

service of summonses, etc. During the course of the last few years, difficulties have arisen in regard to the service of court processes on nominal defendants. Even though liability of the defendant and the trust as his insurer is abundantly clear, the trust has been advised from time to time that no solicitor can accept service of a writ of summons on behalf of any person, unless he has written authority from that person so to do; and it has been thought that section 11 in its present form does not permit the trust or its solicitor to accept service of any writ. The effect of this is that considerable time is spent and money wasted in an endeavour to have a nominal defendant served with the appropriate documents. In brief, the powers conferred on the trust by section 11 were proved to be inadequate.

The object of the amended subsection (1) of section 11 is to give the trust a complete coverage. Unless the Act is amended in this way the trust will have no power to act in the matter until the writ is actually served. The real object of the amendment is to allow the trust to have the conduct of the matter immediately a writ is issued and prior to service. I refer particularly to subsection (1) (d) of the section as amended.

The trust is often placed in an invidious position when a pig-headed defendant, who is clearly liable, refuses to admit his negligence, and the trust then has merely to stand by and see costs thrown away for which they are ultimately liable. Subsection (1) (d) in the proposed amendment allows the trust to admit the driver's negligence in all cases in which there is no personal liability on the defendant i.e. in which the trust by admitting negligence merely makes itself and not the nominal defendant liable.

Subsection (1) (d) (i) empowers the trust to admit the driver's negligence provided there is no claim against the driver in relation to property, and the trust has no right of recovery against him. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Brady, debate adjourned.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Show Day Adjournment

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier): I wish to advise the House that, with the exception of People's Day (Wednesday) we will be sitting during Show Week.

House adjourned at 6.6 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 22nd September, 1959

CONTENTS

	Page
BILLS :	
Industrial Development (Kwinana Area) Act Amendment, 3r.	1709
State Electricity Commission Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r.	1709
Noxious Weeds Act Amendment—	
2r.	1710
Com.	1717
Filled Milk, Assembly's message	1716
Fire Brigades Act Amendment, Assembly's message	1716
National Fitness Act Amendment, 1r.	1716
Interstate Maintenance Recovery, 2r.	1716
Land Agents Act Amendment, 2r.	1718
Tourist—	
2r.	1720
Com.	1728
Art Gallery, Assembly's message	1732
ADJOURNMENT, SPECIAL	1734

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

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (KWINANA AREA) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 17th September.

THE HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [4.36]: This Bill seeks to amend the State Electricity Act, 1945-1956. It proposes to amend section 8 to provide for three consumers' representatives, who shall be nominated by the Minister; one to represent the metropolitan area and two to represent the remaining portions of the State. I understand that the member of the commission who at present represents the other parts of the State is a Mr. Lowe; and I believe he has done a very good job.

I am at a loss to understand why it now becomes necessary to appoint another consumers' representative to represent the other parts of the State. I am sure members will agree that the State Electricity Commission has done a good job and has given evidence of very effective administration. If we are now to give additional representation to this section of the

community, we will find many other organisations and sections of the people seeking to be given representation also.

I believe that a commission of eight members is sufficient to control the destinies of this department, and that the various sections of the community are already sufficiently represented. When members of the present Government were in opposition, they were opposed to increasing the personnel of any of the various boards that existed in this State. I have been a member of the Fremantle Hospital Board for approximately 20 years; and I can remember that when the McLarty-Watts Government came into power there were 13 members of that hospital board; but during that Government's regime the number was reduced to seven.

That number has remained static in the intervening years. Whilst in Opposition, the members of the Government apparently believed that a small board was more efficient than a large one, and I think that has been proved with the reduction of the number of members on the Fremantle Hospital Board of Management from 13 to seven.

The reason given for increasing by one, the personnel of the State Electricity Commission, is that the extra member shall represent the South-West of this State. We know, of course, that that part of Western Australia is very important, especially as the commission, so I understand, is now extending some of its lines in that area. The suggestion for another representative to be appointed came from the Road Board Association, I believe. As the majority of the State's population is in the metropolitan area and as there are, in my opinion, a sufficient number of members on the commission now, I am at a loss to understand why another representative should be appointed to represent the country districts—even although there is to be an extension of the mains—when there is already a very efficient member representing the same part of the State.

The personnel of the commission now comprises eight members, including the chairman; one representative of commercial consumers; one representative of other consumers, one representative of the employees; the Under-Treasurer, *ex-officio*; and three corporate members who hold diplomas of the Engineering Institute of London or Australia. Therefore the commission is fairly representative of the people of this State, and of the various sections who will be served by it. I repeat that it is difficult for me to understand why there should be any call to increase the number of members from eight to nine, in view of the well-formed commission that already exists. Because of these facts, I oppose the Bill.

On motion by the Hon. L. C. Diver, debate adjourned.

NOXIOUS WEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 17th September.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North) [4.45]: I am sorry the honourable member who obtained the adjournment of the debate is not present, but I will continue with the debate in the hope that he might appear in the Council later. This Bill seeks to delegate power from the Agriculture Protection Board to local governing authorities to assist in the eradication of noxious weeds. When the Minister replies to the debate, I would be glad if he would inform the House what steps the local authorities take to eradicate these weeds from their own lands.

I remember, when I first entered this House in 1950, the late Mr. Tuckey pointing to the dangers of Cape tulip encroaching in the South-West. He also mentioned blackberry, and the plant which I think he termed *watsonia*. There may have been others that were mentioned by him. On that occasion the debate continued for some hours on the shortcomings of the local authorities and the Railway Department in neglecting to eradicate these weeds from their properties.

We now find that this measure is designed to give the local authorities power to enforce the eradication of noxious weeds with the same legal right as the Agriculture Protection Board. What I would like to know is: Who is going to police the local authorities to ensure that they do something with their own roads and lands to eradicate all noxious weeds? When travelling through the South-West areas I have noticed that Cape tulip and blackberry in particular, are usually growing prolifically along the borders of the roads.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: There are some noxious weeds that we do not even know how to eradicate.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Although I do not intend to oppose the measure, I certainly criticise the delegating of power from the Agriculture Protection Board to some local authority that does not know how to eradicate noxious weeds from its own property.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [4.48]: I am of the same mind as the honourable member who has just spoken. I know for a fact that local authorities—almost without exception—whenever some new work is to be put in hand by them, have to appeal to the Government for finance to carry it out. In addition to the noxious weeds that have been mentioned by Mr. Strickland, I also wish to draw attention to the latest one that has made its appearance; namely, the weed known as *Calthorpe*.

There are many other noxious weeds that are beginning to appear in those areas where basic crops are grown, and if the local authority is to be the sole authority in the matter of their eradication, I am wondering whether the Government is adopting the right policy. After all is said and done, the Agriculture Protection Board is the body, beyond all doubt, that has been formed to protect our primary industries, and one of its duties is the eradication of noxious weeds. I repeat, therefore, that I doubt whether the Government is wise in delegating authority in these matters to the local governing bodies.

On many occasions when local authorities were requested to expend funds on eradication measures, they asked the Government for the money. It is my view that any Government funds for that purpose should be allocated to the Agriculture Protection Board.

THE HON. A. L. LOTON (South) [4.51]: I am a little concerned at the proposed delegation of more powers to local authorities by the Agriculture Protection Board for the destruction of noxious weeds. As was pointed out by Mr. Strickland, many local authorities are not treating the subject of noxious weeds very seriously; but, on the other hand, others are going flat out to destroy them.

One notices the thick growth of weeds like Cape tulip, double-gee and watsonia alongside the highways of this State. With motor vehicles travelling from one part of the State to the other, the spread of these weeds will continue so long as the breeding grounds adjacent to the highways remain. The first step for the eradication of noxious weeds should be taken by the local authorities, by ensuring that the weeds do not spread. When travelling along the highways and roads, one often finds at a certain spot, some types of noxious weeds taking root. The seeds of these weeds are often picked up in the treads of the tyres of a car, and when that car stops further along the road those seeds may be released. Such seeds germinate readily, particularly on soil which has been overturned; and the spread continues. Unless the weeds so germinated are destroyed, they will continue to spread progressively.

Journeying through areas of heavy rainfall in the State, one can often find the growth of watsonia up to the height of the mudguard of a car. That being so, I wonder just how far the seeds can be carried. The local authorities should take the first steps to destroy noxious weeds, and so set an example for the owners and occupiers of land to follow. If they do not, any steps taken by the occupier or owner of land adjacent to roads that are infested will be of no avail.

Some local authorities have taken action to destroy noxious weeds, particularly Cape tulip. In his reply, I would ask the Minister to advise whether there are accepted methods for the destruction of Cape tulip at present. From the information made available to me, and knowing what takes place in many areas, I wonder whether a satisfactory hormone has been discovered to destroy Cape tulip, in view of its life and its breeding cycle. I shall await the reply of the Minister to decide which way I shall vote on this measure.

THE HON. C. R. ABBEY (Central) [4.53]: I am of the opinion that this Bill will be of some value. Although the Agriculture Protection Board is proposing to delegate some powers to local authorities, it is not giving up all the powers it possesses for the destruction of noxious weeds. In my opinion such delegation will add to the powers of the board.

From the remarks made by Mr. Loton and other members, there seems to be some considerable concern about roadside infestation by noxious weeds. I agree that could be serious. I know of a large number of road boards which are already taking action for the destruction of noxious weeds, in that they either supply the hormone to the neighbouring occupiers of land for treating their paddocks; or, in conjunction with the Agriculture Protection Board, they carry out the spraying at their own cost. It is of little use for any road board to spray the area alongside roads when the nearby paddocks are heavily infested.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: The reverse also applies.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: That is true. Therefore it seems that co-operation is needed. By delegating some powers to local authorities, the Agriculture Protection Board will not be deprived of any authority. Where local authorities are interested in the destruction of noxious weeds, this Bill will be of value.

Reference was made by Mr. Loton to the spread of Cape tulip. In many areas, land so infested has been sprayed on numerous occasions, but, although the growth was checked, the weed was not eradicated. We have yet to find a hormone which is fully effective. The present treatment is expensive, and we must look for some more useful, more effective, and cheaper method. The present treatment costs approximately £2 10s. per acre.

I would like the Minister to give us some indication whether the Agriculture Protection Board is investigating ways and means of reducing the cost of treatment. If the local authorities were subsidised by the Agriculture Protection Board to eradicate weeds along roadsides, much more success would be achieved. In looking at the Bill, I find it is one which I can support.

[The Deputy President (the Hon. W. R. Hall) took the Chair.]

THE HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [4.56]: I would like to know a little more than has been told us by the Minister. I feel that in the past the Agriculture Protection Board has not used its powers to deal with the eradication of noxious weeds. Most decidedly some local authorities have not played their part in this direction. One has only to drive into the York Road Board district and the Beverley Road Board district to see the prolific growth of noxious weeds. When passing by, one wonders whether in the past ten years any action has been taken to eradicate the weeds there. These remarks apply to other districts in many instances. I am rather loth to give further powers to those local authorities which are not playing the part they should play in the eradication of noxious weeds.

I realise that it is at the request of the local authorities that the Agriculture Protection Board has agreed to hand over the powers referred to in the Bill. Those powers are to be delegated at the discretion of the board. I ask the Minister, when he replies, to tell us whether there is any fundamental reason why it can be an advantage for the Agriculture Protection Board to delegate these powers to local authorities.

It seems to me that such powers, delegated to local authorities, could be wielded by them to the detriment of the occupier or owner of land, and involve him in considerable expense, when there may be very little prospect of eradicating the noxious weeds on his property. I have very mixed feelings as to the delegation of these powers to some local authorities which may not use them in the best interests of the occupier or owner of the land for the eradication of noxious weeds. I reserve my decision on this measure until I have heard the reply of the Minister to some of the points raised.

THE HON. L. C. DIVER (Central) [4.59]: There are two features on which I wish to pass a few comments. The first refers to the notice which has to be served on the occupier of the land.

We could have many instances, and there undoubtedly are many, of property being leased; therefore, the person in possession is the occupier. He may have taken on the lease in good faith, but the property may have been infested with a noxious weed. By making the occupier responsible, we will create an asset for the owner of the property. I would like to see the word "occupier" deleted and the word "owner" inserted in lieu. It would then be incumbent on the owner to make certain advances to the occupier, in order that justice may be done.

The second point—the one about which my colleagues are a little concerned—is in regard to the road boards being given

certain powers. Even under the existing legislation, the road boards cannot exercise those powers unless the noxious weed is more than 20 chains from the roadside. That provision is in section 24 of the principal Act. Therefore that part of it does not concern me greatly; but I do agree with those members who are worried about the spread of noxious weeds brought about by road transport trucks passing through an area where noxious weeds are growing, and carrying the seeds to those districts which are free from them. This would create a primary infestation of those areas adjacent to the roadside.

I hope that due publicity will be given to any legislation of this nature in order that every landholder will be aware that it is necessary for the road board to ensure that roads adjacent to infested property are cleared of noxious weeds before it serves a notice upon the owner or occupier of such property.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Hear, hear!

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: I feel this is very necessary, and that legislation along these lines is highly desirable. However, I do want to be fair to all concerned; and I do not want to see an occupier, who has leased a property for perhaps three years, faced with the problem of eradicating a noxious weed that has been established for many years. It is fundamentally the responsibility of the landholder to eradicate the weed.

If this position does not obtain, the cost of the eradication will be placed on the shoulders of the lessee; but the landholder will benefit. That, in my opinion, is not just; and I am sure that the majority of the members of this Chamber will agree with me on that point. Therefore, if no-one else is prepared to give notice of an amendment to delete the word "occupier" and insert in lieu the word "owner," I shall undertake that duty. I think it is common sense, and the fair and decent thing to do.

However, I want to emphasise to the Minister handling this Bill, the fact that the landholders concerned should be informed that it is primarily the responsibility of the local authority to ensure that the roadways are clear of noxious weeds. Only recently I had the privilege of travelling with the responsible Minister in this Government, and I pointed out specific instances where this very situation exists. I could take members to many places today where noxious weeds are only on the roadsides, but where, within three years, the adjacent fields will be covered with them. Therefore, with certain reservations, I support this legislation in an amended form.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government—in reply) [5.5]: It would appear that some members have not much faith in their local authorities.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: On the financial side, I haven't.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: After all is said and done, most of the members of the local authorities concerned with these noxious weeds, are the farmers themselves. Surely they are just as anxious for the eradication of noxious weeds as are members in this House. Any noxious weed in their area must have an effect upon their own properties, if it spreads. For that reason, I am perfectly certain that the authorities will do everything they can to ensure that the noxious weeds do not spread.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: Do you honestly believe that?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: You want to drive around the country a bit.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I get around as much as anybody, I suppose. Let me deal with the first argument raised by Mr. Willesee; and it was also raised by Mr. Diver. The sole purpose of this Bill is to confer upon the local authorities—if the Minister deems fit—those powers which the protection board has under section 22. In the first place, if this Bill is passed, and the local authority is satisfied that the occupier is not dealing with noxious weeds, a notice will be served. Surely the occupier must be the one to receive the notice in the first place, because he is occupying the land. However, immediately he has been notified, the owner will be notified as well. If any cost is involved, or if any fine is imposed, it will be the responsibility of the owner and the occupier—not one, but both.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: But why the occupier?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Because he is in occupation. For the period of his lease, whether one, two, three or four years, he is the owner for the time being.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: But it may have been infested when he took the lease?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: That may be so.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Overnight, a weed could be declared noxious, and he may have no knowledge of its existence.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: That could happen anywhere.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Oh, rats!

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Surely a man who leases a property knows that it is infested; and he knows what are described as primary and secondary noxious weeds. And, surely the man occupying the land is the one who should receive the notice. He is occupying the land for the time being; and he is making a living from it. As soon as he receives a notice to the effect that he is not doing his job properly, the owner

is notified too. If they do not comply with the notices, which are given in writing, they are liable for a fine of £20 for a first offence and £50 for a subsequent offence. There is nothing wrong with that. That has been in the Act since it was passed in 1950. No-one has taken offence about it.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: How about the owner or occupier having the right to serve notice on the local authority?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I have heard plenty of members in this House—particularly when debating the matter in 1950—say that we were taking too much power away from boards. They did not like all the power going to the protection board. I can remember that debate quite well. Members were frightened that the protection board was growing too big and too strong; and that it had all the power, while the road boards had none. That is the position today. Where a road board knows that someone is not doing his job in regard to the property, it is powerless. It cannot do a thing.

However, under this Bill, if the Minister likes to delegate power to a local authority, then the local authority will have power to take action and to serve a notice on the occupier and the owner. And, as I say, if they do not comply with the instructions, they will be fined. If this still does not bring a result, the road board itself can attend to the matter.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Will the road boards make sure that they attend to the areas outside the properties along the roadside?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The honourable member knows the problem.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I know they do not do it.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: This is not an easy one.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It is very important to this State.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not know whether members would like every truck in the district to be halted and hoses down, or sprayed, to prevent weeds being conveyed from one place to another. I do not know whether they would like all the birds to be caught so that they may be fumigated.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That did not prevent the passing of the Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund Bill the other night.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is an entirely different one.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: This is just as important.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: These weeds exist—foot and mouth disease does not—and we have to eradicate them. If members can tell the Minister for Agriculture what can be done—apart from what is being

done at present—to prevent the spread of these weeds, I am sure the Minister will ensure that it is carried out.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Give him another £500,000 and he will do a lot more.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not know whether even then he could.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: A few useful suggestions have been made today.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not know that they have been very useful, inasmuch as members are worrying about giving the local authorities power to solve the problem. The protection board cannot cover the whole of the State, unless a whole army of inspectors are engaged. Even then, we would have inspectors who did not know the job. That is half the trouble. We have rabbit inspectors who are classed as noxious weeds officers. They know what a rabbit is but they probably would not know a Saffron thistle from a Cape tulip. Unless we are going to give all the power to the local authorities, plus £500,000, we will never get anywhere.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: You would get a lot more support if the local authorities did more themselves.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If members would inform the Minister in what regard the local authorities are not doing their job, it would be more helpful than mere words.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: You are still throwing the whole of the onus on to the occupier.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Section 22(1) of the principal Act is as follows:—

When the Protection Board is satisfied that the occupier of private land is not making all reasonable endeavours to comply with the requirements of the last preceding section, the Protection Board may, subject to the provisions of this Act, direct in manner prescribed that primary noxious weeds on the land be destroyed in manner prescribed.

Surely the occupier—the owner for the time being—must be the one to be given the notice. Section 22(2) is as follows:—

The Protection Board may cause notice of the direction referred to in the last preceding subsection to be served on the owner or occupier of the private land affected by the direction or on both of them.

Subsection (3) reads—

Every owner and occupier who is served with a notice mentioned in the last preceding subsection and who fails to comply with the requirements of the direction, commits an offence.

Penalty: For a first offence, twenty pounds and for any subsequent offence, fifty pounds.

Nothing could be plainer than that—the owner and the occupier.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It seems a bit hypocritical that a road board may be affecting an occupier by not looking after its own land.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If the Minister is asked to give these powers to the road board and he knows very well that the road board itself is not doing its share in the matter, he will not grant the powers. After all, the powers have to be conferred by the direction of the Minister.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: Perhaps.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not know whether members are trying to read something into the Act, which is not meant to be there.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Read proposed new section 23A down to paragraph (b) of subsection (3), and link your remarks with what is contained there.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The debt is due by the owner or occupier.

The Hon. C. L. Diver: Then you are satisfied that it is the occupier's duty to do the job?

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: It is a direct contradiction to what you said before.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is not. If a chap has leased land for 10 years, and the owner is in England, in my opinion the person who is getting his living from the land during that period is the owner as well as the occupier.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Would he be using all the land?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Of course he would be using the land.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: What about if he is an agriculturist?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: He has the land under his care and he is getting a living from it.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: You can declare a noxious weed by proclamation; you can do it overnight.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: That is quite likely. One weed might be a secondary noxious weed today, but if it becomes a menace to agriculturists, the protection board may declare it a primary noxious weed tomorrow. I cannot follow what members are objecting to in this legislation. All it does is to authorise the transfer of the power given under sections 22 and 23 of the Act from the protection board to the local authority.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Would those local authorities be in a financial position that would enable them to police this part of the Act?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: They would not ask for the power if they were not in a position to police it. All this legislation does is to give the local authority the right to say to an occupier, "You are not

doing your job in regard to noxious weeds. What about doing something about it?" If he then does not do anything about the position the local authority can give him written notice to that effect. If nothing is done after that notice has been given, the local authority will have the power to do the work at the expense of the occupier or owner.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: How about the owner or occupier being able to serve notice on the local authority in the event of the authority not carrying out its work on the roadsides?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If the honourable member likes to introduce an amendment to the Act in that regard, there is nothing to stop him. The Noxious Weeds Act has been on the statute book since 1950. Amendments have been made to it since that time, but nobody has ever raised this issue before.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: It is likely to be the same in 1969 as it is in 1959.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not doubt that. Despite the fact that many people have spent large sums of money trying to eradicate noxious weeds, I would not be surprised if, in 1969, the position is not worse than it is in 1959. Mr. Loton mentioned the eradication of Cape tulip. Some of the best brains in the country are trying to work out some poison that will eradicate this weed, but they have still not been able to find the answer. If they cannot do it, I do not know who can.

The C.S.I.R.O. are working in an effort to find some means of eradicating noxious weeds. At present they are carrying out experiments with hormone sprays; and everything possible is being done to find new means of eradicating noxious weeds. I do not know how much money has been spent over the last five years in trying to eradicate Cape tulip from around Bindoon and areas further north, but I should imagine a considerable sum has been spent, and yet the weed is still there; in fact, I think it is spreading further afield. I believe that some of the trouble has been brought about by the fact that the local authorities have not had the power in the past to prevent the spread of noxious weeds; that power has been vested only in the Agriculture Protection Board.

All this legislation does is to delegate some of the power of the protection board to the local authorities; but that power can only be delegated by the Minister, and in writing. Surely members should have sufficient faith in the Minister for Agriculture to know that he would not delegate that power to a local authority which could not look after its own affairs!

The Hon. H. L. Roche: But Ministers come and go.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: That is quite true.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (the Hon. W. R. Hall): I think members should allow the Minister to continue his speech without further interjections; and I ask the Minister to address the Chair.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The principal Act was passed in 1950, and power was given to the Agriculture Protection Board in regard to the eradication of noxious weeds. I was one of the members who did not want that power to be given to the Agriculture Protection Board because I thought power was being taken away from local authorities which was rightly theirs. But the same position has obtained for nine years and nobody has ever criticised it. Now the Road Board Association has asked for this amendment to be made to the Act so that local authorities can have some of the power which the Agriculture Protection Board enjoys today. The association realises that on occasions local control is better than State control, and that is why the amendment has been asked for. I do not think I can put the position any plainer than that.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. E. M. Davies) in the Chair; the Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2—Section 23A added:

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: By interjection I was attempting to get some further information from the Minister. He stated that only with the written approval of the Minister for Agriculture will power be delegated to the local authorities, and perhaps only those districts where noxious weeds are prolific will need the power provided in this legislation. But it seems fantastic to me that a road board can be given authority to direct an occupier to eradicate noxious weeds when, on the sides of the roads adjoining the property, there may be weeds which are the principal cause of the trouble.

I know that many noxious weeds are to be found in different areas throughout the State; Cape tulip is growing thickly in districts between Midland Junction and Bullsbrook, and whether the seeds can be transferred by wind or motorcars I do not know. Blackberries are growing thickly in certain parts of the South-West, and whether those seeds can be transferred to private property by one means or another I do not know.

The Minister asked how we could stop birds or the wind from spreading noxious weeds. I do not know, but the point I am concerned about is that it seems an

anomaly if a road board is to be given authority to direct the eradication of noxious weeds on private properties when it has not eradicated weeds on properties which are under its direct control.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: A local authority is usually composed of farmers in the district, and they are not likely to direct that certain measures be taken unless their own house is in order.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That was not the experience with the eradication of rabbits.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Under present legislation, the local authority can make private landholders plough fire breaks when its own house is not in order; so the position would be no different under this legislation. If some member wants to introduce a Bill further to amend the Act to make it mandatory for local authorities to eradicate noxious weeds on the roadsides under their control, I would not mind; but that does not come into this question. Had the authority given by this Bill been given to local authorities years ago, probably the roadsides would not be in the position they are in today. Noxious weeds are spread because fodder and seed are purchased in one district and taken to another district.

I do not know what the Minister for Agriculture would say about the idea members have been putting forward, but I am certain that the local authorities would have to be doing a good job before he delegated any power to them.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: Like most other members I have listened to the Minister with a good deal of interest, and I do not think any one of us would question the ability, knowledge and experience, of the present Minister for Agriculture; but he will not always be the Minister in charge of the department. Even at this late stage, I think the Minister ought to report progress so that we can iron out our differences. If the Minister in charge of the Bill were to discuss the position with the Minister for Agriculture, I am sure he would find that there have been some second thoughts on the matter since it was first introduced. I ask the Minister to report progress so that further thought may be given to the matter.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The only issue at stake is whether or not we authorise the Minister to delegate some of the powers of the protection board to local authorities. The Bill was brought to Cabinet by the Minister for Agriculture; recommended by the Minister for Agriculture; and passed in another place. I deal with it here. If Mr. Diver wants to have a talk with the Minister for Agriculture, I have no objection to reporting progress.

Progress reported.

FILLED MILK BILL

Assembly's Message

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

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Assembly's Message

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

NATIONAL FITNESS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

First Reading

Received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), read a first time.

INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE RECOVERY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 17th September.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [5.34]: I say at the outset that I support the Bill. I am very pleased indeed that an Act so out of date as the Interstate Destitute Persons Relief Act, 1912-1931, should be repealed and that, in its place, legislation more in keeping with the times is brought before the House. The Bill is actually a Committee one, and there are many clauses in it that could or could not require some further elucidation. However, I do not think there should be any speeches against the measure.

When I say that, I mean there are many problems that have arisen over a number of years relating to persons who have dodged their responsibilities by leaving their relatives and families both in this and in other States of the Commonwealth; and the idea is that legislation shall now be reciprocal between all the States and New Zealand. This is to be commended.

I remember in my first year as a member of Parliament having to take a destitute family before the Child Welfare Department. It was most difficult for the department to do anything to help that family other than by using State funds. The father was living in comfort in another State, and, under the Federal Social Services Act, the wife had to find the means of prosecuting her husband at least once every three months. The result was that the entire burden of helping these people was thrown on the State. The Bill deserves the support of the House, because it will help to curb this practice of husbands evading their responsibilities and leaving their families destitute. For that reason alone, if for no other, I commend the measure to the House.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [5.39]: Like other speakers, I approve the provisions of the Bill, and agree that for the most part it is a Committee Bill. It would need a great deal more legal training than I have, however, for me to be certain that I understand every clause in the measure. There is one serious matter on which I would like to touch, however, provision for which does not appear to be in the Bill. I refer to the individual who suddenly disappears from the State leaving his family unprovided for, and who is not traced in another State.

I understand that if that happens here, the wife has the greatest difficulty in persuading the authorities in another State to make any search for her husband. As far as I can see, this Bill will not in any way protect that woman, nor will it help to find the type of individual to whom I have referred. Once an individual has had a maintenance order made against him, and we know where he is, the Bill will work very well indeed. But when a man suddenly disappears—as quite a number have done—and leaves a woman with one or more children, it seems that the police themselves feel they have no power to institute a search for him in another State.

Whether something can be added to make some provision for a woman who has suffered in that way, I do not know, but I would like the Minister to go into the matter. If one looks at clause 15 one will find—

No maintenance order made by a court in a State outside Western Australia is enforceable, nor shall an order so made be enforced, in this State unless the collector of this State serves or causes to be served upon the defendant the duplicate or original certified copy of the order.

That will work reciprocally in all the States provided we can find the person who should be the recipient of the order. But is there any possibility at all of the authorities being given power to search for such a person, in a manner similar to that in which a missing offender is searched for in another State by the police? Apart from those few remarks, I support the Bill.

THE HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [5.41]: I intend to support the Bill, because I think it is long overdue. Like Dr. Hislop, however, I am fearful as to whether its provisions can be implemented. I do not suppose there is any member in this House who has not been called upon to deal with the type of case referred to in the measure.

I remember the case of a mother who was left with two children. There appeared to be no reason at all why her husband could not be apprehended in the Eastern States, because he was employed on a ship plying between Victoria and

Queensland, with an occasional trip to Japan. I made several representations to the Child Welfare Department, and while the department was doing its best to have a warrant served on the husband, it was found difficult to do so, because he would be in Victoria one week and in Queensland another; and he would periodically make a trip to Japan. As a result, the warrant floated about for a considerable time. In the meantime the wife and children were destitute, and were given relief from the Child Welfare Department.

Every effort should be made to control people who have no concern for their families; and all that can be done to implement the provisions of this Bill should be done. Like Dr. Hislop, however, I feel that while we legislate for such eventualities, it is sometimes difficult to implement the provisions as they relate to people who leave the State. I would like to know whether anything out of the ordinary is being done to execute a warrant in order to apprehend such a person and make him fulfil his responsibilities.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Child Welfare—in reply) [5.44]: The point raised by Dr. Hislop and Mr. Davies is a very important one. As to how we should put it into effect, however, is an entirely different proposition. All the Bill seeks to do is to make sure that a defaulter who happens to be in any State of the Commonwealth, or in New Zealand, can have a warrant served on him, provided we can catch up with him. Although the amendment is a long one, all it does is to make the maintenance order variable.

It was decided to change the name of the Act from the Interstate Destitute Persons Relief Act to the Interstate Maintenance Recovery Act, because it was thought that the former title was not altogether appropriate. Accordingly legislation was drafted on the lines of the New South Wales Act.

I know from experience in Western Australia that trying to find some of the husbands who have deserted and who do not want to be found is a pretty difficult job; but I consider that the "missing persons" file at the Police Department is far from complete, because I repeatedly receive write-offs in my office from the Child Welfare Department for the reason that the person concerned cannot be found. These write-offs amount to perhaps £20, £30, or £50; but it would cost far more to try and find the persons concerned.

I will make inquiries in regard to what action is taken by the Child Welfare Departments in other States to trace these people. I say that the only method they have would be through the Police Department. However, whether the Police Department does its best, I would not like to say. Sometimes I doubt it very much. If a young girl of 18 or 19 is missing, there is a public outcry and the Police

Department does its best to find her. But it does not take much trouble to find where defaulting husbands are.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Then the State has to pay.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: This is a big problem. Only today I had to sign orders to bring ten children—from three different families—under the care of the Child Welfare Department until they are 18 years of age, because of the default of the husband in each case. Sometimes the husband is living in a different State with another woman, on a *de facto* basis; in some cases they disappear; and in others they do not want the children.

Anything we can do to make it easier to bring these defaulters to book will be done by the department. As soon as a husband has defaulted and left his family in straitened circumstances, the department looks after the family until other arrangements can be made. From that point of view, the department is doing a good job. I do not intend to take this Bill into Committee tonight.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

LAND AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 16th September.

THE HON. L. C. DIVER (Central) [5.48]: This Bill deals with a very important subject so far as many of our citizens are concerned. It could affect the life savings of many individuals. Therefore, I feel it is necessary that this Chamber, which is a House of Review, should deal with it extremely cautiously. When I said a House of Review, I was speaking as an individual.

The Bill endeavours to close up certain avenues of escape for land agents. Land agents should be reasonably good citizens, as the parent Act sets out that, before they can become registered, they must furnish certain references with regard to character; and their credentials, up to that juncture, apparently must be all that can be desired. Therefore, the public treats land agents with a great amount of confidence. So much so, that they trust them with the financial side of an undertaking; and we know of instances where that trust has been broken.

As bad as this offence is, so far as the law is concerned, no words can adequately express what it means to the individuals who are the victims. Therefore, by passing this legislation, we are, to a degree, just meddling with the problem. In the Land Agents Act there is already provision for a fidelity bond to be provided for

an amount of £2,000, to meet any defalcations of an individual, in this profession. I use the word "profession" because I do not know what other name to use. The people engaged in it should be honoured to come within the category of professional businessmen.

We should previously have extended the legislation to protect the clients of agents who ultimately fall by the wayside by improperly using trust funds. We should have established a pool; and contributions to this pool should be paid by all those practising within the scope of the parent Act.

There should be a common pool whereby every member of that profession manfully assists any victim and says, "You shall be paid 20s. in the £." This would be on a basis similar to that of the registered bookmakers. When a bookmaker fails to abide by just the writing of a ticket, without any other form of contract, the other bookmakers see that the bet is honoured. Surely the land agents can see that if any member of their profession falls by the wayside, the trusting public should not be left in such a position that part or the whole of their life savings will be placed in jeopardy.

I go so far as to say that a pool such as I have mentioned would be in the interests of the land agents themselves; and I suggest they should, through their committee, wait upon the Attorney-General to see that comprehensive legislation is introduced into Parliament for their own protection. If we are to have a continuity of instances, such as we have seen since the parent Act was last amended, of land agents spending trust funds, it must bring the profession into disrepute to such an extent that members of the community will become scared.

What will be the result? A certain limited type of transaction will go through land agents, but the great majority of transactions will go through the old established land agencies, the live-stock agencies and the banks. I would have no hesitation whatsoever, if I were asked, in counselling an inquirer that the safest avenue of dealing with a transaction of any size would be through his banker; and I would recommend that any land transaction be dealt with between banker and banker, as distinct from individual and individual, to make doubly certain that any moneys due from one party to another would find their correct destination.

I have given considerable thought to this matter, and I think the ultimate solution, so far as land agents are concerned—especially the small people—is the establishment of a pool. Even under our existing set-up, it would be more prudent if payments of money—trust funds in particular—were paid by bank draft only,

instead of by cheque; and a certificate should accompany an order for a bank draft from one individual to another, and that certificate should be countersigned by another reputable member of the land agents' fraternity to make certain that discrepancies did not take place; because, with the greatest degree of care, no bank; no auditor; no registrar, or other person could, in the present circumstances, prevent funds from being used in a manner in which they should not be used. We could have the spectacle of certain cheques being drawn against the trust account of a land agent on Friday afternoon, the money squandered at the races on Saturday, and it being too late to do anything about the position when the banks opened on the Monday.

Therefore, it behoves us, as representatives of the people, to look at this piece of legislation and request that the land agents and the Attorney-General get together so that the public can be given more consideration and protection than they at present receive. Many people at the moment feel that they have full protection; that we, as legislators, have seen that they are covered; and they enter into these negotiations in good faith, only to lament what they have done when they find that they have been deceived by the land agent when he uses the trust funds improperly.

I refer now to proposed new section 14I (3) which provides that a person who has not complied with an order to make all books of account available to the committee, shall be penalised to the extent of £200. What type of person is the one against whom this order will prevail? It is the one whom the land agents committee has every reason to believe is a bankrupt; and bankrupt to such an extent that he has dealt with his trust funds in a manner that is not, to say the least, in order. It is obvious that shortly after he has breached the trust, his affairs will be in the hands of a trustee; and this penalty of £200 is to apply when he pleads guilty.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think you will find this does not refer to the defaulting land agent, but to the person who does not do as he is told by the court.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: Who would that be?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It refers to the banker, I think. From a quick look at this proposed new section, I think that subsection (3) refers to the manager or other officer in charge of the bank. If he does not do as he is told, he suffers a penalty of £200.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: That is right.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: The Minister may be right. That is an entirely different approach from the one I had. I want to make certain that the penalty of £200 will not be paid by an unscrupulous land agent

from the assets of his disillusioned clients. That is the point I want to make crystal-clear. If what the Minister says is correct, then it will be unnecessary for me to move the amendment I intended.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I will have a look at this provision and find out the position before I reply.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: I thank the Minister, because this provision is charged with dynamite. It is sheer mockery to allow a man, in these circumstances, to plead guilty, and then to pay his fine with someone else's money. Had I been correct in my reasoning, I would have moved an amendment to delete the words "Two hundred pounds" and insert in lieu "Six months' imprisonment."

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Then you would gaol the banker, too.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: I do not think that would do any harm, in so far as no banker would ever create an offence; but, conversely, the land agent who had created an offence would, under my amendment, do his six months.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Now that I have read this proposed new section, I find that when an order is served on the bank, it shall also be served on the land agent so that the land agent shall know that the order has been made; but if the banker does not do as he is told, he shall be fined £200.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: I think that is so.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: The Minister may be right; I hope that time will not prove him wrong.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I will not waste much time before finding out whether that is correct.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: Even if someone has advised the Minister that he is right, I hope that time will not prove him wrong; in other words, that experience will not show that he is wrong.

When Mr. Watson was speaking he said that he was not happy with regard to the position of the trust funds held by a defaulting agent. I interpreted his remarks as applying to trust funds that could be defined, and could be said to belong to a particular individual. I have made some inquiries on this point, and I have been told that if it can be established that any trust funds belong to a certain person, the judge, in administering the law, shall decree that those specific funds shall go to the person concerned.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The last paragraph in the Bill deals with that point.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: That is so; but I think Mr. Watson mentioned the matter. I was inclined to agree with him at the time, and for that reason I tried to get some clarification of the position. I am assured that the position is as I have

stated; that the judge will apply the existing law in the manner I have mentioned, and that any funds beyond those that can definitely be established as belonging to particular individuals, will go into a common fund. I have taken some time on this matter, but it is one which means a lot to many people.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: It is extremely serious.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: I agree; and it is one that should be tidied up far more than it is today, even if it takes us half a day to do it. The legislation should be put into far simpler language than that in which we now find it; and, what is more, the land agents themselves should, forthwith, see that members of the public having dealings with any members of the Land Agents' Association will be able to do so with confidence and with the knowledge that the land agents will stand in to meet to the extent of 20s. in the pound, any shortcomings of a defaulting agent.

On motion by the Hon. R. Thompson, debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

[The President resumed the Chair.]

TOURIST BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 17th September.

THE HON. R. C. MATTISKE (Metropolitan) [7.30]: There is no need for me, Mr. President, to expound at length on the value of the tourist trade to any country or State; nor is there any need for me to stress that in Western Australia, with its vast area, we must, of necessity, have places of varying climate and varying interest, in all respects, so far as tourists are concerned. We have much to offer to the people of all countries of the world; and, with the great use of air travel at the present time, the world is rapidly becoming smaller. Whereas, a few years ago, it may have seemed quite a venture to go from one side of the globe to the other for tourist purposes, now such a thing is commonplace; and for that reason I feel sure that Western Australia, with all it has to offer, can sell itself to the world with great economic advantage to this State.

I will not stress the various advantages offered to tourists in different parts of the State; nor is there any need to emphasise the fact that the tourist trade, which is, in effect, an invisible export trade, is one which could bring and does bring considerable purchasing power to any country which exploits it. The tourist trade also provides employment in a very wide field; and therefore I feel that the Government is to be commended on the step it is now taking in an endeavour to exploit this field of export.

I think the action of the previous Government in assisting, as it did, to secure the Empire Games for this State in the near future, was something for which we can be thankful; and its offer of a reasonable amount of money for that purpose was a sensible one. I am sure that, before the games are over, this State will be involved in the expenditure of a sum considerably greater than the amount offered; but, as compared with the results which must be achieved, I feel sure that it will have been money very wisely spent.

I fail, however, to understand the attitude of certain members in this Chamber, whom I have heard, from time to time, say that the expenditure of a couple of hundred thousand pounds in this direction is not warranted at present, when so many other things are required in this State. I think that is a very strange outlook indeed; because if we look around and analyse every penny of expenditure by the State, we might well argue that there are many other fields in which Government expenditure might be made to greater advantage; but this is an investment. It is money being laid out to attract people to this State and, when they come here, I feel sure their eyes will be opened; because there is no better form of education than visual education.

Once visitors to this State see what we have here, I feel it must be inevitable that what they learn about this country will lead to a lot of them returning, either in person or through their representatives, with the object of developing certain of the natural resources here which are crying out for development at the present time. One point in the Bill upon which I wish to comment is the question of administering the measure. I am aware that the Premier is particularly keen on tourism; and that he, as Minister controlling it, will devote a considerable amount of his own time and energy to this important subject. Therefore he must have a very good reason for seeking, through this Bill, to set up a committee of eight persons to administer the tourist trade in this State.

For that reason I have no alternative but to bow to the Premier's judgment and support his request in regard to the establishment of this committee; but, at the same time, I wish to express some views of my own, which I would put into effect if I were Premier. Were I the Minister controlling the tourist trade, I would not like to be hamstrung, to a certain extent, by what I consider will be an unwieldy committee. I have had a lot of experience, in the commercial world, of committees of one sort and another. When one has a committee of eight members there must, inevitably, be a lot of time spent on very formal machinery action.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: There need be only four to form a quorum.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I think it would be preferable to appoint one person, very experienced in tourist matters, as a sort of dictator; and I believe there are plenty of persons in this State who could fill that position quite well. The appointee could be given power to co-opt the services of the various departmental heads mentioned in the Bill; and he could be given the power necessary for entree to the local authorities concerned, and the other bodies interested in the tourist trade. Would it not be better, therefore, to have one individual of that sort, acting under the guidance of the Premier, to administer the tourist trade with a free hand, to put some action into the whole set-up, rather than spend a considerable amount of time at meetings discussing this and that?

I feel that a live-wire person in this position could, by using his imagination, get considerable assistance from other people free of charge. Only recently we, in this House, had the pleasure of viewing a film dealing with the North-West of this State; a film taken by the chief photographer of *The West Australian*. I understand that that film has been back and forth to Canberra and other important places. It is in high demand, owing to the quality of the workmanship in it.

If a private organisation, such as Western Australian Newspapers Ltd., is prepared, at its own expense, to get photographers to make films of that nature, could we not ask it to go a little further and give the tourist attractions of this State publicity throughout the world? I feel that the film to which I have referred is good enough to warrant screening anywhere in the world; and it is something of which we, as Western Australians, should feel proud.

I feel sure that our newspapers would co-operate with the Government to the extent of printing articles dealing with the tourist trade and publicising certain portions of this State which, hitherto, have not received much publicity. The Press, through its wide distribution, could do much to publicise the State; and a live-wire individual, in charge of the tourist trade, could do a lot towards getting such organisations behind him in this regard.

I must also mention various trade journals and publications issued by different companies. We all receive a variety of them; and they are very well prepared. I feel sure that, if suitable articles were included in those publications, they would constitute another avenue through which Western Australia could be publicised in various parts of the world. I, therefore, cannot help feeling that a single individual, with freedom to act—even though he might be directed so far as policy was concerned—would be able to achieve very much more than a committee would.

We have had examples in this State of that sort of thing, in the handling of the principal tourists who have come here—members of the Royal Family. When we are honoured with a royal tour, there is one person in this State who handles all the arrangements. He does that work under the direction of a higher authority which dictates policy; but he has power to co-opt the police, the transport authorities, and any other Government instrumentality. He can put all those organisations to any use he wishes, in connection with the tour. He does not have to bother with meetings of a committee, at which there might be discussed for hours the merits or demerits of doing something this way or that way. He has a job to do, and he uses his own initiative. He gets around him all those who can assist in the job; and the net result is action. I feel that in this direction lies success as far as our tourist authority is concerned. If he does get that action, well and good. If he does not, we can get someone else who will.

In practically every large business organisation these days there is a public relations officer who is on a similar footing. I consider that, with the tourist trade in this State crying out for someone with initiative, energy, and imagination, we could do a great deal of good by this means. Nevertheless, as I said at the outset, I am not the Premier of this State; and we all have different views. The Premier, no doubt, has given this matter careful consideration and is probably thinking along other lines; and it is his desire to have this authority of eight persons constituted. I have no desire to upset what he has in view, but I could not help but take this opportunity to express my own views. I support the second reading.

THE HON. G. E. JEFFERY (Suburban) [7.46]: In passing a few remarks on this measure I point out that I took some pains to investigate and study the tourist industry in other parts of the world. I also took the trouble to look up the definition of the word "tour" in the Oxford Dictionary and, among other definitions, it is defined as, "a rambling excursion," so if I am inclined to make a rambling excursion while speaking to the Bill, I will have to be excused.

In my opinion, the measure before us has been brought down as a result of a promise made by the Premier in his policy speech during the last election campaign. Despite all the noise that has been associated with the introduction of the Bill, I am afraid the proposed tourist authority will be like an old motorcar—a lot of noise and a poor performance. I believe that the Government has at its fingertips all the facilities necessary—with perhaps a little adjustment—to carry out the task that is intended to be set for the tourist authority proposed in the Bill.

With all the enthusiasm that is being shown for the Bill, I would not be surprised if someone came forward with a suggestion that aboriginal boys should meet the ocean-going liners at Gage Roads in canoes, or similar craft, so that they could dive for coins or other objects that may be tossed overboard by the passengers.

Perhaps another novelty attraction that might be suggested is that we should take people up to Kalgoorlie and show them the arena where the national game of two-up used to be played. To add further to our attractions, we could take tourists to the desert and conduct safaris in search of lost tribes. I do not claim to be an Australian anthropologist, but I do suggest that there are no lost tribes in Australia.

My personal theory is that with the advent of the present Government, those natives who have been referred to as being the lost tribes have probably taken to the bush and intend to remain there for another two-and-a-half years preferring the desert and drought to the so-called era of prosperity of the Liberal Government.

The question of hotels and their accommodation has been brought up, and I would like to mention that the other day I heard of two well-known citizens who had been attending a country race meeting. They said they went into the local hotel and asked for a meal. They were met with the traditional question: "Galah or goat?" and they ordered goat. When the waitress returned, they discovered there were no vegetables on their plates so one gentleman asked if they could have some pickles. The waitress sauntered up to the door in the partition that separated the dining room from the kitchen and called out, "Have you any Pygmalion pickles, because there are a couple of cows here who think it's Christmas?"

Returning to a more serious vein, I suggest that many of our country hotels—despite the criticism that we read in the Press—are equal to many of those in the city. In fact, I would venture to say that there are several country hotels that are superior to the city establishments. The question of tourist attractions is a vexed one; it covers a great deal of ground, and our two great problems are the large area of the State and our small population.

Western Australia has the climate that California thinks it has, but nevertheless people will not come to Western Australia, mainly because of the distance involved. That is one problem that this Government, or any other Government, cannot easily solve. Even with my limited travel within the State, I am sure that we have scenery that is equal to, if not better than, that in some of the more publicised parts of the Eastern States or countries overseas.

Those members who have travelled through the South-West of the State—to Denmark, Walpole, Albany, and other places—are aware of the terrific potential

that exists for the fostering of our tourist trade. However, they are no doubt aware of the terrific cost that would be entailed to provide the facilities that are necessary to attract tourists to those places. There is no doubt that we lack, in this State, the high-powered publicity that surrounds many of the tourist resorts in the Eastern States.

I had the privilege of travelling to the Gold Coast, and its natural beauty is not to be denied; but, frankly, I am sure that our metropolitan beaches are equally as good as the Gold Coast, and, with some development, they would be better. With the exception of two or three magnificent structures like Lennon's Hotel at Broad Beach, the balance of the Gold Coast buildings were similar to those one would see on a Hollywood location. They appeared to have been thrown up, were garish and gaudy in appearance, and resembled a second-rate Luna Park. I am sure the hotels in our State could, without much expense, be greatly improved.

The general consensus of opinion seems to be that we must travel far from the city to look for more tourist attractions; we must make some effort to encourage tourists. However, there are many ways we could encourage visitors to our city without a great deal of expenditure, and one way is to smarten up our city approaches. It is often said that the first impression is the most lasting, and if one were to board a train at East Perth and travel into the city, all that one would see would be a line of rusty iron fences; and the impression that would be gained by any visitor, I am sure, would be the same as one would get in travelling through Redfern to Sydney by train.

In my opinion, we should resume the triangular piece of land between Pier Street and Wellington Square and the railway line so that all the old cottages could be pulled down and the area landscaped. I am not suggesting that this could be done overnight, but we could make it the subject of an interim development order and resume it over a period of time. No doubt some of the land could be used for Royal Perth Hospital extensions or other purposes associated with the hospital.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How would you resume an area of land that size over a period of time?

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: As I have said, a blanket cover would have to be put on it now, and the Government could resume it over a period of years if it so desired. The trouble is we talk for so long that, when we do decide to resume any land, we find that the cost of resumption has risen considerably. From my experience of land values in the City of Perth, and from my observations of land values in other cities, I have noted that

land becomes increasingly valuable as time goes on; and if we delay in taking action now, we will regret our lack of foresight in ten years' time.

There is one attraction that I think should be established in Perth and that is the formation of a national theatre. Although we are the smallest of the capital cities on the mainland, I believe that our people have a greater appreciation of art than those in the other States. Our amateur and semi-professional theatricals reach a standard that is unequalled in Australia. In regard to the establishment of a national theatre in Perth, I was thinking of something along the lines of the Stockholm National Theatre in Sweden.

Speaking of Sweden, I was particularly interested in that country's liquor laws. I suggest that liquor trading hours have no bearing whatsoever on the attraction of tourists. We see a great deal of criticism appearing in the Press concerning the liquor trading hours in this State. Whatever are the merits or demerits of more liberal hours of trading for our hotels, I am sure that this would have no bearing on attracting more tourists to Perth.

Perth has many natural advantages, including its wildflowers. There is no doubt, however, that wildflowers are gradually disappearing from around Perth and its suburbs, and for many reasons one has to go great distances to see them in any profusion.

In my opinion, the bulldozer is one of the main causes of their disappearance; and another is that the average person cannot resist their beauty, and picks them despite the fact that they are protected. Further, a great quantity of our wildflowers are despatched to the Eastern States by various means. I suppose that is all right to a point, but the wildflowers are to be found only by going further and further afield, and therefore the search for them becomes less attractive to the tourist. I have seen people from the Eastern States fall in love with them. Whilst visiting the Eastern States I saw them encased in ice and their display in those States aroused great interest.

Therefore, despite all the noise that has been made over this Bill, I am not very happy with the proposed tourist authority that will be set up for the purpose of attracting more tourists to this State. In my short experience in Parliament, I have found that every committee or body that is constituted is made up mostly of civil servants representing various Ministers. A committee of three, with its representatives nominated by, say, the Australian National Travel Association, the Tourist Bureau, and an interested party such as the Australian Hotels Association would perform the duty much more efficiently.

I cannot see any great value in having upon this proposed tourist authority a representative of the Minister for Works or of the Minister who is in charge of the Main Roads Department. If one so desires one can get a map of Perth from the Royal Automobile Club. The Bill is unimaginative and will fill no great need. The existing facilities, with a little remodelling or streamlining could be used to attract tourists to this State just as well as, if not better than, the moves that are proposed in this Bill.

The value in attracting tourists to Western Australia cannot be gainsaid, but the cost of encouraging them here has to be weighed against the State's economy. I would not like to see a trickle of tourists being attracted to this State as a result of heavy expenditure of public money when we have so many other essentials to be provided for the population of this State.

I need not say anything further. The members of this House have some idea of the facilities that are required to attract tourists, but I know that if I had the choice of being able to construct a new high school or to attract 1,000 tourists to our State, I would prefer to construct the new high school. I will defer any further remarks on the Bill until the Committee stage.

THE HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [7.58]: Despite the fact that this measure does not contain all the merit that it might, I intend to support it. I know that the Bill provides for the constitution of a tourist authority comprising eight members which will include the Minister or his deputy. The Bill also provides for money to be set aside to enable the authority to carry out its function. The Governor, also, may make regulations to enable the authority to perform its duties.

The main reason for my speaking to the Bill is that I believe that, over a period of years, there has been insufficient publicity of our State—and indeed of the Commonwealth—in other parts of the world. To my mind, Western Australia appears to be at a disadvantage geographically—compared to the rest of the Commonwealth—when it comes to the question of attracting tourists. We have to bear in mind that although we are the largest State in area, we have, next to Tasmania, the lowest population; but nevertheless, we have an advantage that would prove to be of interest to tourists if we could only attract them here.

The no-man's land of approximately 1,000 miles, lying between this State and its sister State, is one of the disadvantages under which we labour. Coupled with that, of course, is the factor of interstate jealousy. No member in this House or in another place, after visiting the Eastern States, will not agree that this State lacks very considerably in its publicity.

I have in mind a visit I made to South Australia a little more than 18 months ago. When speaking about the relative attractions of the respective States in this country, I was told in a rather sneering manner that Western Australia was the Cinderella State of the Commonwealth. Although I am not a Western Australian-born citizen, I have lived here for the greater part of my life, and to all intents and purposes I am a loyal Western Australian. I have stated to some of my friends in the Eastern States that, although this may be regarded as the Cinderella State, its people take a great deal of courage and comfort from the knowledge that Cinderella eventually became triumphant over her ugly sisters.

That is one of the main reasons why this State has failed to attract as many tourists as it should have. There are, among the States, certain jealousies which militate against Western Australia. If we were to journey to the United Kingdom we would see that Australia was one of the most poorly advertised portions of the British Commonwealth. The advertisements and propaganda of countries like South Africa, New Zealand, Canada, the U.S.A., Yugoslavia, and other continental countries, put some of our propaganda to shame.

The time is long overdue when a great deal more money should be made available for advertising Australia in other parts of the world. I was rather astounded when I was last in England to see our own agency—Savoy House in the Strand which has two show windows, one on the side street going down to the Thames embankment, and the other facing the Strand—failing to publicise Western Australia in those show windows. One would have thought they would have been used to display the goods and produce of our particular State. The show window facing the Strand was used to display pressure cookers, with a large notice to show that they would be available in Australia within a short period.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I did see a sheaf of wheat being displayed in the show window on one occasion.

The Hon. E. M. DAVIES: It seemed rather amusing to see pressure cookers being displayed with that notice, when everyone knew they had been available in Australia for a number of years.

My main object in speaking to the debate is to point out that, irrespective of the personnel appointed to the proposed authority, many other organisations are more worthy of representation than those enumerated in the measure. If we are to publicise this State successfully we will have to take more forcible action than we have in the past; particularly in the United Kingdom and other dominions. In my perambulations around the United Kingdom, it appeared that Australia in

general was one of the most poorly advertised portions of the British Commonwealth.

Whether the proposed authority is to be formed, or whether a particular body is to be delegated the task of boosting tourism in this State, I feel that the main effort should be made overseas, and in the other parts of the Commonwealth, so that tourists will be encouraged and attracted to come to this State, where they can spend their money as freely as we spend ours in other parts of the Commonwealth.

I support the Bill, because I believe it may have some virtues. It may be the means of creating enthusiasm in some of the people charged with the responsibility of attracting tourists. Although the personnel of the proposed authority is not to my liking, the Government has at least made a start. Possibly ways and means will be found to improve that committee, and to bring about a greater amount of advertising and propaganda in regard to tourism, not only in this State but in the Eastern States and overseas.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines—in reply) [8.7]: This Bill reminds me somewhat of the debate on the Address-in-reply, because during the various contributions we were certainly taken over a considerable portion of the State by members who expressed their views on the districts in which they live and which they represent.

From the various addresses, one fact became obvious. Almost without exception, members thought that some steps should be taken to develop the tourist industry in this State. Almost every member expressed the viewpoint that this matter required attention. In introducing this Bill, the Premier attempted to overcome the problems to which members here made reference during this debate.

I say, without any offence, that no attempt was made previously to develop tourism on lines similar to those envisaged in the Bill—not by the previous Labour Government or the Governments before that.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The Premier had no faith in it, according to his remarks.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That statement is not true. The Premier has much faith in the Bill. To be perfectly frank, I am not appreciative of the amount of cold water that has been thrown on the attempt of the Premier to solve this problem, which everyone agrees requires urgent attention.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: He said so himself when he said he expected nothing out of it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Premier said we must make haste slowly, and so we must in a matter such as this.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: He said that nothing spectacular could be achieved.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I wish to comment on some of the matters raised by the various members in this debate. Mr. Strickland thought that the Bill superimposed an authority on the Tourist Bureau. That is not the position at all. The Tourist Bureau is not set up by any statutory authority; it is simply a Government department. If we are to take notice of the expressions of nearly every member in the House, urgent action should be taken to enable it to do a better job in developing tourism in this State.

I think Mr. Strickland struck the most important note in this debate when he said that many thousands of people who come to Australia see this country for the first time through the cities of Fremantle and Perth. I agree with him wholeheartedly. Because of that, surely it is up to all of us to try and make our fair city as attractive to the tourist as we can! The proposed authority will attempt to do just that.

It was stated by Mr. Strickland that the tourist authority would not have very much hope of achieving, or that it would not achieve, what the sponsors of the Bill hope it would. I say that the time to make such a statement is after finding out whether or not it is true. In a matter like this, one should not pour cold water on an idea—

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I am guided by the Premier's own remarks.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH:—before it has been given a trial. The honourable member said the Bill merely sets up an organisation "which has nothing to organise," using his own words. That is a most contradictory statement. In the first place, the honourable member said that Western Australia and Fremantle were the gateway to Australia, and then he said we have nothing to organise.

The Hon. J. Murray: Not with the personnel of the proposed authority.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member has had his say. I shall refer to his remarks shortly.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: Pour cold water on what he said.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I certainly shall not pour more cold water on this subject than has already been poured. Mr. Strickland drew a comparison between the attractions in New Zealand and those in Western Australia. New Zealand happens to be endowed in a different way—climatically and geographically—from Western Australia; but surely, because of that, and because the population of Western Australia is so sparse and its area so vast, we should not say that there is not much hope of doing anything here.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I did not say that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That was the way I read the honourable member's remarks. If they were optimistic rather than pessimistic, then I am glad to learn that he is optimistic.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I only objected to the proposed authority.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Let us examine the position in the other countries of the world. When I introduced the second reading, I stated that many countries relied very substantially for their revenue on the returns from the tourist trade, and they gave the tourist industry the greatest attention. The finest example of this encouragement is found in Switzerland, which was dealt with in the remarks of Dr. Hislop.

There is a country which most certainly concentrates to a very large degree on the tourist trade. Each year, many hundreds of thousands of tourists visit that country and spend their money there.

It may not be very important to point out how difficult it is to get a berth on the train from the Eastern States to Western Australia, because of the great number of visitors to this State, but I hope the position will become increasingly difficult as a result of more people desiring to come here. Should that transpire, we would have sold to tourists, the attractions of this State in a better form than they have been sold heretofore.

It was very pleasing to me to hear the optimistic remarks of Mr. Davies and Mr. Cunningham, and the view they took concerning the Bill. Theirs was the sort of speech that I could enjoy, because they were at least prepared to say they could give the Government a small pat on the back for trying to do something; and that we should give the measure a trial to see whether anything could be achieved.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Do not you think the previous Government did anything?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I did not say that the previous Government had done nothing. I think I said that the tourist authority, or the Tourist Bureau, as was mentioned by Mr. Strickland, did not attempt to improve itself beyond its present position. Everyone is prepared to say that it needs improvement; and this is an attempt to bring about a better state of affairs so far as the tourist industry in Western Australia is concerned.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The previous Government gave big grants to country tourist bureaus.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would not say they were big in comparison with some other grants the Government gave. However, although this is the Tourist Bill I do not propose to go touring on that point of view.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The Premier gave us credit for it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. Strickland also said that the Bill was a bit premature. He said he thought the Tourist Bureau as constituted at the moment could do the job, and that this move by the Government was a little premature.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: That is right.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: When does he think a time should be chosen? When does he think the time will be ripe to make a start? I am sure I do not know.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: To make a start?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If the honourable member had been in the position that I am in now, and had the privilege of introducing this Bill, I am sure he would have said that this was the right time. It is said that this is an attempt to fulfil an election promise made by the present Government. It is; and I do not think that any member of the Government is endeavouring to hide that fact.

The Premier, in his policy speech, said that he would endeavour to improve the tourist industry in Western Australia, and that he would do so by setting up a tourist authority. It is for that reason the Bill has been introduced, and we are asking the blessing of Parliament on the matter.

Mr. Strickland concluded his remarks on the basis that he thought there was insufficient tourist traffic at the moment, and insufficient prospect of it in the next few years, to warrant the establishment of the authority. I would say, with the greatest respect, that now is the time to make some attempt. This Government has not been long in office, but it is fulfilling one of its undertakings, and it is also bearing in mind that in 1962 Western Australia will probably get the first big chance it has ever had to publicise itself. I most heartily agree with Dr. Hislop that in this respect we cannot afford to make any mistakes. Therefore, I think this is an excellent chance to see whether this authority will work.

Mr. Strickland said he thought the Bill would bolster up something which should be done by private industry. I do not think that is the case at all. It was suggested by him that private industry might get this money. Let me assure him that it is thought by the Minister in charge of this department that the demands will be so great on the local authorities that private enterprise will not get a look-in so far as the money is concerned. I do not feel it is up to the Government to help private industry in this respect. Private industry should be able to—and does—look after itself.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: But the Bill provides for it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It does.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Surely the Government thought that way.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. I repeat, the Bill does provide for something to take place; but it is not only in connection with money that private industry can be helped to establish itself in regard to tourism. There are many ways in which it can be encouraged and helped, apart from the monetary aspect.

We pass now from Mr. Strickland's remarks to those of Mr. John Thomson who supported the Bill. He had the benefit—like myself—of attending the country tourist bureaux' conference recently, and of seeing the delegates in operation. It was enlightening to me to find how enthusiastic they were and how they conducted their conference. They were very pleased to think that the Premier, as the responsible Minister, had introduced this Bill, and that he was really trying to do something in the way of tourism.

Their criticism of the Tourist Bureau in some cases was, to say the least, not quite kind. They pointed out one fact which, to my mind, was very important. They mentioned the type of person employed by the Tourist Bureau. Because of the fact that it is not a permanent public service institution in which the employees can gain advancement, there is a tendency for young people to be engaged on the counter to attend to those seeking advice. This has the effect of making the young people want to leave, because there is no prospect of advancement. At the conference it was suggested that it would be a good idea—and I thought it would, too—if we could introduce into the office, people such as those employed by the steamship companies and the airway companies; in other words, those who wish to make an occupation of that type of work. Advancement is available if the employees are sufficiently ambitious to seek it. Mr. Thomson has placed on the notice paper an amendment to deal with the representation of country tourist bureaux, and we can consider that when we go into Committee.

As I said, the speech made by Mr. Cunningham was one of a more optimistic nature, and was very helpful in respect to a Bill of this kind. I would like to make a few comments in connection with the remarks made by Mr. Ron Thompson. He suggested that the Government was clutching at a wish-bone. He also said that we have a Tourist Bureau which could carry out the objectives of this particular Bill. He then went on to tell us about all the defects that existed in the State.

One must take into consideration the fact that although there are defects, the Tourist Bureau—which he thinks can carry out the functions of this Bill—has not been attending to them. That is a good reason why we should give this authority an opportunity to see whether it can overcome these matters.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Change that wish-bone to a boomerang.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The hon. member has made his speech. I thought he said a wish-bone. If he said boomerang, it does not matter. It means much the same thing.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It means the same to you.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think it meant the same to Mr. Thompson.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: There is a difference between a wish-bone and a boomerang.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. Thompson wanted to know whether, under the Bill, the Government could resume land. I do not think that by any stretch of the imagination it can be said that there is a provision to that effect in this particular Bill.

There was some talk of representation on the authority, and Dr. Hislop joined in the criticism and said there need not be one "John Citizen" on the authority. Of course there need not be one. That is perfectly true, but if members will bear in mind the second reading speech I made on behalf of the Premier, and also the Premier's own remarks when he pointed out that this authority would comprise Government representatives and representatives of private enterprise, it will be quite clear to them that under the heading of the words "private enterprise," "John Citizen," as Dr. Hislop calls him, will have a very definite place on this tourist authority.

The Hon. J. Murray: Not very heavy representation!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Maybe not, in the honourable member's opinion. If he keeps on telling me, it will sink in. I know what he said, and I will come to it in a moment.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: Just do not forget!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will not forget. Dr. Hislop brought something to my mind which I think is of considerable importance; and the subject was traversed by the country tourist bureaux' conference at Albany. I am referring to the question of courtesy in tourism. At the conference, one of the delegates told the story of some very short measure he had been given by a particular shopkeeper and how his mind had reacted to it. He told the conference that he was unlikely to go into that shop again.

I found from my experience overseas, that courtesy is a watch-word with people in those countries, and that when they come into contact with a tourist, the one thing that is outstanding is the treatment and courtesy they extend to him.

If I remember rightly, Mr. Ron Thompson said it was difficult for a man and his family to have a holiday in a hotel,

and he took us through some of the hotels in the State and pointed out the various charges. I say that position does not apply only to Western Australia or to the other States of Australia but that it is world wide. It is not everyone who can afford to take his whole family to a hotel for a holiday. However, other countries of the world have tried to find—and have succeeded in finding—a way to entertain tourists and provide amenities for their own people.

The Hon. R. Thompson: The Minister has missed the theme of my speech. I was at that stage referring to the classification of hotels.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I can agree with him on that point. One of the matters which is given consideration in overseas countries is the classification of hotels. One can find out what sort of a hotel one is going to, and what the charge is, beforehand; and in regard to our hotels we can also find out what the charge is beforehand. However, what I was going to say was that in my second reading speech I mentioned that we had two types of tourists with which to deal. In the first category we have our own people, and in the second category we have those of the Eastern States and other countries.

I feel we should try to find ways and means of ensuring that the working people of our State—who naturally cannot afford to take their families to hotels—should, nevertheless, be given an opportunity to enjoy a holiday. In countries like England there are established holiday camps, which are very popular, and where working people can go without having to pay large costs. Of course, because the distance involved in travelling to places of interest in other countries of the world is not so great, people can go touring for two or three days, or up to a fortnight, at reasonable charges. However, we have to make haste slowly in regard to these matters; and, in an endeavour to make a start on a problem that has not been tackled before, this authority will be set up.

Mr. Heenan was more helpful to me in regard to this matter. He thought the aims and objects of the Bill were worthy and would need all the encouragement we could give them; he doubted, however, whether this legislation would achieve what it set out to achieve. But I repeat that the important thing is to give this authority an opportunity to try to do something; and if it is proved that it cannot achieve what it hopes to achieve, those people who are now satisfied that it will not achieve anything will probably be happy about the result.

This has been a most interesting debate because one has been able to get the views of all members, without any reservation. Mr. Wise supported the measure and said that we in Western Australia have a great

deal to sell. His opinion was in contradistinction to the one expressed by Mr. Strickland.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I did not say we had nothing to sell.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. Strickland thought it was too early to set up this authority—it was a little premature.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I said the authority was premature. You know what I said.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The little State of Tasmania has profited from tourism, and a great many people go to Tasmania every year. Many people there have capitalised on the tourist trade. I became so interested in many of the remarks made, particularly those of Mr. Wise, that at one stage I forgot to take notes of some of the things that were said. To sum it up, I think that we have to try to sell Western Australia, and, in the words of Mr. Davies, do something to create an interest in Western Australia.

I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Davies when he says that Australia is one of the most poorly-advertised countries in the world. It is a pity to see the dingy old office that the Western Australian authorities occupy in the Strand London. The whole approach does not lend itself to advertising our country overseas; and I would venture to suggest, as I have done before in this House, that a commercial enterprise would spend more money on one advertising campaign than Western Australia spends on its Agent-General's office in the Strand, London, in the course of a year, and with much greater success.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It is in your hands now.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Now we come to the point of view expressed by Mr. Murray. He joined with Mr. Strickland in saying that he thought the Bill lacked imagination. He also said that he thought our public servants lacked imagination and vision. To be perfectly frank with the honourable member, that is pretty poor praise.

The Hon. J. Murray: It is true, just the same.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member has expressed his point of view and I will stick to mine; it is poor praise of civil servants who give their lives to the occupations they follow.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: And for which they are paid.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Of course; nevertheless the attitude shown and the approach one has to one's job, and the payment received are sometimes quite at variance. I feel certain that the Premier will choose, when he selects those who are to occupy positions on this authority, people who will be able to attach to their

jobs the importance that the Premier thinks warranted, and I feel sure that the authority will confound the critics.

Mr. Lavery in his contribution to the debate suggested that one of the persons on the authority should be a lady. He handed me privately the name of the person he thought should be on the authority, and I will communicate it to the Minister concerned; and then it will be up to him. Mr. Mattiske also joined with the others in offering some criticism of the authority itself. It appears to me that, in the main, the criticism in connection with this measure boils down to criticism of the authority itself.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: That is right.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There are many other committees, boards, and authorities which have more members than this authority. Mr. Mattiske said that he thought we should have one person who would be a dictator. He should know that the Party to which we belong does not like dictators. To appoint a dictator would not make the authority successful.

Mr. Jeffery also passed some comments in connection with the matter. He did not bring Cleopatra into this debate, but he did tell us of some of his perambulations. I am sorry to hear that his Party is in the wilderness; nevertheless open confession is good for the soul.

With those few remarks I commend the Bill to the House. I hope that it will be read a second time, and that it will eventually become law; because it is an attempt on the part of the Government, and the Premier in particular—who has himself taken the portfolio of Tourists—to do something in regard to an urgent problem. Dr. Hislop said that we will be on trial when the Empire Games are held in this State in 1962. I hope we will not make any mistakes and that we will profit from the energy and enthusiasm that will be shown in regard to this authority.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon) in the Chair; the Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 put and passed.

Clause 4—Western Australian Tourist Development Authority:

The Hon. J. MURRAY: This clause covers that part of the Bill which has been criticised by all Parties. The Minister, in replying to some of the early debate, said that we would be happy to see the authority fail. We will not be happy to see it fail, and that is why we have drawn attention to this matter. Probably this

is one of the most important matters the Government has tackled. I realise that on the hustings the Government made certain promises; but that does not necessarily mean that it should rush in where angels fear to tread.

The present Government Tourist Bureau has failed completely to sell Western Australia as a whole; but this proposed authority will be weighted with public servants. So let us examine that aspect. If the Government is truly conscious of its responsibilities in regard to tourism in Western Australia, the most senior public servants in the departments mentioned will become members of the authority. But can any member visualise those public servants having the time necessary to devote to this question? Of course not! Senior public servants were made members of the Land Utilisation Committee. But what have they done?

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: Nothing.

The Hon. J. MURRAY: They have shifted the job on to one man because they are too busy. The same thing will happen to this authority if senior public servants are made members of it. What is the alternative? To appoint a junior. And can anyone see a junior from the Main Roads Department, or the Public Works Department, recommending to his Minister that large sums of money be spent, and getting away with it? It is just too ridiculous, and that is why I say this legislation is not only premature but ill-conceived.

Clause 4 is the stumbling block. I do not doubt the Government's sincerity in wishing to promote tourism, and there is little time between now and 1962 to put the department on the right road; but we will not do it with a committee of this description. Mr. Thompson asked whether the committee would have powers of resumption. Of course it will not! We know that the Forests Department is holding up the majority of the areas of land in the South-West which could be used as tourist resorts.

In a committee overweighted with public servants we can anticipate the sort of thing which has happened in regard to Rottnest. I previously said that there were 70 civil servants to 30 of the public visiting Rottnest during the holiday season. I will now say that the comparative figures will be 60 civil servants to 40 of the public. Rottnest is controlled by civil servants. The accommodation has been reserved for civil servants in years gone by, and it will continue to be so in the future. They have permanent bookings.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It does not leave room for the tourist.

The Hon. J. MURRAY: Let us get some square thinking on this. The sooner the Government includes people on the Committee who have some idea of the requirements of Western Australia, the better.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 29—Delete the word "and."

It is desirable to have on the committee someone who has knowledge of country tourist bureaus. There were six country tourist bureaus at the annual conference at Albany.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 31—Add after the word "and" the words "Country Tourist Bureaux; and"

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: In his introductory speech the Minister said that one of the members would come from the R.A.C. and one from the tourist section of the Chamber of Commerce. I do not oppose Mr. Thomson's amendment, but I would like the Minister to explain what it might mean. The tourist bureaus would be doubly represented; and I hope that is the case. Mr. Murray and I have definite views on the type of person who should serve on the committee; that it should be somebody from outside Government departments. But I would draw Mr. Murray's attention to the fact that he said juniors might be appointed. In this case, members other than the Minister are entitled to such remuneration and travelling expenses as prescribed; it is not usual that juniors participate in such emoluments.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: It seems that the effectiveness of Mr. Thomson's amendment is more apparent than real. It says that the one person shall represent the country municipalities, boards of country road districts, and country tourist bureaus. We could go on and include the Royal Agricultural Society, football clubs, and so on.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: What about adding the word "public"?

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: That would be *reductio ad absurdum*. I cannot help feeling that the tourist bureaus are entitled to representation as such. Mr. Thomson could probably enlighten us on the composition of tourist bureaus.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The amendment is acceptable to me; and if it is agreed to, it will simply mean that one of the representatives on the board will represent country local authorities—both municipalities and road boards—and also the country tourist bureaus.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Not "and also".

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There will be a representative of that body also.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: He need not be associated with the bureau.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No. It might explain matters if I were to say that in anticipation of the Government's accepting some representation from them, the country tourist bureaux, at their annual conference, appointed three persons, one of whom could be selected by the Minister. The Minister controlling the authority will set out to get a person who has local authority affiliation and country tourist bureau affiliation; then he has two in one.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Have those three persons the qualifications?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I know at least one of them has; I am not too sure of the others. There is no necessity to mention the names. On the point raised by Mr. Strickland, when the person representing the local authorities and the country tourist bureaux is appointed, there will still be room in subclause (6) for the appointment of two more. Mr. Strickland was quite correct when he understood me to say that the R.A.C. would be invited to submit a nomination.

The remaining member could be a nominee of the Perth Chamber of Commerce Tourist Promotion Committee. I suggest that he, in all probability, will be a "John Citizen"—he will be somebody from private enterprise. So will the man who represents the local authorities and the country tourist bureaux. I think that without doubt the person who comes from the R.A.C. will represent private enterprise.

I would like now to refer to the caustic criticism by Mr. Murray concerning the constitution of this authority. It would be interesting to know the representation on the Victorian authority. It comprises the Minister, or his nominee, who is the Chairman; six representatives of Government Departments, one representative of country road districts; and one representative of outside interests. The Government considers the authority offered in this Bill is a more balanced one. We have four Government nominees, and the Bill lays down who they shall be; and there are three from private enterprise, as well as the Minister as chairman.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon): I would remind the Minister that he is speaking to an amendment.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think my remarks are completely connected to the amendment because we are talking about representatives from local authorities and country tourist bureaux. In the process, mention has been made as to who the other persons shall be. Mr. Murray mentioned junior representatives. They will not be junior representatives; they will be well chosen by the Government, and I think the honourable member need not have any fears about the members of the

authority. If they are not satisfactory they can be replaced. The amendment is acceptable to me.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: I listened carefully to Mr. Watson in regard to the appointment of a country tourist bureau representative. Had I moved to appoint such a person to the authority it would have increased its number. I think the authority is large enough. I see no necessity to increase its number by one, two, or three. A panel of three names will be submitted to the Minister; and, apart from these people having an intimate knowledge of country tourism, they will have a very good knowledge of local government in country districts. Therefore, they will be competent to represent local authorities.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: I thought Mr. Thomson was going to explain why he moved his amendment as he did. Had he nominated a member of the country tourist bureaux he would have been imposing a burden on the Crown. As it is at present, the Minister who will be in charge of the Act—who happens to be the Premier—can, if he so desires, choose someone from the country tourist bureaux, or he can select one of the three persons mentioned at the Albany meeting as having the dual qualifications of knowing something about tourism as well as local government.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: From what the Minister has said I understand that the country tourist bureaux intend to hold a conference in rotation at Albany, Bunbury, and Geraldton. I hope the Minister will draw the attention of that conference when it meets in Geraldton to the fact that Geraldton is not the end of the State. The representatives who are now on this authority represent areas covering half the State; but there is no representative—none that I can see—to represent the northern half of the State, which, in my opinion, offers more to the people living in the southern half of the State than the southern half offers to the people living in the northern half, in the way of tourist attractions.

I hope the Minister will draw the attention of the Premier to that fact and remind him that there are some very good vessels on the North-West coastal run; and when the vessel which is now under construction is completed, a further 100 berths will be available.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I would draw the attention of the Minister to paragraphs (v) and (vi) in which appear the words, "deemed to represent." A person can be deemed to represent anything when that person has no connection at all with it, and if we take out these words "be deemed to" then the people must represent the section and they must belong to the section.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Not necessarily.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Yes; the general frame of representing is that they are people who represent their colleagues in such a vocation. If one is deemed to represent then he does not have any connection at all with that vocation. I realise that whilst we can delete these words in subparagraph (vi), the Bill will have to be recommitted to have them deleted in subparagraph (v). Is that your ruling, Mr. Chairman?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (the Hon. G. C. Mackinnon): Yes.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: To test the feeling of the Committee I move an amendment—

Page 2, lines 32 and 33—Delete the words "be deemed to."

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In the first place, I would like to tell Mr. Strickland that I am quite sure the Premier does not have to be reminded of the importance of the North-West of this State.

I believe it is completely unnecessary to delete these words. Dr. Hislop gave as his reason that a person must be deemed to represent a body but need not have any interest in that body. After having read subparagraph (v) can anyone believe that the Premier—the Minister in charge of this Bill—would appoint someone completely outside the ambit of those particular callings. I think it is unreasonable to suggest he would. Dr. Hislop feels that if these words are deleted, the person will automatically represent the country municipalities and boards.

Subparagraph (vi) provides that two shall be appointed who shall be deemed to represent persons having a special interest in the development and publicising of the tourist attractions of the State. I suggest that there would be a multiplicity of organisations which would have a particular interest in the tourist industry; and by deleting these words, how much better would we be?

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: "Deeming" generally assumes that that that is not, is.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is as clear as mud.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: That is the usual reason for the inclusion of the word "deem." As Dr. Hislop has said, one may not be, but he may be deemed to be. I am not sure that the deletion of these words will leave the subparagraph effective; because generally if we provide that a person shall be appointed and shall represent the councils of the country municipalities, that presupposes that the country municipalities have gone through some form of procedure to nominate him. I think that is why the words are included here.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: On that basis they should be left in.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: Yes. And yet I recall an incident some years ago when someone had to be deemed to represent the farming community. I think it may have been in connection with the Fremantle Harbour Trust. It was some such board. They appointed a Trades Hall secretary.

The Hon. R. Thompson: It was not the Harbour Trust.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I thought that it was the Harbour Trust. I know it was a flagrant breach of the spirit of the provision. However, that person was deemed to represent the class specified, although he did not have any interest in it. On balance, I would be inclined to take a chance and leave the words in.

The Hon. J. MURRAY: Strange as it may seem, I am supporting the Minister on this particular point.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Jolly good!

The Hon. J. MURRAY: I can see all sorts of difficulties if we delete these words. I cannot see any Government breaching the spirit of this particular subsection. These words have been included so as to make it clear in the public's mind that it must be someone who is deemed to be. I feel that "deemed" is the right word, because he might be a member of a municipal council or road board today but not tomorrow. We cannot sort of sack him overnight because he has lost his position. Therefore I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I find myself on this occasion in agreement with the Minister.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Jolly good!

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I feel that there is a lot of truth in the saying that you can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink. I cannot see any difference in leaving the words in or taking them out, except in the explanation of Mr. Murray. The nominee is to represent a certain section. He is deemed to represent them, and I feel the explanation Mr. Murray gave makes it very clear that "deemed" is the correct word.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I do not mind what is done with it; but it seems humorous that a week ago this Chamber agreed to take out the same word at the request of the Minister.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clauses 5 to 13 put and passed.

Clause 14—Power to Minister to appoint sub-committees:

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I move an amendment—

Page 7, lines 37 and 38—Delete the words "according to its tenor."

As we have dealt with these words previously, there is no need to explain the amendment.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I feel that the words are unnecessary, and I will not oppose the amendment.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: The delegation might give power to exercise all the powers of the person making the delegation; or power only to exercise one, two, or three of many powers; and that is why the words "according to its tenor" are necessary. If its tenor is a full-blooded power of delegation, all right; and if it is only a half-blooded power of delegation, all right also.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I agree. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 15 and Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

ART GALLERY BILL

Assembly's Message

Message from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to amendments Nos. 2 to 9 inclusive made by the Council, and had disagreed to Nos. 1, 10, and 11 now considered.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (the Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; the Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

No. 1.

Clause 6, page 2—Delete all words in subclause (1) after the word "shall" in line 32 and substitute the following:—

be appointed by the Governor and shall consist of seven members including the chairman and vice chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing to the amendment is—

It is not desirable to make the Board so large and also it is not desirable to have a board differing numerically from that of the Museum.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move—
That the amendment be not insisted on.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I think the reason given by another place is totally inadequate, and we should have a better explanation as to why a small committee should be appointed in place of the larger committee which we suggested. I hope we will stick to our amendment, because the matter was fully discussed previously. The main reason why we considered the committee should be larger is that it is too important a body, and it spends too much

money to allow it to have a quorum of three with two persons thinking alike dominating the purchase of pictures and the expenditure of considerable sums of money.

The fact that we are told it is desirable to have a board of the same numerical strength as the Museum board shows a complete lack of understanding of the two bodies. We have already had legislation introduced to dissociate the two sections because of their inherent differences, and at the moment there is a wider field of interest connected with the Art Gallery than there is with the Museum.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We have spent a long time on the Bill to establish a tourist industry in Western Australia, and were told that the authority concerned with tourists is too big; but as regards the Art Gallery, we are told that the committee proposed is too small! Prior to the introduction of the Bills covering the Museum and the Art Gallery both organisations were run by the one authority, and it was desired, as Dr. Hislop said, to make them two separate entities because of their different interests.

When dealing with the Museum Bill a board of five with a quorum of three was agreed to; but with the Art Gallery the board must be comprised of seven members and the quorum increased to four. I do not think that the decisions the Art Gallery board will make will be of any greater consequence to that board than will the decisions, which the Museum board will make, be to the Museum. Therefore I cannot see any reason why we should insist on the amendment.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I think the Minister has laid himself open, because he agrees that the two bodies are inherently different. They are. The money which will be spent by the Museum board will be relatively small as compared with the money spent by the Art Gallery board. The Art Gallery has committees and people interested in it; whereas very few people are interested enough to form committees in relation to the Museum. The Minister said that the expenditure by the Art Gallery board will be no different from the expenditure of money by the Museum board.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I did not say that at all. I spoke of decisions, and I did not mention money.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Then let us say "decisions"; and I will quote a case of where a decision by the Art Gallery could mean a lot of money. Within the last 12 months or so the Art Gallery purchased a picture painted by George Lambert. This picture cost £2,500, or thereabouts, and it is a picture which has been seriously criticised by artistic people in this city as being out of keeping in its time so far as our Art Gallery is concerned. George Lambert was one of the senior painters

when I was a small boy. I have been advised, on very good authority, that when the directors of the Art Gallery met some time earlier in the year they criticised the purchase of that picture at £2,500 or thereabouts and wondered why that sum of money was expended on a picture which was not regarded as being very good and certainly was not a good picture by that particular artist. However, if we had relied on the advice of those who are more interested in art in this State, we would have acquired for our Art Gallery a painting by Graham Sutherland or perhaps Darling, which the public could have gone to see with some interest.

Regardless of whether the members of this Chamber or I like modern paintings, we have to live with them because they are part of the modern make-up. When a decision, such as the purchase of a valuable painting, has to be made, we are justified in having a larger number of members on the board than only two or three; and therefore I think we should insist on our amendment.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This is purely a question of deciding whether we will have seven members appointed to this board as against five mentioned in the Bill. The functions of the Museum and the Art Gallery have been separated for the reasons given. Not for one moment do I think the decisions of the Art Gallery board will be any better if they are made by seven members instead of by five. The five members will be well chosen, because Ministers do not select such people lightly. They obtain the most competent and suitable people for the job, and I cannot see any reason for increasing the number of members.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: In its reasons given for objecting to the Council's amendment, the Legislative Assembly has advised that it is not desirable to make the board so large, and also it is not desired to have the Art Gallery board comprise a number that differs numerically from that comprising the Museum board.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is right.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Is it possible, despite the suggestion to separate the functions of the Museum board and the Art Gallery board that there would be no new thought because we would still have the one Minister administering both boards? Has the Government in view the object of keeping the same number on the Museum board? If it has, I would prefer seven members on the board.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: To the best of my knowledge, there is no intention that the members of both boards shall be one and the same.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: There is abroad the idea, especially among those associated with the Art Gallery, that Cabinet has the impression that artists seek to run

the Art Gallery. In fact, they have no desire to do that whatsoever. The Perth Society of Artists is an active body, and it merely asks that there shall be a sufficient number on this Art Gallery board to enable an active body associated with art to be represented on it. If the Art Gallery desires to purchase a picture, we do not want to buy it simply because only two people favour it.

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

Ayes—6.

Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. R. C. Mattiske	Hon. J. Murray

(Teller.)

Noes—11

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. G. E. Jeffery	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. A. R. Jones	

(Teller.)

Majority against—5.

Question thus negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 10.

Clause 13, page 5, line 16—Delete the word "three and substitute the word "five."

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing is that this is consequential on No. 1.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: As you have said, Sir, the amendment is consequential and a motion is not necessary.

The CHAIRMAN: I must have a motion that the amendment be insisted on.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move—

That the amendment be insisted on.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 11.

Clause 26—Delete.

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing is—

This clause should be retained because it is not advisable to permit sales in the Art Gallery of Western Australia. Such sales are not permitted in other State Art Galleries.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

This clause was deleted from the Bill. To get its full purport, members should read clause 20. I am informed that even if the clause is not retained in the Bill, the trustees of the Art Gallery will continue their policy of refusing sales in the Art Gallery. Such sales are not permitted in any other Art Gallery in Australia. The trustees and director both advise that much embarrassment could be caused by the director being called upon to give

advice as to the quality and the price asked for any particular work of art, especially if a local artist were involved. I hope our action will have the effect of putting the clause back in the Bill to save the director the embarrassment I have mentioned.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I hope we will insist on our amendment. If what the Minister says is true, then nobody—the artists included—will have any objection whatever. But under this they have grave doubt whether the custom that has continued over many years can still continue. Not one of the artists or the society itself wants sales to take place, but they do want to be able to get in touch with artists to purchase pictures. The very afternoon we discussed this here one of the Perth art prizes was bought and taken to Sydney.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Inside the Art Gallery?

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: How else? The person concerned saw the picture in the gallery and wanted to buy it. We have had the opportunity of advertising our art in many parts of the world because of pictures that have been bought simply by contacting the director. Some of the Perth prizes have finished up in private collections in America. All we want to do is to see that the measure protects art and the artists in Western Australia.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is a question of what I am given to understand by the Minister in another place who is in charge of the Bill. I do not suggest that what Dr. Hislop says is not true. The trustees of the Art Gallery have followed this policy and will continue to follow it whether the clause in the Bill is left in or not; but they have specifically asked that a statutory authority be placed in the Bill to prohibit that to which I have referred. I cannot make an explanation beyond that.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: There is a misunderstanding, so let us get an arrangement whereby we can clear it up.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I support the Minister. We were terribly tangled up when the clause was last before the Committee. We put an amendment to the clause which was carried, and we then defeated the clause when it was put as amended. The misunderstanding Dr. Hislop has mentioned is more apparent than real. I cannot see any provision in this clause which will prevent anyone from seeking information from the director. Clause 26 states that no person shall sell, offer for sale or expose for sale or suffer to be sold, offered or exposed for sale, in the Art Gallery any work of art that belongs to him and is being exhibited in the Art Gallery.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Clause 18 gives the Art Gallery the right to purchase a work of art being exhibited.

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

Ayes—8.

Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. G. E. Jeffery	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. R. C. Mattiske	Hon. J. Murray

(Teller.)

Noes—9.

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. A. R. Jones	

(Teller.)

Majority against—1.

Question thus negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

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

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 29th September.

House adjourned at 10.5 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 22nd September, 1959

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :	
Electrical motors, price loading	1735
Fruit fly, baiting in south suburban district	1735
Collie High School, girls' toilet facilities	1735
High school, erection between Fremantle and Perth	1736
Riverside drive, Causeway via Mt. Lawley	1736
Perth-Guildford Road, widening	1736
Albany housing, allocation of funds to building society	1736
Rural electricity supplies, conversion of current	1736
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE :	
Mines Regulation Act, definition of "small tools"	1736
Sittings of the House, adjournment during visit of overseas parliamentarians	1737
New industries, names of firms	1737
Validation of legislation, Swan River Conservation and Cancer Council Acts	1737
Brentwood-Mt. Pleasant boundary, gazettal	1737
Sale of TV sets, report of Director of Investigation	1737
Government printing requirements, tenders and quotes	1738