of a monopoly.

I understand that the *Daily News* and *The West Australian*, as well as three or four weekend papers and radio stations, are controlled by the same company. I believe, further, that it is also to have a monopoly in regard to television.

I think it is very bad for the State of Western Australia if vested interests can get a monopoly of all sources of communication, or all means of getting information over to the general public. In my opinion it is a dangerous position, and I believe there are countries in the world where monopolies of this description would not be permitted. I am sure that if such a state of affairs existed in the United States of America, legislation would be brought down, or something done to stop it. I believe it to be dangerous, because if people controlling the propaganda machines I have mentioned—such as the daily Press, the radio, and television—want to suppress certain matters they can do so; and I have not the slightest doubt that they have done it in the past and that they are doing it at the moment.

So I hope the Government will have a look at this position. As a private member I would not care to bring down

a Bill to meet the situation, because I probably would not get sufficient support unless some members on the Government side had a prick from their consciences. In the meantime I shall leave it to the Government in the hope that something will be done to stop one or two companies getting a virtual monopoly of the advertising, publishing, and propaganda machinery of Western Australia.

[The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Roberts) took the Chair.]

There is nothing more I want to say on this debate, but I understand that the Government intends to introduce certain amending Bills which will give me an opportunity of bringing forward matters which vitally affect my electorate.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

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

Ayes—21.

|               |              |
|---------------|--------------|
| Mr. Bickerton | Mr. Kelly    |
| Mr. Brady     | Mr. Lawrence |
| Mr. Evans     | Mr. Moir     |
| Mr. Fletcher  | Mr. Norton   |
| Mr. Graham    | Mr. Rhatigan |
| Mr. Hall      | Mr. Rowberry |
| Mr. Hawke     | Mr. Sewell   |
| Mr. Heal      | Mr. Toms     |
| Mr. J. Hegney | Mr. Tonkin   |
| Mr. W. Hegney | Mr. May      |
| Mr. Jamieson  |              |

(Teller.)

Noes—24.

|                |                   |
|----------------|-------------------|
| Mr. Bovell     | Mr. Mann          |
| Mr. Brand      | Sir Ross McLarty  |
| Mr. Burt       | Mr. Nalder        |
| Mr. Cornell    | Mr. Nimmo         |
| Mr. Court      | Mr. O'Connor      |
| Mr. Craig      | Mr. Oldfield      |
| Mr. Crommellin | Mr. O'Neill       |
| Mr. Grayden    | Mr. Owen          |
| Mr. Guthrie    | Mr. Perkins       |
| Dr. Henn       | Mr. Watts         |
| Mr. Hutchinson | Mr. Wild          |
| Mr. Lewis      | Mr. I. W. Manning |

(Teller.)

Aye.

Pair.

No.

Mr. Andrew

Mr. W. A. Manning

Majority against—3.

Motion thus negatived.

MR. HALL (Albany) [5.56]: The first subject with which I wish to deal concerns the Chief Secretary; and it is a subject that disturbs me greatly because he was a member of a delegation sent by this Parliament to the Civil Defence School at Macedon. Yet now he has thought fit to introduce regulations which will have the effect of depleting the volunteer fire brigade force by doing away with the volunteer firemen who act as fire guards at theatres and concert halls.

Members ought to realise that these people have spent many years doing active service of this kind; and the volunteers have had to be on tap for 24 hours a day, receiving no remuneration whatever for their services. Sometimes they have been asked to go on duty at two or three o'clock

in the morning, and they have had to attend their monthly parades so that they could learn how to use the hoses, hydrants etc. in order to do their work. They have done everything possible to maintain the force in a respectable way. Therefore it amazes me to think that the revenue those brigades receive will be reduced by the action of the present Government.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is not right.

Mr. HALL: I do not know whether it is right or not; but it has happened under the Minister's jurisdiction. I was sorry to see, by way of answers to questions, that 1,000 men will be affected in this State because fire guards are to be dispensed with. There are 47 brigades affected, not counting bush fire brigades.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Of course, the great majority of them will benefit financially by the regulation.

Mr. HALL: I have some questions on the notice paper for the next sitting in reference to that point. I sincerely hope these people will be compensated, but I feel sure that many of them will not, because the effect of the regulation will be to reduce the numbers, and there will be a consequent lack of finance. The sum the Minister has in mind might ease the position, but I am sure it will have the effect of reducing the numbers and there will be a loss of interest.

When a fire guard went on duty, he was aware of the responsibility he held, and he was fully trained to use the equipment necessary for his work. I fail to see how any door attendant or fire guard door attendant—reversing them as the Minister did in replies to questions asked—can be capable of carrying out the duties of a fire guard successfully unless he has been trained in the use of the necessary machines.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Those fire guards have been operating as fire guards for some time.

Mr. HALL: Volunteer firemen have been operating as fire guards mainly in the country areas. They assist by carrying out the duties of door attendants and also at times, when asked, they have agreed to sweep the lobbies. I do not know of any volunteer fireman who has refused to perform those duties. So, as part of our civil defence programme, the Government is endeavouring to destroy a force which should be retained at the peak of its efficiency. These men practise on Sundays and also attend their regular parades and drills on week nights. They get their initiative and enthusiasm from their social environment. I fail to see how this regulation will not affect them, because I am acquainted with their way of thinking in view of the fact that I was captain—and I am a life member—of the Albany Volunteer Fire Brigade.

The next matter I want to touch on is the Albany harbour development. I am sorry that you are occupying the Chair, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because you will be unable to interject. In my opinion, the north side of the harbour could be reclaimed at very little cost. If this were done, it would provide industrial sites and would make cheaper land available, which is necessary to attract suitable industries to Albany. The wool scouring works could be built adjacent to the Albany Woollen Mills and to where the wool sales are held. A good comparison could be made between Albany and Geelong. After Geelong commenced its wool sales that town made rapid progress.

There is no reason why the land I have mentioned could not be reclaimed over a period of years. I am not asking the Government to put a dredge there to carry out the work *holus bolus*. A small dredge could be sent there to engage continuously on that work. It disturbs me to find that finance has not been passed for the dredging of the harbour bed adjacent to the No. 1 berth, as it was recently renamed. This will restrict the draft for shipping from 34 to 31 feet. That will have a bad effect, because we have no winter load line, and the tonnages that are now going through Albany have greatly increased.

Mr. Brand: Who took the dredge away?

Mr. HALL: I am not sure of that. The quantity of cargo that has gone through Albany over the past 12 months has increased by 11,312 tons. That is indeed a large tonnage in shipping. Linked with the harbour development, it will also be necessary to establish the No. 2 transit shed which will be adjacent to the railway so that cargo handling costs will be reduced to a minimum. It will also obviate double handling when cargo is carried by road transport.

The No. 1 transit shed should be converted, without any difficulty, into a holding shed for fruit and wool. In my opinion an arrangement for the storage of fruit—similar to that at Geelong—could be entered into with very little cost. The No. 2 transit shed is most necessary for the handling of imported cargo, and it will be used for outward cargo, if necessary. I hope that no objections will be forthcoming from those in the Fremantle area, but I would suggest to the Government that a connecting road be constructed from the South-West areas to the South-West Highway so that commodities may be handled through the port of Albany. If such a road were constructed it would also be of advantage and an attraction, to tourists. This road would make the way clear for the back-loading of goods to be shipped through Albany.

I also consider that Rocky Gully could be connected with the port of Albany by the construction of a suitable road. Recently I travelled over the back road from Albany and I found a 40-mile stretch in bad condition. I hope, therefore, that the Government will pay some attention to the condition of the roads in my district, because, among other things, it is to the advantage of the State to attract tourists to those parts so they may enjoy seeing the beauty spots; but those attractions will not be open to them unless they are served with good roads. Manjimup could also be included in such a road system, and I am sure that if this suggestion were carried out that town would not need one hotel but possibly two or more.

We must consider the tourist angle, apart from the advantages that would be gained by having good roads over which freight could be transported to the port of Albany. If we want to ship cargoes from Western Australia we must consider closely the shipping costs. The difference between the shipping costs and the cost of dredging the ports of Bunbury and Geraldton is so great that they are not even comparable.

In the final analysis, when we come to export our commodity, that assessment must be made somewhere along the line. As much as we might not like to think about it, it is there, and it must be faced up to. We have to assess that cost of production somewhere; and if the cost of production is less, the cost of the dredging must be loaded on to the production cost. Albany has a natural harbour to export commodities at the minimum cost, and I do not think that argument can be refuted. We realise that Bunbury is there as a port, but it has big siltage problems. Whether it is a paying proposition is one thing; and whether we should have it is another. Sometimes I think it would be better to have three or four big ports than several small ports.

Mr. Brand: Which small ports are you referring to?

Mr. HALL: Bunbury for one.

Mr. Hawke: Dongara.

*[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]*

Mr. HALL: Another point on which I wish to touch is fishing. From time to time research has been carried out on trawling in this State. When we look at the research and the facts established by the Commiles, the Benders, and the Benthops into the supply and the cultivation of the fishing grounds, we find that the Commonwealth Government financed a South Australian firm out of the money received from the sale of the Babbage Island whaling station.

No-one can dispute that Albany should be entitled to at least a one-way trawl, but we have not received any such facility.

Yet we find that our grounds are being fished over, and the fish are being taken out of Western Australia. The point we must face is that we are now getting short of fish, and the prices are going up, because we are finding lucrative markets overseas. It is very well known that we can sell more fish in the Eastern States.

Mr. Roberts: Any Western Australian business firm has a similar right of approach to the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. HALL: If we can get the assistance.

Mr. Roberts: It is there for them.

Mr. HALL: I will give the hon. member an example. Recently, I made representation, through Mr. Anderson of the Fisheries Department, for a small sum of £500 from the Commonwealth Government to have an eight weeks' survey carried out on tuna fishing possibilities from Albany. I would point out to members that Dr. Serventy's report clearly shows the significance of tuna fishing. I have given much thought to the subject; and Mr. Hunt, of Hunt's Canneries, is quite prepared to accept Benito tuna and the blue fin for canning purposes. There is a most lucrative market for this type of fishing.

MR. WATTS: I move—

That the member for Albany be given leave to continue his speech at the next sitting of the House.

Motion put and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [6.10]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 21st July.

MR. HAWKE (Northam) [6.11]: I do not agree with this motion; certainly not in its entirety. The only reason I have heard—and the Premier has given none this afternoon—for this adjournment motion, is in relation to a legal conference which, I understand, is to be held on an Australia-wide basis, and which is to take place in Perth on three, four, or maybe five days next week. I would not have any objection to Parliament adjourning for one day because of this conference, but I think it is stretching things beyond reason to have Parliament adjourn for the whole week, simply because there is a legal conference in Perth during that week.

We all know that Australia-wide conferences are held in Perth every so often. Is it to be suggested that every time an Australia-wide conference of some kind or another is to be held in Perth, Parliament is going to adjourn for a week; or, if the conference is to run over a fortnight, for two weeks?

Parliament is the most important assembly in this State; and I think that would go for every other State in the Commonwealth. Accordingly we should be careful to ensure that Parliament does not just become a place which goes out of business every time there is an important conference—no matter how important—being held in Western Australia. There are important matters awaiting the attention of this Parliament. This afternoon the member for East Perth tried very hard, against superior opposition as it subsequently turned out, to have a debate on a question which unduly affects human life, and affects it very seriously.

But he was not given that opportunity. Now we reach a stage where Parliament is to go out of business for a whole week, so that those who wish to attend this conference may do so. I would have supported the move to adjourn the House for one day in order to give all members who desire to attend the conference the opportunity to do so. I would not have minded if the day of non-sitting was Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday. But I think it is getting a bit hot when Parliament—Parliament, mark you, Mr. Speaker!—is called upon to put up the shutters for a whole week because there is a conference to be held in Perth; and I do not think we should agree to it.

I think we should assert the far greater importance of Parliament, the stability of Parliament, and the necessity of members of Parliament to face up to vital and urgent problems, instead of putting the shutters up for a week in order that those members who are interested in attending the conference might do so, while those who are not interested might do what they like.

Mr. Graham: There are only two legal men in this House.

Mr. HAWKE: I am not in favour of the motion, and I hope that the majority of members do not agree with it. I suggest to the Attorney-General that this is not a reasonable proposition. It is not reasonable to shut Parliament down for a whole week. If the Attorney-General, or the Premier, were willing to indicate that he would accept an amendment to the motion to adjourn Parliament for one day next week—and suggest the day—I would be willing to co-operate to that extent.

I see no reason, and I have heard no argument, why Parliament should close down for a whole week; I do not think any acceptable reason can be put forward as to why we should close down the proceedings of Parliament for an entire week. I am surprised that members of the Government should come forward with a proposition of this kind, because it indicates that they do not value, nearly sufficiently, Parliament, and the work it should be called upon to do from time to time. So I ask the Premier whether he would agree to an adjournment of one day next week.

### Point of Order.

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you on what authority we are continuing to sit. It is past 6.15 p.m.

The SPEAKER: I extended the time for a few minutes as a matter of courtesy to the Leader of the Opposition, in the hope that he would be able to complete his remarks without interruption. Unless he finishes shortly, however, I will have to leave the Chair.

Mr. TONKIN: On what authority are you able to extend that courtesy? I understood that the Premier moved for the business of the House to continue till 6.15, and after that from 7.30 if necessary. It has now gone 6.15, and I want to know where you, Sir, get your authority to extend the time.

The SPEAKER: I think it is the prerogative of the Speaker, and I hope I shall be allowed to exercise it. That is the responsibility I accepted.

*Sitting suspended from 6.18 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. HAWKE: I made my position clear before the tea suspension. I repeat again that Parliament should not be closed down for the whole of next week, and that Opposition members would not offer any objection to an adjournment for one day, if the Government considers there should be some adjournment of the House in connection with the law convention.

MR. WATTS (Stirling—Minister for Education) [7.32]: In answer to the objections raised by the Leader of the Opposition, I would point out to him and to the House that approximately a fortnight ago I addressed him a letter in which I told him that the Government desired to adjourn at the conclusion of business on the 9th July until the 21st of the month. That of course involved an adjournment over three sitting days; namely, the 14th, 15th, and 16th July, to which I referred in the letter to him. Those are the only three sitting days over which the House will be adjourned if this motion is carried.

I further informed the Leader of the Opposition in my letter that the major reason for that suggestion was that an international law convention was being held in Western Australia. I amplify that statement by saying that delegates to this convention are coming not only from Australia, but from various parts of the world, including Great Britain, South-East Asia, and other places. It is an occasion which has not taken place in this State before, and is not likely to take place here for many years to come. There was a desire on the part of officers of the Crown Law Department to be able to attend, without any difficulty, the various lectures and functions involved in that convention.



Undoubtedly the contact which they would make with some of the people who are coming to this convention would be very valuable to men who have not had much opportunity, by virtue of the somewhat insular position of Western Australia, to contact the prominent people attending. We have one of the Lords of the Privy Council coming here, and he will deliver addresses and lectures. We have other very distinguished jurists and judges also coming.

While Parliament is sitting, and always with the expectation that legislation may be proceeded with, the officers of the Crown Law Department are reasonably aware of some obligation to be at their posts. In consequence they would find difficulty in attending some of the functions at the convention. I agreed with them that in all the circumstances of the case, and in view of the rarity of the opportunity, their attendance at the law convention would be of great value to them. They were pleased that this opportunity was likely to be given to them, and they expressed their pleasure to me if it could be arranged.

Accordingly I put the matter before Cabinet. At the same time there were Ministers of the Crown not connected with the legal part of the convention's operations who were anxious to fulfil some engagements in the country during the coming week. Those two things combined—particularly the former, as I mentioned to the Leader of the Opposition as being the major reason—are the reasons why the Government seeks an adjournment over next week. I do not think under those circumstances that it is unreasonable, especially when one bears in mind that it is very rare for this Assembly to meet before the last week in July to transact any business at all, in most years. There have been few occasions when there has been an assembly of Parliament before the last week in July.

On this occasion Parliament was assembled on the 30th June, mainly for the transaction of business which has already been transacted. Those are the circumstances in which this adjournment is asked for. I suggest again that it is not unreasonable that the adjournment be granted. I do not suppose that in the next 20 years a similar opportunity will present itself to the people to whom I have referred. In the net result, their participation in the convention will be a contribution towards the more successful carrying on of the Crown Law Department by those associated with it. I need say no more because that is a full explanation of the matter. I trust that the House will agree to the motion.

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

## Ayes—25.

|                |                   |
|----------------|-------------------|
| Mr. Bovell     | Sir Ross McLarty  |
| Mr. Brand      | Mr. Nalder        |
| Mr. Burt       | Mr. Nimmo         |
| Mr. Cornell    | Mr. O'Connor      |
| Mr. Court      | Mr. Oldfield      |
| Mr. Craig      | Mr. O'Neill       |
| Mr. Crommeijn  | Mr. Owen          |
| Mr. Grayden    | Mr. Perkins       |
| Mr. Guthrie    | Mr. Roberts       |
| Dr. Henn       | Mr. Watts         |
| Mr. Hutchinson | Mr. Wild          |
| Mr. Lewis      | Mr. I. W. Manning |
| Mr. Mann       | (Teller.)         |

## Noes—18.

|               |              |
|---------------|--------------|
| Mr. Bickerton | Mr. Lawrence |
| Mr. Brady     | Mr. Moir     |
| Mr. Fletcher  | Mr. Norton   |
| Mr. Hawke     | Mr. Rhatigan |
| Mr. Heal      | Mr. Rowberry |
| Mr. J. Hegney | Mr. Sewell   |
| Mr. W. Hegney | Mr. Toms     |
| Mr. Jamieson  | Mr. Tonkin   |
| Mr. Kelly     | Mr. May      |
|               | (Teller.)    |

Majority for—7.

Question thus passed.

House adjourned at 7.43 p.m.

## Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 21st July, 1959

### CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| <b>QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE :</b>            |      |
| Matron Anstey, Arbitration Court evidence   | 289  |
| <b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :</b>                |      |
| War service land settlement—                |      |
| Work done by and amount paid to S.          |      |
| Caratti                                     | 290  |
| Building in project areas                   | 290  |
| Complaints from settlers                    | 291  |
| Eneabba project                             | 291  |
| Lighting of bicycles, compulsory reflectors | 291  |
| <b>ADDRESS-IN-REPLY, SIXTH DAY :</b>        |      |
| Speakers on Address—                        |      |
| The Hon. J. Murray                          | 292  |
| The Hon. J. D. Teahan                       | 296  |

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

### QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

#### MATRON ANSTEY

##### Arbitration Court Evidence

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP asked the Minister for Mines:

Would the Minister procure, and make available to the House, a copy of the evidence given recently by Matron Anstey before the Arbitration Court?