

is in the best interests of the dairy farmers. Because I am unconvinced, I am not enthusiastic about this legislation.

I am asking now most seriously and earnestly whether any member knows where there is some reliable data on the question; and, if so, will he indicate to me where I can see it? Because I am most interested to learn what I can about it. I am not at all satisfied that sufficient investigation has been made or sufficient consideration given to this question from the proper point of view. I feel all we have done is to follow the usual track—"This is going to be a threat to our industry. Let us block it in some way"—as many years ago the great mass of workers misguidedly believed that the introduction of machinery would be a threat to their livelihood and smashed the machines.

I think it is the same feeling which is causing primary producers to be opposed to things of this kind without being absolutely certain that the course they are taking is in their own interests. I will not go so far as to oppose the Bill, because I am not satisfied as to the correct course to take; but nevertheless there are extreme doubts in my mind.

On motion by Mr. Watts (Attorney-General), debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 11.5 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 12th August, 1959

CONTENTS

	Page
ADDRESS-IN-REPLY :	
Presentation	912
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :	
Goats—	
Extinction of wild goats in the Recherche Archipelago.	912
Prevention of further destruction	913
Railway Department, watches issued to staff	913
Rural and Industries Bank, transfer of bricks to Esperance building	913
War service land settlement, transfer and sale of farms	914
Pemberton trout hatcheries, assistance	914
Koolyanobbing iron ore, sale to Japan	914
Esperance, additional water supply	915
MOTIONS :	
Members' reference committee, proposed appointment	915
Licensing Act—	
Printing of parliamentary committee's report	941
Order discharged	942

CONTENTS

	Page
BILLS :	
Royal Commissioners' Powers Act Amendment, assent	912
State Electricity Commission Act Amendment, 1r.	918
Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund, 1r.	918
Supply, £21,000,000—	
2r.	918
Com., report, 3r., passed	940
Cattle Trespass, Fencing, and Impounding Act Amendment, 2r.	940
Transfer of Land Act Amendment—	
2r.	942
Com.	942
Report	943
Child Welfare Act Amendment, 2r.	943
ADJOURNMENT, SPECIAL	944

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

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Presentation

The PRESIDENT: I desire to announce that, accompanied by several members, I waited on His Excellency the Governor and presented the Address-in-reply to His Excellency's Speech, agreed to by the House. His Excellency has been pleased to make the following reply:—

Mr. President and honourable members of the Legislative Council: I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, and for your Address-in-reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament.

ROYAL COMMISSIONERS' POWERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

GOATS

Extinction in the Recherche Archipelago

1. The Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM asked the Minister for Mines:
 - (1) Will the Minister advise the House in what circumstances goats are declared vermin?
 - (2) Is it true that a small herd of goats on Gull Island and Rabbit Island in the Recherche Archipelago, which have been something of a tourist attraction for a number of years, are to be exterminated?

- (3) As these islands are uninhabited, in what way can the goats constitute a menace to agricultural activities, or become a pest?
- (4) If the answer to No. (2) is "Yes," what is the estimated cost in cash of this expedition?
- (5) As a great number of these islands are infested with rabbits (declared vermin) is it the intention to abide by the Chief Warden's answer to the Esperance Chamber of Commerce, "Goats declared vermin under the Act must be destroyed by law"?
- (6) What is the actual reason for this sudden awakening of need to implement an Act, and remedy a set of conditions which has existed for so long without harm to anyone?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) The Agriculture Protection Board may declare any fauna to be vermin.
- (2) Goats run wild or at large on the islands of the Archipelago of the Recherche and were declared vermin by notice in the *Government Gazette* of the 24th April, 1959. The islands in question are a fauna sanctuary under the jurisdiction of the Fauna Protection Advisory Committee, which has authorised a resident of Esperance to organise a party to destroy goats there.
- (3) Goats can be without doubt great destroyers of habitat. History evidences continual and positive proof of this. In this case, unless the habitat of the Archipelago is preserved, the native animals and birds must perish.
- (4) No expense is being incurred by the Government.
- (5) It is known that rabbits exist on some of the islands, and it is desirable also that they be destroyed. At the same time the damage inflicted on habitat by rabbits is negligible compared with that done by goats.
- (6) The Fauna Protection Advisory Committee has only recently been invested with responsibility.

Prevention of Further Destruction

2. The Hon. G. BENNETTS asked the Minister for Mines:
 - (1) Is the Minister aware that much concern is being expressed by the Chamber of Commerce at Esperance about the action of the Chief Game Warden in connection with the mass shooting of goats on Gull Island and Rabbit Island?

- (2) Does the Minister know that these islands are noted by tourists and others for the class of seals, Cape Barren geese, goats, and other animals and bird life?
- (3) In view of this destruction, evidence of which has been received by telegram, will the Minister take urgent measures to prevent further action until full inquiries can be made?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Correspondence on the subject has been received by the Chief Warden of Fauna from the Esperance Chamber of Commerce.
- (2) The native fauna is undoubtedly an attraction to tourists. It is doubtful whether wild goats would prove equally attractive.
- (3) A party, organised jointly by the Lands and Fisheries departments, visited a dozen or more typical islands in the Archipelago in April, 1958. A further investigation is not considered necessary at this stage.

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT

Watches Issued to Staff

3. The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE asked the Minister for Mines:
 - (1) What is the cost price of watches issued by the Railway Department to engine drivers, guards, etc.?
 - (2) Who repairs these watches?
 - (3) How many watches were repaired during 1958-59?
 - (4) What was the cost of these repairs during 1958-59?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) £5 9s. each.
- (2) W.A. Government Railway Workshops, Midland Junction.
- (3) 1,003.
- (4) £3,174 3s.

RURAL & INDUSTRIES BANK

Transport of Bricks to Esperance Building

4. The Hon. G. BENNETTS asked the Minister for Mines:
 - (1) Has the Minister for Transport received any complaint regarding the transport of bricks by the building contractors for the Rural & Industries Bank at Esperance?
 - (2) Will the Minister advise whether any permit was granted for road transport?
 - (3) If so, for what reason was the permit issued?
 - (4) If no permit was granted, will the Minister have inquiries made concerning this matter?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) No record can be found of any complaint.
- (2) One permit was granted for the transport of 4,000 bricks from the Armadale brickworks to Esperance.
- (3) The cost of double-handling of bricks is severe. For this reason it is the policy to grant road permits except where bricks can be loaded direct on to rail trucks at the works.
- (4) Answered by No. (3).

WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT

Transfer and Sale of Farms

5. The Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) Since the inauguration of the war service land settlement scheme, how many leases have been—
 - (a) affected by the death of the settler;
 - (b) transferred to—
 - (i) the wife of the deceased;
 - (ii) the son of the deceased;
 - (c) confiscated due to the inability of the wife or son to continue the farm?
- (2) Are there instances where the son or sons of the deceased settler are capable of carrying on the farm, but have been given notice to vacate the properties?
- (3) How many war service land settlement farms—
 - (a) have been sold;
 - (b) is it anticipated are to be sold?
- (4) Does the Government propose to rectify the position concerning transferring of a property to the wife or sons of a deceased settler?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

- (1) (a) Deceased lessees 19.
 (b) (i) 16.
 Three widows did not wish to accept lease conditions.
 (ii) Nil.
 (c) Nil.
- (2) No.
- (3) (a) 123 farms and 49 surplus areas have been sold. The types of farms are as follows:—

Dairy farms	44
Tobacco farms	42
Wheat and sheep farms	14
Various undeveloped ex group properties	19
Vineyard	1
Poultry	3

(b) At the moment there are 22 farms available for sale and one surplus area.

Dairy farms	5
Tobacco farms	7
Undeveloped farms, ex group properties	10

- (4) The wife is an eligible person and is entitled to a lease with war service land settlement conditions of finance. The son can, under certain conditions, be granted a lease, but as he is not an eligible person he is not entitled to finance under the war service land settlement scheme.

PEMBERTON TROUT HATCHERIES

Assistance

6. The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT asked the Minister for Mines:

Will the Minister ascertain from the Minister for Fisheries the following information:—

- (1) Has consideration been given to assisting the trout hatcheries at Pemberton, as this worth-while organisation is urgently in need of financial assistance?
- (2) If the answer is in the affirmative, has any decision been reached?
- (3) Is he able to give any details of assistance that may be given?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) The Government has recently approved of an increase, in the total grant to the Trout Acclimatisation Council, from £1,200 per annum to £2,000 per annum.

KOOLYANOBING IRON ORE

Sale to Japan

7. The Hon. F. J. S. WISE asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Is it a fact that consideration is being given to the sale of iron ore from Koolyanobbing to Japanese interests; and if so, what is the tonnage, and what is the price being paid?
- (2) Has an export license been granted?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) The Government is giving consideration to applying to the Commonwealth Government for a license to export iron ore.
- (2) The report which appeared in *The West Australian* of today's date indicating that the Premier

informed the Legislative Assembly that the Government had applied to the Federal Government for a license to export iron ore is not accurate, as no application has yet been made. This was the advice given by the Premier to the Legislative Assembly.

ESPERANCE

Additional Water Supply

8. The Hon. G. BENNETTS asked the Minister for Mines:

In view of the large increase in population and the lack of a suitable town water supply at Esperance—

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the Water Supply Department has been advised regarding the position?
- (2) What steps are being taken to select a suitable site for the establishment of an adequate water supply?
- (3) What other relevant information is available in regard to this matter?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Extensive investigations over a substantial area surrounding Esperance have been made and these are still being assessed. They include stream flows, supply from underground sources, rock and bitumen catchments, or combinations thereof.
- (3) It is proposed to carry out boring in an area immediately west of Esperance townsite as soon as urgent drilling in other areas of the State has been completed.

MEMBERS' REFERENCE COMMITTEE

Proposed Appointment

THE HON. C. H. SIMPSON (Midland) [4.41]: I move—

That this House set up a further standing committee to be known as the Member's Reference Committee, such committee to consist of three members and to be empowered to consider and make recommendations regarding the allowances, emoluments and concessions of members of parliament.

That the substance of this motion be communicated to the Legislative Assembly and that the Legislative Assembly be requested to appoint a similar committee to combine as a joint committee of both houses. Such joint committee to elect one of its members as chairman and to be provided with a secretary.

In placing this motion before members for consideration, I desire to deal with it under three headings. The first, by way of introduction, will explain the circumstances and background which gave rise to the desirability of putting the motion before the House. The second will deal with the change of name from the Parliamentary Rights and Privileges Committee to the suggested name appearing in the motion; and the third will define the functions of the committee, its limitations, and the work it might be called upon to do.

Members will be quite aware that several committees have been formed over the years to deal with questions relating to members; and that proposals have been submitted to the Government, which has dealt with them. The most recent committee as members will be aware, and of which I had the honour to be chairman, concerned the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund. For two years the committee worked very hard and collected an immense amount of data. It gave the benefit of its research to members of Parliament; and after the matter had been submitted to the Government of the day and the Trustees of the Superannuation Fund, certain adjustments were made which had the effect of increasing the contributions of members, and also the benefits they would derive from the fund.

This year, Mr. Loton had placed a motion on the notice paper, but after discussing the matter with me, he withdrew it and suggested that I, having been chairman of the previous Rights and Privileges Committee, should undertake the handling of the motion in the House. Subsequently, the motion was reframed, and it is now submitted for consideration.

With regard to the change of name of the committee, the old name did not matter very much, because everyone knew the work the committee did and the functions it was called upon to perform; and, as I said before, it was accepted by the members in both Houses of Parliament, and by the respective authorities to whom representations were made. Now, I believe, we have arrived at the stage, as I suggested last year when the parliamentary superannuation fund was under consideration, that a committee should have statutory standing; and that it should be formed from time to time and charged with certain duties which could be specified. It should also be provided with a secretary for the keeping of necessary records; and, for quite good reasons which I shall explain later, it should be empowered to select its own chairman for the conduct of the meetings it might hold.

The term "Rights and Privileges Committee" is, I think, understood, as it is common to all Parliaments throughout the world—certainly throughout the Commonwealth. Over the years a standard practice has been evolved such as is outlined in the

various volumes of *May*. They have dealt with the relations of members to each other; their rights and privileges in Parliament—and sometimes even out of Parliament—and they have given consideration to those matters which somewhat concern members, but which are really connected with the work which members do. But since those rights and privileges have been traditionally established and adopted over the years, the position in regard to members has considerably altered.

There was a time when members of Parliament were not paid at all, and only Ministers of the Crown received an allowance. Nowadays most members, instead of treating their duties in Parliament on a part-time basis, devote the whole—or nearly the whole—of their time to the discharge of duties as members of Parliament.

They are paid allowances and salary for that work; and those allowances, in the main, recognise the fact that the member concerned has largely to depend upon them in order to live in the manner expected of him. Under those altered conditions, there is a need for some representation of members, generally, as an authoritative channel through which to approach the various authorities—perhaps the Government; a tribunal appointed by it; or possibly the trustees of the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund. The proposed committee would be the recognised channel of communication. It would collect the necessary data, keep records, and present a case as and when occasion arose.

Some brief reference to *May* may help to illustrate what I mean when I say that "Parliamentary Rights and Privileges" as a name, while it has a distinct meaning in Parliamentary circles, is hardly applicable to the committee and the functions of the committee which is suggested in this motion.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: It is not remotely accurate.

The Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: *May* says—

Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the high court of Parliament and by members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals. Thus privilege, though part of the law of the land, is to a certain extent an exemption from the ordinary law.

Further on, we read—

The distinctive mark of a privilege is its ancillary character. The privileges of Parliament are rights which are "absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers." They are

enjoyed by individual members, because the House cannot perform its functions without unimpeded use of the services of its members and by each House for the protection of its members and the vindication of its own authority and dignity.

That, I think, sets out the purpose and intention of Parliamentary privilege, as such, and how it should be applied. There are other privileges. For instance under most circumstances, a member of Parliament is exempt from arrest while the House is sitting unless, I think, in a case of felony or some major misdemeanour under the Criminal Code.

It is recognised that the member of Parliament, as a representative of his constituents, must be available to do the work which his election as a member charges him with doing. So, over the years, those rights and privileges have been recognised; and I have turned up at least 20 references in *May* to the rights and privileges of members, both in and out of Parliament. This question is referred to again and again in the course of the volume of *May*; and that is common to all Parliaments, as such, all over the world.

In obtaining the necessary data in regard to this question, I wrote to the clerk of Parliaments in Canberra and asked what was the practice in the Federal sphere in regard to rights and privileges; and this is the reply that I received—

Section 49 of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution states—

The powers, privileges, and immunities of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and of the members and the committees of each House, shall be such as are declared by the Parliament, and until declared shall be those of the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom, and of its members and committees, at the establishment of the Commonwealth.

The Commonwealth Parliament has not enacted any comprehensive declaratory law relating to its privileges, therefore the Commons' privileges apply.

The Committee of Privileges of the House of Representatives is not a statutory body with specific powers, but is appointed under Standing Orders of the House at the commencement of each Parliament. The relevant Standing Order, originally adopted in 1944, now reads as follows:

A committee of privileges, to consist of seven members, shall be appointed at the commencement of each Parliament to inquire into and report upon com-

plaints of breach of privilege which may be referred to it by the House.

This committee is in effect a standing Select Committee of the House, not a joint committee, and has no functions other than to inquire into matters referred to it by the House. It conducts its inquiries in accordance with normal Select Committee procedure and, after examination of witnesses and deliberation, reports to the House its opinion as to whether or not a matter referred to it constitutes a breach of privilege. The House then deals with the report in such manner as it deems necessary.

There is no similar provision in the Standing Orders of the Senate for the appointment of a committee of privileges of that House.

There is no provision for a committee to be appointed; but that House, I believe, in common with the other Houses of Parliament in Australia does, when questions of that nature arise, follow the practice of the House of Commons, where a special committee is appointed to deal with a particular case; usually upon the submission by any member of Parliament that such a committee should be appointed—according to my reading of *May*.

It is only competent for the House to move in the matter; and it can only move when a petition or request is submitted to it. Reverting to my suggestion for the appointment of a members' reference committee, I wrote to the Leader of each of the parties—the Liberal Country, the Country Party and the Labour Party—and gave the text of the motion, and said—

The notice of motion explains itself, and I would be glad if the members of your party will give it their support. I feel that the old title "Rights and Privileges Committee" was a misnomer and that the proposed title of "Members' Reference Committee" is more suitable.

The functions of the committee are defined and in my opinion embrace all matters which properly concern individual members. The parliamentary rights and privileges of members are covered by standard works on parliamentary practice.

Provision is made for the committee to elect its own chairman. This, I submit, is desirable. In other standing Committees, the President or Speaker would automatically be members, but as both President and Speaker are trustees of the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund I suggest it would be better to exempt them from duty on the committee.

I stand corrected there. I now understand that the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly is not at the moment a trustee; but I think that is the usual practice. To continue—

The setting up of a standing committee creates a statutory body automatically appointed as each new Parliament meets, while the provision of an official secretary ensures to members proper records for convenient reference and access.

Members will notice that there are five points in the motion itself. Firstly there is the proposal to appoint a standing committee to be known as a Members' Reference Committee; secondly, the suggestion to make it a joint committee of both Houses; thirdly, the motion specifies and defines the function of the committee; fourthly, the committee is to appoint its own chairman; and, fifthly, the provision of a secretary. I suggest that if we appointed a committee of this nature, without specifying what its functions were to be and, as it were, setting some limitation on its activities, it might not be acceptable to all members of both Houses.

The committee, which I have suggested should be formed, could perform a most useful service. If constituted with members appointed from both Houses, it could carry out those functions and be a recognised channel of negotiation and communication between, say, the Government and the members; or between the trustees and the members; or perhaps between the Commissioner of Taxation and the members; and so on, in regard to certain privileges.

Some of the data that has been provided to me suggests that it would be worthwhile for such a committee to ascertain from other States exactly what concessions in the way of travel, telephone calls, or taxation, are granted in those States so that a comparison could be made; because, other things being equal, I should imagine that the members of this Parliament would agree that we are entitled to take steps to place ourselves on an equal footing with members in other States.

For instance, in regard to taxation deductions, I understand the allowances in Tasmania vary from £400 to £700 a year for members, and up to £1,000 a year for the Premier. Those are matters which I think would properly be brought before the committee for review; and I am hopeful, following the explanation I have given, that the House will be prepared to approve the appointment of such a committee and for three members to be nominated from this Chamber; and that the House will agree to the motion being forwarded to the Legislative Assembly in due course inviting that Chamber to take similar action.

On motion* by the Hon. H. K. Watson, debate adjourned.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING

1. State Electricity Commission Act Amendment Bill.

Received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), read a first time.

2. Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund Bill.

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

SUPPLY BILL, £21,000,000

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the previous day

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North) [5.5]: As has been pointed out in this Chamber on various occasions, the Supply Bill is one of the measures upon which members are afforded an opportunity to express their views on various questions that concern them. There are many questions which I would like to discuss, but I am afraid I would not be in a position to do justice to them at this stage. Earlier in the session I endeavoured to enlighten myself in regard to several railway matters, but I was denied an opportunity to study railway report No. 9 by Royal Commissioner Smith until yesterday, despite the fact that it had been presented to the Government two months ago.

The reason advanced by the Government for the belated tabling of this report was that the Government had not then considered it. That was the answer which prompted my move for the tabling of the report. However, the Government has now considered it, but apparently no action is to be taken; and we are still to be left in the dark as to what is contemplated now that the report has been made. After a quick glance at the report I am satisfied that the action of the previous Government—in which I was Minister for Railways—in closing various railway lines during its term of office, was completely justified. I also point out that the action taken by the previous Government followed a decision by Parliament to discontinue several unpayable lines.

When debating the Supply Bill in this House two years ago, the railway question loomed very large. Through the Press, the Government of the day was told that there was every likelihood that it would be denied Supply unless the discontinued railway services operated again.

On looking up the records of the day, I was rather amused to read a Press report of a meeting which was held at Northam in July, 1957. At that meeting a motion was passed that the Government should be denied Supply by the Legislative Council. After reading the Press report which appeared in *The Countryman* of the 18th July, 1957, one realises that the meeting

was more or less a political fiasco; especially when one is aware of what actually happened. The report in *The Countryman* is as follows:—

Farmers and country people representing districts from north of Geraldton to Denmark in the south, heard politicians of both Opposition parties threaten to stop the passage of the Supply Bill in the Legislative Council unless the railway closure motions before the Council were fully discussed and acted on.

The statements on the Legislative Council move were made from the floor of the meeting by Country Party M.L.C. Sir Charles Latham and Liberal Party Legislative Councillor C. H. Simpson, following a motion asking that Supply be withheld unless the Government reopened all lines closed. Sir Charles Latham told the meeting that the Supply Bill would be held up until motions moved by both himself and Simpson were discussed. He said the Bill could be held up for a week or a fortnight while the resolutions were sent to the Legislative Assembly. If the Assembly did not support the resolutions then a move would be made in the Legislative Council to defeat the Supply Bill.

Liberal Party member C. H. Simpson said the present intention was to adjourn discussion on Supply until the two railway motions had been discussed and that it would depend on support from both Opposition parties in the Council as to the future of the Supply Bill.

The then Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Brand) who was present at that meeting, was reported as having said—

Opposition members had asked for amendments calling for individual investigations of each proposed closure and that alternative transport be provided before any closures were made. It was on this basis that some members of the Liberal Party in the Legislative Council had voted for the Act. However, he added, the Government had not honoured the amendments, even though they had been passed and accepted by the Assembly. "We were taken for a ride," he commented.

It is rather comical to read Press reports such as that concerning the meeting which was held in Northam because, for a start, the statement made by Mr. Brand that a motion had been moved asking for individual reports was entirely incorrect. No motion to that effect was ever moved by the Opposition of the day. A motion was moved by Mr. Court, in the absence of Mr. Brand, who was, I think, in hospital at the time. That motion, moved in the Legislative Assembly in 1956, was an amendment to the one that Parliament had passed and which had certain conditions contained in it.

These conditions were to ensure that there would be genuine economies, increased efficiency, and so on; and that there would be adequate alternative services, and so on. Obviously, Mr. Brand, at that time, if this report is correct, was heaping coals of fire on to the question; and, to some extent, apologising for those members of his Party in this House who supported the discontinuance of railway services. Those members did the taxpayers of Western Australia—and Australia, because we are a claimant State—a service, because many thousands of pounds have been saved as a direct result of that motion being carried. Therefore, those five Liberal members have done a service for the taxpayers of Australia. This was proved without any fear of contradiction in the Royal Commissioner's report No. 9.

The Hon. A. R. Jones: Would you support the cancelling of the North-West shipping?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The taxpayers of Australia should be grateful to the people who saved them a large sum of money. As I said before, this meeting was quite a comical one. Views on what was going to take place were announced, and Mr. Brand apologised for his members—I say he had no need to apologise for them at all—after which the Leader of the Country Party went on to say, "If the railways closure move had not been supported by five Liberal members in the Legislative Council, the closures would not have occurred." It seems to me that the meeting was an argument about who was responsible for the motion going through. I say Parliament was responsible.

I repeat, it is a good thing that those members did support the motions which were before the House when this meeting took place in 1957.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: In 1956.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The closure motions were before the House in 1956, and the meeting was held at Northam in July, 1957. The motion before the House was a censure motion moved by Mr. Brand when he was Leader of the Opposition. His motion sought to censure the Government for not taking action about a motion which his Party had supported only six months previously. On the 13th December, 1956, the motion finally passed through this Chamber; and on the 9th of the following July, Mr. Brand moved his censure motion, which was finally amended to approve of the action taken by the Government.

The action taken by the Government was to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the railways. Despite the fact that the Royal Commissioner was carrying out these inquiries, Mr. Brand said, according to this paper, that the

Government at that time had done nothing in regard to the inquiries. I say that this meeting was purely a political football with one side apologising for the other. The motion moved by Sir Charles Latham to rescind the motion to discontinue certain lines, was carried in this House; and Mr. Watson, the only member to retain his original thoughts on the matter, voted with the Government.

The Government lost the motion. What happened? Nothing; and Supply, I am pleased to say, was not withheld. When, two years later, one looks back upon this momentous meeting and remembers that those attending came from near and far, one realises it was rather comical.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: It was not comical for those concerned.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I agree with the honourable member; just as the Royal Commissioner agrees that some people will experience financial expenditure. The Royal Commissioner's report No. 9 distinctly states that all our fears about land values dropping are absolutely groundless.

The Hon. A. R. Jones: They are not.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: This evidence has been laid on the Table of the House. That is the finding of the Royal Commissioner; and he based his findings on not one opinion, but on the opinions of two or three taxation experts, and those of stock and station agents, and on the sales in the districts.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: I suppose he whitewashed—

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: He mentioned one line where it could have had that effect—the Corrigin to Brookton line. However, when that line was closed it was found that no farm was more than 22 miles away from the railway. I do not know what those farmers would do if they were farming on the Gascoyne River, which is 300-odd miles from the railway.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They are alongside a port though.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: After hurriedly reading through the report, I derived some satisfaction from the findings of the Royal Commissioner in regard to the action which Parliament authorised in 1956.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: He still says they might open them, doesn't he?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I do not mind if they are all re-opened; but the Minister for Railways—the same as any other Minister—will find that he has a duty in regard to the expenditure of money. Ministers have to take notice of the funds which they have at their disposal, and decide how they are going to spend them.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: They are going to spend a quarter of a million pounds on the Empire Games; why argue the point about a few hundred thousand?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I hope the desire of the honourable member will be achieved and the particular line in his province will be re-opened. The Government of the day should have had no qualms about stopping Supply or asking who was to blame for the closure of railway lines. All the Government needs to say now is, "We will run these services again." The Elleker to Nornalup line was the only one which either House sought to delete from the list of closures, despite the fact that the Speaker in another place, in reply to a query, informed that House that he would accept motions to delete one part, all, or any from the list.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: This House moved to delete the lot, so you are wrong in that aspect.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The only amendment to the motion to delete a line was in connection with the most insignificant line from Elleker to Nornalup.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: We moved to delete the lot.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: If any member cares to read *Hansard* he will find that what I have said is correct. I have the reports here in concise form should any member care to look at them. I repeat again that the taxpayers of Australia owe quite a lot to the Royal Commissioner who has, over the past two years, been inquiring into the administration of the Western Australian Railways. He did an excellent job. During the two years he achieved something which members in this Chamber said was not possible; the setting up of a completely new administration of the railways. That was achieved without "buying out" one of the Commissioners who had boasted that he would need to be "bought out." I say again that the taxpayers of Australia are indebted to Mr. A. G. Smith in regard to his activities over the past two years.

I have never been able to bring myself to understand why the Liberal Party and *The West Australian* were so anxious to terminate the services of Mr. Smith as quickly as possible; because he was doing a good job. I have never been able to understand why a political party would want to curtail an inquiry that was proceeding so successfully. I know that some aspects of the inquiry disclosed undesirable features as regards tendering and purchasing for the railways. I also know

that there were some suspicious occurrences and that they were high-lighted in the Commissioner's reports, which were tabled during my term as Minister.

Whether the Royal Commissioner was disclosing too much, or more than was desirable, I do not know; but it is hard to find a sound and logical reason why the inquiry should have been terminated when it was proving so successful. I am not going to attempt to suggest the reason; but there certainly was a reason, which, one day, I hope I shall discover.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: The appointment was not for life!

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Quite so; but, on the one hand there were motions in Parliament stating that the Government was not inquiring far enough and was not doing its duty, while on the other, public meetings were condemning the Government for not inquiring into the administration of the railways. A few days after this the Press stated that it was time the Royal Commissioner's activities were wound up.

All the questions which were referred to the Royal Commissioner during my time as Minister for Railways were completed, with the exception of one; and no new matters were introduced. The one question to which I referred was simply whether subsidies should continue or whether they should automatically disappear.

That is a question of subsidising the farmers—or anyone else—where the railways were discontinued. That matter has also been used as a political football. I told the House, when I introduced the motion in November, 1956, that the subsidies were to be discontinued by one-seventh each year so that they would disappear at the end of seven years, but that if the Government found this arrangement was injurious to any industry, such industries would be dealt with individually, and their conditions inquired into. I can remember Mr. Baxter putting on quite a show and asking me what I considered was an industry, and so on. But the Press would not print that. The Press produced a teletape—or whatever it was; a tape recorder—at Cadoux, when I explained the position to the people there. But the recording of what I said has not been played over to anyone.

After all this political manoeuvring between parties, there should not be any more railway closures. Mr Diver should have no more worries, because those who were making all the fuss—except Mr. Watson—now have in their own hands the power to deal with the railway question.

Whilst talking on the subject of money, I would like to pass a few comments on the Federal Budget. Together, with many other Australians, I feel that the Federal Budget could have gone a lot further than

it has; particularly in relation to taxation. I have no doubt—no one has—that the income tax concessions are not aimed at being of material assistance to the wage-earners on the lower rungs; and they are not of great assistance to the people on the higher rungs either. I am disappointed that the pay-roll tax and the sales tax were not looked into and dealt with in some manner. I feel that the Federal Government has overlooked the question of taxation.

When I say that, I mean it has overlooked the matter of income tax for a start. Anyone who earns an income above £104 a year is required to fill in a tax return, and is liable to be taxed. The figure of £104 has, I presume, been in existence since taxation was first imposed. Money values have altered considerably; during my working life, the basic wage has trebled. In order to get money values in perspective, a person, before being required to be an income tax payer, should have a minimum income in the vicinity of £312. But the figure of £104 has not been altered for years. Consequently there must be a handsome rake-off each year from the youth of Australia when they commence their first employment and begin to earn money.

As soon as they start to work, they are required to pay income tax; because I do not think anyone these days works for less than £2 per week. A job which paid less than £2 per week would be a poor one indeed. If an employee is taxed only 6d. a week, the amount is stopped out of his pay packet by the employer; the employer must do that by law. Then the wage-earner has to prove that he does not owe the tax. This is quite a complicated matter when one looks at it in that light; and we find that the same thing happens to those in business who have to pay provisional tax.

The Budget contains many disappointments, whereas I feel that improvements could have been made and something fairer brought forward. I wish to mention one matter in connection with the P.M.G.'s Department. Apart from rising costs and charges, I think it is iniquitous that an amount of £10 should be charged for the installation of a telephone. A person may take over premises that are already wired for a telephone—but the previous occupier might not have required the use of the instrument—and he would be charged £10 merely to connect up the service. That charge is iniquitous, and should be looked into; although none of us would frequently pay £10 for this service. Legislation is not required to alter this set-up.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You can point to many taxes and say they are iniquitous.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Yes; but this is a charge. I would like to make an explanation in connection with the Commonwealth grant of £5,000,000 which has been made available to Western Australia

through the efforts of this Parliament, and all Governments, over the past 18 to 20 years. During that time, submissions have been made to the various Commonwealth Governments for financial assistance to develop the North. Following motions—one was moved by Mr. Jones in this Chamber, and another by the late Mr. Ackland in another place—an all-party representations to the Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies); and to Sir Arthur Fadden; and to Mr. Spooner, we have at last achieved something. When the grant of £2,500,000 was first announced by the Prime Minister in 1957—2½ years after the representations had been made—it was generally stated by the Press and others—members of various political parties—that the amount was insufficient; that it was chicken-feed; and so on.

I never thought that way about it. Being one of those who were on the deputation which waited on the Prime Minister, I was of the firm opinion that if an offer was made to grant £2,500,000 for the North, it was the beginning of larger things. That opinion proved later to be the fact.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Be thankful for small mercies.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Yes. In 1958, legislation passed through the Federal Parliament authorising a grant of £2,500,000 to Western Australia for three specific purposes. One was the jetty at Wyndham; another was the Black Rocks jetty; and the third was the Napier Broome Bay development.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Mr. Peter Brown does not think it will do very much.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: No. After that money came to hand, the Premier (Mr. Hawke) advised the Prime Minister that he was grateful for the foresight shown by the Federal Government; but he desired to point out that, although the amount was substantial, it certainly would not meet the full expenditure of the three proposals, and the Prime Minister could expect, at a later date, some further representations. Well, the Prime Minister did not wait for further representations, because he later made an announcement that he would double the grant.

What the Prime Minister did lends further weight to my original thought; that the £2,500,000 was a beginning. I consider that the £5,000,000 is also a beginning, because I feel the Commonwealth Government will continue to provide the State Government with ample funds to spend on developmental projects in the North.

As my colleague, Mr. Wise, has said, some Federal members do not feel this way; and perhaps they do not see eye to eye on the point with me. One such Federal member is the new member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Peter Brown) who, during the last State elections, wrote to the Press and condemned out-of-hand the proposed expenditure on Black Rocks jetty; and he made

the same condemnation again in the Federal Parliament when he said he believed the money was an absolute waste.

All I can say is that all Western Australian members of the Federal Parliament who condemn their State—or who condemn proposals designed to develop their State—should give more mature thought to their utterances; and that they should not, perhaps, be misled by political feeling to the point of condemning something which might be favourable to Western Australia.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: You are not suggesting that Mr. Brown condemned money being given for the North?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Mr. Brown undoubtedly condemned it.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Did he condemn the North, or that particular project?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Yes; the Black Rocks project.

The Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: He did not condemn the money, but the project.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member may make a speech afterwards.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: He condemned the project; that is right; he did not know what he was talking about. He termed the meeting at Northam a political stunt; something comical; and a fiasco, and I also think that much of the talk and much of the procedure in the Federal Parliament is also somewhat of the same nature, because we find that some members there wake up all of a sudden when money is granted to Western Australia.

I was amazed to read, in the Federal *Hansard* of the 14th May, 1959, what Mr. Hamilton, the member for Canning, said on the legislation that was introduced to give Western Australia an additional £2,500,000 for these projects. He did not condemn what was done; he said it should have happened years ago; but he was a long way out in what he said. The statements were very misleading to anybody who took the trouble to read Federal *Hansard*. He said—

If I remember rightly, the present Minister for External Affairs (Mr. Casey) was Minister for National Development in this Parliament at that time. Unfortunately, members of the Labour Party in Western Australia took the opportunity to play politics on this matter.

He said that Mr. Casey, and the Parliament of that time, had offered to build the Black Rocks jetty and proceed with the Ord River scheme. That was completely wrong. He went on to say—

They—
speaking of members of the Labour Party—

—went to Derby and said that the town should not be shifted out towards Point Torment or Black Rocks, as it is commonly known.

He blamed the members of the Labour Party—who would be North-West members—for holding up the issue of this money from 1952 until 1959. That is absolute rot. I can explain what Mr. Hamilton was endeavouring to say.

Members will recall that shortly after 1953, when the Hawke Government came into office, the then member for Kimberley (the late Mr. Coverley) died suddenly, thus causing a by-election to be held in May, 1953, some six or seven weeks after the general elections held in that year. There had not been an election in the Kimberley electorate for many years, because Mr. Coverley had been unopposed. When we arrived in Derby to take part in the campaign for the by-election, the then Premier (Mr. Hawke), the candidate (Mr. Rhatigan) and I, found that there was a terrific turmoil about the Black Rocks project. All that the people wanted to know was whether or not the town would be moved from Derby to the Black Rocks site.

We made no bones about it. We said at a public meeting, straight out, that if we were fortunate enough to get the money to build the jetty at Black Rocks the town would not be shifted to the jetty site.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: One will not operate without the other.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: There was stagnation in Derby until that announcement was made; and the people of the town endorsed the announcement because they elected our candidate with a big majority; and they re-elected him only a few months ago with an increased majority.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: What was his majority?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Mr. Hamilton got a little bit mixed about the whole affair. The Minister for Local Government has just said that one will not work without the other. I presume he means that Black Rocks could not work without the Derby townsite being moved to the Black Rocks site. To follow that theory through, he might as well argue that Perth should go down to Kwinana—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: There is a lot of difference.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: —because we have a new port there. I have heard lots of arguments about what should be here and what should be there from those who pass through these places, have a quick look and listen to the views of some people; but their views are not factual. Personally, I would like to see the jetty go as close to the town as possible.

The Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: That is what Peter Brown suggested.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Ever since Mr. Wise first started to look at the position, somewhere around 1942, every engineer has told us that the Black Rocks site is the closest site to Derby.

The Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: What is the closest site?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Every engineer says the same thing.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I think the Minister for Local Government will agree with that.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Mr. Brown, and some of our other Federal members, want to give more mature thought to these matters. On the 14th May of this year, Mr. Brown, at page 2245 of *Federal Hansard*, also had this to say—

I say here tonight, quite unequivocally, that I am still in opposition to this particular project.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: Why don't you get Mr. Cunningham to go up there and have a look at it?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: If one reads Mr. Brown's speech, or the article in *The West Australian* at election time, one sees that he makes no suggestion as to what should be done with the money, except to say that it should be used to improve the pastoral industry. I know what ought to be done up there with this £5,000,000. There are some people but not all—in the district, who think that the money should be spent on fencing and improving their properties—to do exactly what they have not done over the years.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: And what they should have done.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Yes. If the people up there do not want to do this work, there are others who are prepared to do it; and they should be allowed to do so. How Mr. Brown, and many others, can fall for this sort of rubbish, I cannot understand. The trouble is he is young, flushed with success, and no doubt surprised that he got in. As a result he is running around wanting to build Rome in a day. He will learn! The correct explanation about the expenditure of this money was made by Senator Paltridge when he introduced the Bill in the Senate on the 14th May of this year. He said exactly what I have just been telling members, and what those who spoke to the Bill in the Federal Parliament could not grasp. He said—

The former Premier warned that the final cost of the first three projects might exceed the initial grant of £2,500,000. The grant of a further £2,500,000 will, we hope, not only enable the State to finance the full cost of these works, but will also permit other projects to be undertaken.

Senator Paltridge grasped the position, and grasped it thoroughly. He knew what he was talking about; and he went on to say what could be done in that area. I will proceed to enlarge on that in a moment. He explained to the Senate that much could be done. But despite that, Senator Scott rose to his feet and made all sorts of incorrect statements. He is hopelessly out of touch with the position up there. He agreed with Mr. Brown and said that he opposed the expenditure on the Black Rocks jetty. He went on to say—

In Derby itself, not five per cent. of the population want a deep water port at Black Rocks. Not two per cent. of the station-owners in the outback areas want it.

He is absolutely out of touch with the position, because the West Kimberley Pastoralists' Association, through the then Premier (Sir Ross McLarty), advised the Prime Minister that they wanted a port at Black Rocks. The association put up a good case and quoted various mariners' opinions on the position. How members of the Federal Parliament can become so hopelessly biased against their own State, and say things which are completely unfounded, is beyond me.

Nearly every person, including the Minister, who spoke on the matter was misleading. Senator Scott went on to say—

This is the first time in the history of Australia that the Commonwealth Parliament has made available, in the form of a gift, money to be spent on the development of the North-West of Western Australia.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is not right.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It is absolutely incorrect. I can remember in 1937 when Mr. Wise, who was a Minister at the time, obtained a grant for the relief of pearlers in Broome, following a disastrous cyclone. It was a State-aids grant through the Federal Government. As Premier of the State, the same Mr. Wise was successful in getting a State-aids grant from the Chifley Government in 1949 for the development of the Kimberleys. This money was granted under an Act known as the State Grants Encouragement of Meat Production Act, 1949. The money was granted to build a road from Wyndham to Nicholson, a distance of 250 miles. A sum of £750,000 has been spent on the road, but the Menzies Government has discontinued further payments—the funds have run out.

That is a pity because road-building in that country is an expensive proposition. The road means something to the people up there; and every pastoralist in the East Kimberleys wants the road to be finished so that he can dispense with the old-time method of droving, and use

road trains. It will not be possible to use those trains on the road as it exists; it will have to be sealed, because the rivers in those areas flood and cause terrific havoc at times.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Is the road usable?

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: A lot of it is.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It is the main road to Wyndham; and, as a matter of fact, it is the only road which links that area with the Eastern States. The road joins with one from Hall's Creek, which is known as the Great Northern Highway.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Ultimately it runs through to Newcastle Waters.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It is the only link through that direction, and it is a main road. Vestey's former manager (Mr. Bingle) repeatedly asked me, during my time as Minister, to try to do something about it.

Whenever Mr. Bingle was here he invariably called to see me, as Minister for the North-West; and even when he brought the new manager (Mr. Morris) around to introduce him, he advised me to continue making representations to the Commonwealth Government for further expenditure on that road. I have no doubt that that company will continue to make representations in this matter. I advise the Ministers in this House to urge the Government to do something about completing the road, and to try to get a further grant under the Act I mentioned, because its object was the building of the road, and the necessary bridges, to make it an all-weather highway. As yet it is not an all-weather road, although £750,000 has been spent on it.

That was another grant made available by the Commonwealth for the development of the North. Other grants have been made to the State to help the wheat-farmers by way of drought relief, and so on. We have been receiving such grants for years; and yet we read where our representatives in the Federal Parliament do not even know about them. That is rather a pity.

Several members in the Federal sphere opposed the expenditure of money on the jetty at Black Rocks. Some people in Derby itself oppose it; but I have not the slightest idea what objective they have in mind in opposing it.

But I fear that this Government, instead of spending some of that money and getting on with the job, is dilly-dallying and wasting too much time in listening to outside opinions. An amount of £5,000,000 is a lot of money to spend; and when a Government has the task of spending it at the rate of £1,000,000 a year it is very difficult indeed. The Government should not delay any longer; nor should it waste time listening to the opinions of

one or two people who are vitally interested in their own particular affairs, rather than the welfare of the district. The Government is wasting precious time.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Better to waste time than £5,000,000.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: If Mr. Watson thinks that £5,000,000 spent on developmental projects such as this is a waste of money, then I am sorry indeed to hear it. When, in 1958, the legislation was being passed for the approval of the first £2,500,000, we had the spectacle of Senator Vincent asking Senator Spooner, who was in charge of the Bill, whether the Government would make absolutely certain—or words to that effect—that the money would not be spent on socialistic enterprises.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Hear! hear!

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Unfortunately, the money is to be spent on socialistic activities.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Hear! hear!

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It is unfortunate for Senator Vincent and for Mr. Watson that this should be so. If it is the intention of the Liberal Party—and I am now not talking about Liberal members, but those behind the members who represent the party in this House—to overcome what they consider to be an unsavoury disability in connection with this matter, then it is a very poor outlook for Western Australia, because each project which the Federal Government approves—and the Bill says that it must approve before we can get any money—is in itself a form of socialistic enterprise.

Two of these projects provide for a jetty, and the intention of the third is to look for a landing which will also provide a port to open up the country. So, if there were no expenditure on socialistic ventures, things would be very bad indeed.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What programme did your Government have for spending the money?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: We had three proposals which we put to the Federal Government. The first was the extension of the Wyndham jetty; the second was a deep water jetty for Black Rock, to serve the industries at West Kimberley; and the third proposal was for an investigation to be made to find a suitable port to enable lessees to develop their pastoral holdings in the North Kimberley area. They were all submitted, and all approved. The legislation passed in the Commonwealth Parliament reads as follows:—

4. (1) The State may request the Commonwealth to approve, for the purpose of this Act, a project in relation to the development of the northern part of the State, and the Treasurer may, subject to the next succeeding sub-section, approve the project on behalf of the Commonwealth.

(2) The Treasurer shall exercise his powers under the last preceding sub-section with a view to ensuring that moneys are provided under this Act only in relation to projects which he is satisfied will contribute to the development of the northern part of the State and could not reasonably be expected to be carried out during the prescribed period without the grant of financial assistance to the State by the Commonwealth in relation to those projects.

So every project must be submitted to the Treasurer, and he must approve before any money is made available. The Bill granting the first £2,500,000, and that granting the second £2,500,000, are identical. In relation to the Ord River scheme, I point out that in June, 1955, the original proposal submitted to the Prime Minister indicated that it was absolutely necessary to enlarge the Wyndham jetty to provide two berths. It was shown that the existing facilities could not possibly handle shipping, if the project were proceeded with, because of the large quantities of materials which would necessarily have to be landed there.

As a consequence, we have started on what I would say is the first leg of the Ord River project; we have started in a practical way by constructing a jetty. At the time the Hawke Government asked the Prime Minister to allow it to spend some of the £5,000,000 on the initial works of the diversion dam on the Ord River, the State general elections took place.

Because of the elections, no reply was received, but the Hawke Government did anticipate—as I have explained here quite early—that this money was a lead-up to the Ord River development scheme. Before the election we decided, as a Government, that we would use State funds to probe that section of the Ord River where the diversion dam was to be sited; we decided to commence work in a manner that was announced at the election meetings held at Wyndham, Derby and Broome. Not one word of the meetings that were held was ever reported in the Press, despite all the correspondence that the Press had reported previously, in its usual manner.

On account of the elections, there appeared to be a complete blanket placed on the North-West; because I have no recollection whatever of any report of the election meetings held in connection with any of the three seats in that area. However, the people of the North-West were told that they need have no fear as to what the Hawke Government would do; they were told that it would proceed with the preliminary work on the project, and that it felt the Federal Government would ultimately approve of what was done.

Some questions were asked at our election meetings about the eventual benefit of the Ord River scheme. I was asked, "Are you

going to grow sugarcane when it can be grown in Queensland? It is over-produced in the world." That is the type of question I was asked. I could not tell my questioners what could be grown; but I could say with some certainty that nobody could tell what the value of sugarcane would be by the time the Ord River dam was completed, and the land ready to be put into production for any type of crop.

I defy any committee to advise accurately the value of any produce from the land in 15 or 20 years' time. I was able to tell those people, however, that, with irrigated pastures, and with the many thousands of acres which the Ord River dam would ultimately irrigate, the production of beef alone would more than compensate, or at least adequately compensate, for the expenditure involved. Let us consider a few quick figures, and we will then see that what I say is strange but true. The cattle stations throughout the Kimberleys do not market more than 25 per cent. of the calves they breed each year. That is a big thing to say, but it is a fact. None of the station-owners knows the number of cattle he has on his run, but he does know the number of calves he brands each year.

These station-owners do know the number of beef cattle they sell each year, and the figures are those I have already given. I read the figures from the report of the agricultural officers in that area. I checked these figures with the owners, and they are quite factual. As a matter of fact, I asked Sir Ross McLarty if he got 25 per cent., and he agreed that he did not think the figure was as high as that. This year, 37,000 head of cattle went into Wyndham; last year there were 36,000 head of cattle. Those 36,000 head of cattle were sold; and, together with their by-products, they returned £1,250,000. That number is only 25 per cent. of the calves bred on the stations that supply the Wyndham meatworks. If we can save only one more quarter, and make it 50 per cent., it would provide another £1,250,000 worth of productivity.

As Mr. Wise has told us, these calves perish because they have to walk too far to natural waters. Many of the calves die between the time they are calved and when they reach five or six years of age and are strong enough to walk the long journey to the meatworks. So members will appreciate what could be saved if we were to provide properly irrigated pastures, to which a portion of the calves could be brought on a rotation basis, from off the open range, and fattened for the Wyndham meatworks.

The money that is lost in beef, due to existing conditions is colossal; and a saving of a mere fraction of the amount would be enormous. When we look at the figures I have given, we must realise that the time has come for the cattle stations in the

Kimberleys to be put to better use. The production of the stations must be lifted, and the colossal waste no longer allowed to occur. There is only one way to bring this about, and that is to have the stations managed better. When we consider the question of the better management of stations, we find that several alternatives are involved.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I was saying that the colossal wastage of cattle in stations east and west of the Kimberleys should be halted. To give some idea of what can be done ultimately with that country, I propose to quote from a report which I understand was submitted by the manager of the Ivanhoe Research Station to the Federal authorities some three or four years ago.

As an example of what can be done with irrigation from the Ord River, he stated that Ivanhoe Station, the property upon which the research station is situated, is a property of 750,000 acres, and is classed as a very good property. It is one of the selections of the Durack family in the early days. Ivanhoe Station, with its 750,000 acres, turns out a mere 500 head of cattle per year; and based on a net yield of £25 a head, a gross return of £12,500 is obtained. The equivalent return could be obtained from 90 acres of sugarcane, based on a yield of 35 tons per acre, at £4 a ton. That figure is considered by the officers at the research station to be reasonable, based on the result of yields which have been obtained.

They further stated that an equivalent return could also be obtained from 225 acres of rice based on 1½ tons per acre, at £37 a ton. The same return could also be obtained from 830 acres of pasture, allowing three bullocks per acre and £5 per head increase in value.

From pasture trials conducted at the research station, with bullocks from Ivanhoe Station, it was found possible to bring them up to 1,000 lb. in weight. They were so big and fat that it was not possible to walk them into Wyndham. It will be seen that from those trials very encouraging results were obtained.

One of the most promising results from the experiments conducted there is the amount of water that can be used for irrigation. The experiments have proved that a 3,000,000 acre-ft. storage on the Ord River will provide about 750,000 acre-ft. annually for irrigation. Allowing half to be lost on the river channel and on distribution, the amount available would irrigate 70,000 acres annually, and would return from rice the sum of £3,500,000 per year. These figures are based on experiments carried out over the last 10 to 12 years on the Ord River Research Station.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Would the presence of geese permit those returns?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Geese do not cause the same trouble as they have caused in the Northern Territory. They seem to favour the Northern Territory. In the Northern Territory, until Mr. Wise became Administrator, the geese were protected. There was no doubt about their great numbers. However, they have not caused the same amount of trouble as other birds caused originally. I remember when, as a boy, I saw vineyards in Spearwood covered completely with bird netting. That was the only way in which grapes could be produced. Today, with settlement and control I have not seen a wired-in vineyard around the metropolitan area for many years. At Liveringa, the native companions were in their thousands when I was up there about this time last year.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They are still there.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Because they were protected, and were not shot at or disturbed in any form, they became very friendly. They could not be termed domesticated, but they were certainly quiet. Nowadays one cannot get within 100 yards of them, especially if one is in a motorcar. They have become frightened since people began firing at them.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: There are still a few kangaroos there.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Yes. To give an idea of the potential production from that area, the experiments which have been conducted and the figures obtained therefrom fully warrant the expenditure of money for the establishment of the Ord River scheme. The Black Rocks jetty is essential to the Kimberleys as a deep water port for the district. I understand that Black Rocks is the nearest suitable site.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Only a relatively short jetty is required.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: A long jetty of one mile is required at Black Rocks, as well as a mile-long neck leading down to the jetty over the marshes. Earthworks a mile long are required before reaching the jetty of the same length. That is the same as the position at Busselton, Esperance, Carnarvon and Broome. Unfortunately, through necessity, the jetties have to be long to reach the ships.

Speaking of the rivers in the Kimberleys, the flow of the Ord has been measured at 9,000,000,000 gallons per hour. The capacity of Canning Dam is only 20,000,000,000 gallons. So the flow of the Ord during top flood would fill the Canning Dam in less than 2½ hours. That is an amazing quantity of water. As Mr. Wise explained during an earlier speech, the potential area of land which can be irrigated has not yet been assessed.

The land could be taken right through to the Northern Territory if sufficient water were available.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Would it flow at that rate every year?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Almost every year. At the research station the difference in height between the slow trickle and top flood is 56 ft. The height of 56 ft. was the highest recorded at the station. Every year the river does flood, but the flood may not be that high. The river floods more than once during the wet season. It rises and falls several times a year.

In the West Kimberleys we find exactly the same thing. You will recall, Mr. President, that at your request in 1951 the Lands and Surveys Department of the C.S.I.R.O. conducted a soil survey of the Leonard and Margaret River areas. While I was a Minister I had the opportunity of viewing the plans which were forwarded to you in connection with the survey. The results showed that at least 100,000 acres of black soil plains were available and could be irrigated from the Margaret River. That, of course, is a tributary of the Fitzroy, and it joins the Fitzroy some 200 miles upstream.

It is estimated that the Margaret River, with a 100 ft. wall, will dam 103,000,000,000 gallons of water on an average year's flood, or five times the quantity impounded at Canning Dam.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Have measurements been taken of the evaporation rate in that area?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I do not know whether they have been taken for that area. However, statistics and data in connection with the evaporation rate have been taken under the same climatic conditions in similar areas.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is considerable.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It is. Those who have assessed the capacity of the Ord River say there is ample water. The Leonard River, which was one of the rivers surveyed under your direction, Sir, is much closer to Derby. The result showed that only 35,000 acres of black soil plain were available; but there were the levee banks and other types of surrounding land which could also be utilised under irrigation.

When one looks at the enormous area which can be irrigated by the rivers up there, the potential is very great when compared with the area in the South-West which is under irrigation or can be irrigated. The total area of land in Western Australia now under irrigation is only some 80,000 acres, but the amount which has been spent on that irrigation scheme is enormous. Of necessity, all irrigation schemes must cost a lot of money.

In my opinion it is absolutely essential, now that the ice has been broken and a commencement made on a long-term project of using properly the land and waters in the Kimberleys, to set up an authority to control the expenditure of the funds for that purpose.

The expenditure of this money and the planning of the whole concern should be along the lines of the Murrumbidgee irrigation scheme which turned not poor class, but a little below average class, wheat and sheep country into the valuable country it is today. Anybody who has been to Leeton or Yanko, and had a look around will have seen the rice and pastures growing in rotation. This has been made possible by the irrigation scheme. The country is similar to many hundred square miles of our wheatbelt country; and the rainfall is something like a 14-in. average. Great towns are built over there, and there is a big fruit preserving factory at Leeton. There is also another prosperous place called, I think, Griffith, not far from there.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It must be a good place.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: While realising that the Kimberleys might never produce the quantity that is produced over there, it has been proved that rice can be grown; and there is not the slightest doubt about the production of beef. It is already produced in the Kimberleys. The trouble is it never survives.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It takes a bit too long.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The country has proved itself. I believe this is a wonderful opportunity for Western Australia to proceed with the development of the Kimberleys. As I said before, I am rather fearful of the dilly-dallying of the new Government in connection with these schemes.

I have asked questions in relation to Napier Broome Bay, but I have not been able to obtain a satisfactory answer. I am not saying it is not satisfactory from the Minister's point of view, but from the point of view of the project. What I mean by that is that I feel some concern in connection with the offhanded way that the department—not the Minister—is pushing aside the expenditure on investigation for a port—and particularly at Napier Broome Bay—to serve the North Kimberleys.

I feel keenly about this matter because in 1953, as Minister for the North-West, I had a lot to do, together with the then Minister for Lands (Mr. Hoar) and the Surveyor-General (Mr. Fyfe), in getting the Morgan survey fully equipped and sent up there in 1954. As a result of the survey the country was divided into pastoral holdings; and ultimately they were thrown open for selection, and most

of them were leased. We have the money to find a suitable place to enable the leases to be occupied, but after almost two years there is no move being made to do anything; and the excuse is that the officers concerned are busy on other work. One of the works mentioned was a survey of the Ord River. What a hydrographical surveyor is doing there, I have not the slightest idea!

I admit it is not long since I was a Minister myself, but I was still hammering to have the job proceeded with. On the 22nd November, 1957, a land board allotted more than 5,000,000 acres to approved lessees. When I say approved, I mean that the applicants had to prove that they had the necessary finance or resources to take up pastoral areas. Now, nearly two years later, I have asked the Government to ensure that the investigation will be made this year; but no satisfactory answer is received. The response is that it all depends on when the officers become available from other works. By including the Ord River in the works, the Government is, I think, just taking a hydrographical surveyor a little bit out of his territory.

We have gone to a lot of trouble to try to open up and develop country which has never been used before—there are 35,000 square miles not being utilised—but which is said to enjoy the heaviest rainfall in the area. This country is exceptionally well watered; it has been said by more than one surveyor that no beast would have to walk more than three miles for a drink at any place up there at any time. That indeed must be a well-watered area.

But surveyor Morgan, in 1954, led his expedition from Wyndham into that area from Gibb River Station and went through to Kulumburu. They surveyed the land and pegged every mile from Gibb River to Kulumburu Mission at Napier Broome Bay. They also appraised 13,000 square miles of the country, and rode across it on horses or mules. They then plotted the pastoral areas and marked out six portions adjacent to Napier Broome Bay. A seventh one they allotted to the Benedictine Fathers, who run the mission there, so that they could follow pastoral pursuits.

The people who were granted the land had the resources, because the land board had to approve of them. There is one gentleman from New South Wales with 810,000 acres; another partnership from New South Wales with 830,000 acres; a Victorian with 830,000 acres; a South Australian with 875,000 acres; and another New South Welshman with 956,000 acres. There is a young man—or he was a young man—named Eagleson who in 1950 had half-a-million acres between those holdings and Napier Broome Bay.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: He is still there, too.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Yes, he is still there. If those acres are added up it will be seen that there are more than 6,000,000 acres of first-class pastoral country waiting for the lessees to take stock and materials on to them. They have no chance whatever of getting in from Derby or Wyndham because of the terrain; and that is the reason the land has never previously been occupied. Of course, in the early days if anybody went in there with their cattle, the natives speared the beasts because they, like anybody else, had to eat. Therefore, it was certainly not economical to try to enter the country then. As a matter of fact, when the Benedictine Fathers first went there some 50-odd years ago to the Drysdale Mission, some of the fathers themselves were speared by the natives. Unfortunately, later, when the Japs went to war they dropped a bomb and killed another of the fathers. However, that is beside the point.

Under present-day open-range conditions practiced throughout the Kimberleys on cattle stations, those 6,000,000 acres would hold at least 100,000 head of cattle. Under the present turn off they would get 10 per cent. of their herd. That would be 10,000 beasts which would be worth a quarter-of-a-million pounds. But the lessees cannot get into their land. Under the terms of the lease, they must, within five years, have complied with the improvement provisions of the Land Act. That is, they must have spent £5 for every 1,000 acres; and within 10 years, £10. Under the Land Act a homestead could be built in the middle, but that is one of the weaknesses of our Land Act.

But these are the conditions that affect them: Within two years they will need to have two head of livestock for every thousand acres; and within five years, four head. For the remainder of the lease they will have to have six. And yet, since the 22nd November, 1957, they have not had an opportunity even to inspect their country; unless they had a helicopter and could fly in.

Members may no longer wonder why I am persistent about Napier Broome Bay. I am very persistent about it. Mr. MacKinnon said yesterday that the easiest country should be developed first. There is no easier country in the world to take up than the pastoral areas of the Kimberleys; more especially, the pastoral areas of North Kimberley. Up there, one can leave one's cattle without any fear of their being poisoned or starved.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Someone might pinch them.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: There are no blacks now. It is absolutely impossible to go wrong up there. It is the easiest country in the world to stock, and yet the hardest to get into. We have the money from the Commonwealth Government, and we have the people who are

prepared to go there, but no access. We are dillying and dallying, and being pushed around by departments which dictate to us and say that it cannot be done this year and it cannot be done next year. I know that when I was Minister I was told by an officer—or I heard an officer say—that we could not expect people to go up there in the wet.

People have to live up there all the year round. I would like to see the Government's policy put into operation in regard to this particular matter. Let private enterprise take a hand. I should say there are any number of private surveyors who would be willing to tackle the job. But, for Heaven's sake, do not talk about not developing the North when we have the money and land! Everything is there except the means of getting into the properties. Let us get on with the job; and do not take any notice of people who say, "Leave it till next year." Get along and get the job done.

That area of 6,000,000 acres of land is only a fraction of what will ultimately be available; but it is the best and easiest of access, because it is reasonably flat country which is capable of being used properly. Incidentally, Mr. Wise has reminded me of something else appearing in this *Federal Hansard* where, at page 1494, on Thursday, the 14th May, 1959, Senator Paltridge referred to what the country could produce and, mentioning the North Kimberleys, as I have done, said—

Aerial surveys are the only surveys which have been made of the area.

I have already told the House that a line has been surveyed and pegged every mile, over 240 miles from one point to another. I did not know that Senator Paltridge had a hand in it; but he said—

In 1954 I had the unique and pleasurable experience of walking with a survey party from Hall's Creek to a place called Kulumburu.

Hall's Creek is 400 miles at least away from there, as the aeroplane flies, and, if Senator Paltridge has ever walked that distance, I will walk to Shanghai.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You had better be careful. It is a long way to Shanghai.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: This is a distance of 400 miles in a straight line; and I think that on foot the journey would be at least 500 miles. One would need the agility of Sir Edmund Hillary to cross that country; and I think the honourable senator, if he were to undertake that journey, would need to lose some of his rotundity. As I said before, our Federal Parliament is becoming a little comical and it is a pity; because sometimes the debates are on the air, while at other times people read the reports in *Hansard*. Senator Paltridge continued—

After we had crossed the Forrest River we became the first white men to walk across the Napier Ranges to Kulumburu.

The Napier Ranges and the Forrest River are 300 miles apart. The Napier Ranges are 300 miles west of the Forrest River, and they have been scratched from one end to the other by dozens of prospectors. They were first crossed by Hann in 1898, and were crossed and recrossed by Brockman in 1901, and by Easton in 1921; and by I do not know how many cattlemen in the meantime.

I do not doubt that Senator Paltridge may have been carried away with his success in getting his Bill through; as he had to battle against tremendous odds, in the form of Western Australian senators; and he may have lost his bearings. However, I thought it might strike a note of humour if members pictured the rotund senator, scrambling, in 1954, along the 400 miles from Hall's Creek to Kulumburu. There certainly seems to have been some mistake made in the geography.

I wish now to refer to oil, which is today and apparently for many years to come will be, the gold of the universe. I asked, in this House, some questions in regard to oil. My reason for asking them was my own personal curiosity; and the fact that during trips through the North, over the last couple of years, many people have asked had I any inside information relating to oil. They also asked what was being done in relation to oil; and so I deduced that people were becoming a little restless in regard to the oil search in this State.

As a Minister of the Crown I could only answer, truthfully, that I knew very little about oil; except that we had had a promising strike and that I hoped oceans of oil would in due course be found. We know that oil has been discovered at Exmouth Gulf, and that it flowed to the surface—although not in commercial quantities—for six weeks, as the Minister said in reply to my question; and that many thousands of gallons of oil flowed from the bore. I also asked whether any more oil could be produced from that well if pumps were installed; but the Minister's answer suggested that very little more could be obtained in that way; and he gave some technical explanation as to why that would be so.

I do not know whether any member has read a book by the British Petroleum Company called "Our Industry"; but on reading it I find that there are numerous oil wells in the world producing, although the oil does not flow to the surface. The fact is that in many instances the oil has to be pumped to the surface, just as we raise water from underground. Every banana grower on the Gascoyne River pumps water from underground—sometimes as much as 1,000,000 gallons per day.

In view of the Minister's answer to my question, I think that his advisors could perhaps consult some of the Carnarvon

banana growers and ask them how they get water to the surface. However, I accept the information that the oil reservoir at Exmouth Gulf is a small one. I also asked the Minister whether, in view of the fact that the company had abandoned drilling and the search for oil in that area over the past two years, it would be possible for other interested people to do further research there. The Minister's reply was to the effect that the Shell Oil Company and another group had entered into partnership; and were planning a further search in the area.

We are all pleased to hear that the search for oil in the Exmouth Gulf area will be furthered; and I hope that it will be proceeded with very soon. It has been disappointing to the people of Western Australia and to Australia as a whole, that no oil has flowed in commercial quantities in this State. Numerous oil rigs were quickly on the scene after the original strike; but now they have all been taken away; and the nearest rig to that discovery is some thousand miles away from it. The indications are that the Exmouth Gulf field has been abandoned, to all intents and purposes.

On receiving the Minister's answers to my question, I was prompted to ask whether somebody else might be enabled to further the search for oil there—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Do you want somebody else to come in on the grouter?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It is not a matter of somebody coming in on the grouter. If a person holding a gold-mining lease walks off it, someone else can prospect it; but, if it is to be shut up in this way, no one can search for oil in that area. When I read in *The West Australian* Senator Spooner's announcement that the Commonwealth Government was further going to subsidise substantially, the search for oil—that is in the cost of drilling, apart from services supplied through its socialistic activities such as the C.S.I.R.O., the Geophysical Survey, and so on—and that some 30 companies searching for oil would come under the subsidy, I was sorry to learn that of those 30 companies, engaged in the search in Australia, New Guinea and Papua, only three were operating in Western Australia.

I feel that we have not our fair share of companies prospecting for oil in this State; and the reason for that may be that they have not the areas in which to search. When the original leases were allotted, the Ampol Company's lease stretched from Cape Leeuwin to Wyndham. During the regime of the Hawke Government, the Act was amended to extend the lease, which was for two years, and enable the company to hold its areas for much longer. The company did forfeit an

area between the Northern Territory border and Wyndham; and it is pleasing to note that another company will commence drilling there in the near future.

In view of the position I have outlined, one naturally asks whether the major company has more land in its leases than it can fairly utilise; because surely, with all the potential oil land in this State, we are entitled to see more activity taking place in the search for oil. We all know that the finding of oil in commercial quantities would be of great consequence to any Government at the time of discovery. I am sure the Minister will give the House some further information in connection with oil leases, and so on, when he has had time to examine the question. I support the second reading.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (West) [8.14]: In rising to support the Bill, I wish first to remedy a couple of omissions during my contribution to the debate on the Address-in-reply; because on that occasion I failed to offer my congratulations to the two new Ministers. That was due solely to inexperience—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: We accept your apologies.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I wish also to thank Mr. Lavery and Mr. Davies for the great help they gave me during my election campaign. During the debate on the Address-in-reply, I dealt with some aspects of workers' compensation. I will now read to the House a letter dated the 7th August which I received. This letter, addressed to myself c/o Parliament House, reads as follows:—

I am writing to request you to bring a compensation anomaly before the notice of Mr. Watts, the Attorney-General for Western Australia. You will remember, Ron, from talks we had before you became our member, that I had to pay my ex-wife alimony at the rate of £6 weekly.

Last week I had the misfortune to injure my back at work, but against my doctor's advice I had to carry on working as I could not afford to go on workers' compensation. A man in my position receives compensation rates of a single man and yet I am obliged to carry on paying my ex-wife alimony at £6 per week. To stop these payments while one was on compensation at single rate would cost fifteen guineas for legal expenses. These costs I ascertained from one of Perth's leading solicitors.

Surely this anomaly must be regarded as unjust especially when one also takes into consideration the fact that the Federal Government takes the alimony payer as a single man.

If you consider that injustice exists, which can or should be amended by our State Parliament, I would be extremely grateful if you would bring this matter to the notice of the Attorney-General, Mr. Watts.

Although that anomaly is foreign to the one I dealt with, it is, more or less, a pointer to the weaknesses in the Workers' Compensation Act. The wife of this man deserted him and went to the Eastern States, and she had a judgment against him for the payment of alimony at the rate of £6 a week. Despite this, he is taxed as a single man; and would receive compensation as a single man if he met with an injury. Yet he has to support himself, if he goes on compensation, on £2 per week. Members will realise that this is impossible with the present cost of living. I thought I would read the letter in the hope that the Minister may be able to do something to effect some amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act.

I now want to deal briefly with the question of long service leave for casual workers. I do not know what the future position is going to be in this State, but I am given to understand that this year all State Parliaments will be introducing legislation for long service leave to be granted to casual employees in industry. The present awards which provide for the granting of long service leave have been found to be inadequate when relating to casual employees in those industries such as stevedoring, the pastoral industry, the building trades, etc.

We know that under existing awards, employees are required to remain in employment with one employer for a period of not less than ten years before they qualify for *pro rata* payment for long service leave. I know for a fact that some employers are taking advantage of this qualifying period by deliberately dismissing men before they complete ten years' service. I have dealt with several complaints in this regard in the last couple of months. One man worked for a cement firm for seven years. He went on compensation for a fortnight, and when he returned to resume work his employer told him, "I have another man in your place now."

When I approached the employer about the matter he said, "In a couple of years' time I will be up for long service leave payment for him; I have put another man in his place and he can stay there." The Commonwealth Parliament has recognised that casual employees are equally entitled to those benefits that are granted in the awards covering permanent employees. Specific conditions have been laid down and various adaptations have been made to grant as far as possible, equal benefits to casual workers.

For example, in most industries which rely upon the employment of casual workers, it has been recognised that the

remuneration of the casual workers should be over and above that of the permanent employees, to compensate them for sick leave and other benefits that are enjoyed by the permanent workers. I have some lengthy screeds relating to long service leave being granted to casual workers. The one I have here covers a submission to the Tasmanian Parliamentary Select Committee on the 12th March, 1958. One of the submissions made to that Select Committee reads as follows:—

The award of long service benefits is no doubt based on a number of considerations including:—

- (a) it is a modern and progressive condition of employment associated with an enlightened and civilised industrial community;
- (b) it is a necessary step in elevating the general living standards of the entire community;
- (c) it is a benefit justly and properly conferred on workers whose service has continued for an extended period;
- (d) after continuous service, it provides a medium whereby workers may refresh themselves and recoup their physical and mental working capacity and improve their ability for further service;
- (e) it is a recognition that the workers' service has a substantial social value.

So it goes on for 16 or 17 pages. I have a great deal more information on this question; and I think it is essential that the Minister for Labour should incorporate in our statutes a provision to grant some privileges or concessions to casual workers. There is no doubt that the farmers, the pastoralists and the employers in the building trades could not function successfully if these men were hired on a permanent basis. Therefore, they have a substantial social value to the community.

Casual workers perform their service honestly when they are called upon to do so; and, therefore, they should not be denied the privileges and benefits that are enjoyed by those men who are permanently employed by virtue of their skill as tradesmen. Those men enjoy the benefit of long service leave because they are enabled to serve their qualifying period. Casual workers, however, are not engaged in such occupations long enough to have such benefits conferred upon them. I intend to discuss this question with the Minister for Labour at a later stage, and I sincerely hope that he will be able to take the necessary steps to do something for casual workers along the lines I have suggested.

I noticed with concern a report in this evening's newspaper that there are about 1,000 youths out of work in Western Australia. I have seen many unemployed

young men in and around Fremantle but I consider that the greatest number of unemployed youths, in relation to the total population of the town, is at Medina.

The prospect of their obtaining employment in the near future is not bright irrespective of what Government may be in office. No-one yet seems to be able to offer a solution to the problem. I find that I am receiving calls daily to assist unemployed youths at Medina; and I know that the member for South Fremantle in another place, and the other members for the West Province in this House, are receiving similar calls to do something for the unemployed young men at that town.

We have already criticised the Minister for Local Government for refusing to pay the single unemployed additional relief to the extent of 17s. 6d. weekly, but I think he should have a further look at the position of the unemployed youth at Medina. Their plight is serious because their parents cannot afford to give them even 5s. a day to enable them to travel to Fremantle or Perth in search of work. Many of the parents concerned have been residents of Medina since the first houses were erected; they migrated from England in the hope that they may be able to give their children better opportunities than they would in England.

However, because their children are unable to find employment they are seriously considering returning to England. They have pointed out to me that, although their sons have been educated in this State and are virtually Australians, it is impossible for them to obtain employment.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: If they sacked many of the married women who are in employment it might make room for them.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It must be understood that there is no avenue of employment for married women other than at the oil refinery or the B.H.P. rolling mills; and very few women are employed at those works, or even at Medina itself. I ask the Minister to consider seriously the reintroduction of the 17s. 6d. weekly relief to enable payments to be made to the unemployed youth at Medina, even if it is made in the form of a travelling allowance to give them an opportunity to go out and seek employment.

On their present incomes and social service payments it is practically impossible to live in that township. However, we now see that the Department of the Navy is going to open up Leeuwin as a training centre. Perhaps our Federal members and Ministers of the Federal Government have realised how far we are lagging behind in Western Australia; and possibly they may regard this as an avenue of absorbing some of our youth into useful trades. The boys will receive their early training here before being transferred to the Eastern States.

A chap who was discharged from the army about four weeks ago came to me to see whether I could obtain employment for him. When he joined the army he was promised the world. He was told that as soon as he was discharged he would be given employment. However, after serving for three years, the army completely wiped its hands of him. I put through about 15 telephone calls in an endeavour to trace from where these promises came, but I was referred from one army department to another; and so it went on. This chap and I got tired, because we knew there was no sincerity about the promises that had been made.

This man pointed out to me that it would be a conservative statement to say that five out of every 10 recruits entering army establishments in the Eastern States came from Western Australia. That shows we are losing the cream of our community. People are more or less being forced to join the army and go to the Eastern States so as to eke out a living; and, when they are discharged, they very often take their wives and families to the Eastern States, just as this man intends to, because they cannot find employment here. The chap about whom I have been speaking has passed a trade test—he is a painter by trade—yet he cannot obtain employment.

There is another subject about which I desire to speak; and it is in connection with the re-siting of the North Fremantle railway bridge. I know a lot of people are getting tired of hearing about this bridge, but the residents of North Fremantle are very concerned about it. A fortnight ago the mayor of North Fremantle convened a meeting; and I would say it was the best-attended meeting ever held in North Fremantle. Unanimous decisions were made at that meeting, there being not one dissentient voice, in regard to the re-siting of the railway bridge; provided it was alongside the existing bridge.

North Fremantle is a very small place with no room whatsoever for expansion, yet 27 resumptions will take place because of this decision by the Government. North Fremantle is bounded by Commonwealth lands, the river, and the ocean; and the Railway Department has taken quite a proportion of the beach, which has denied business people quite a deal of revenue. In his Address-in-reply speech, Mr. Davies showed quite plainly what will take place when land is resumed and an embankment built through the middle of the township. There will be a bank of 18 or 20 feet running through the middle of the township; and this does not augur well for North Fremantle.

The area of this town is not much more than 1,500 acres. Industry has crept in, and it has helped to keep that council going financially. However, if the railway runs through the town, and if houses

and industrial sites are resumed, North Fremantle will become a rather bankrupt township. This is not necessary. Experts have pointed out that there is no need for the bridge to go on the site decided upon by the present Government.

In connection with the Leeuwin project, the Premier has pointed out that it is one step towards the development of a naval base. The logical place for a naval base is Cockburn Sound. Development must take place in Cockburn Sound in the near future because, as time goes on and Western Australia progresses with new industries, the present harbour facilities will not be able to cope with the resultant increase in shipping.

About seven years ago, a very minor collision occurred in the Fremantle Harbour adjacent to "G" shed when a coal hulk was being moved across the harbour and was struck by a freighter—I think it was the *Koomilya* or the *Kooringa*. The coal hulk sank with about 1,200 or 1,400 tons of coal on board. It was one of the old sailing ships, and its name was *Concordia*. That berth near "G" shed was useless for 2½ years because this little obstruction appeared by the wharf.

What would happen if a major collision occurred in the mouth of the harbour? Not one ship would be able to get in and out of the harbour. There was a near-collision two years ago when the wind took hold of a Greek ship in ballast and blew it from one side of the harbour to the other, with three tugs pulling hard against it. It was only by a freak that the ship was not holed and sunk in the harbour.

The decision of the Government—I do not think it is the Government's decision but Mr. Tydeman's—to proceed with an upriver extension of the harbour is not wise, particularly when one considers that perhaps in wartime atomic and hydrogen bombs may be dropped here; although I hope that will not occur here or anywhere else. However, we have to look to the future and it would be foolish in the extreme to develop the harbour upriver. At Cockburn Sound channels have been dredged at the expense of the State; and this site would be most suitable for a dry dock, and for any future harbour berths. There are two miles of coastline which could be utilised for this purpose by tunnelling or open-cutting straight into the cliffs along Naval Base, or along the seven or eight miles of coastline just south of Woodman's Point. Two or three berths could be built there for the cost of the No. 10 berth at North Fremantle. That berth was not a success.

We should learn by our mistakes. We certainly paid dearly for the No. 10 berth at North Fremantle. We should look to Cockburn Sound in the future. If the Government were to build wharves in that vicinity, it would be an incentive for the

Federal Government to establish a naval dock in Fremantle. Over the years, many hundreds of thousands of pounds have left Western Australia because we have not had docking facilities. The last ship to leave here, the *Farmand*, would have provided £96,000 in wages to the port of Fremantle, plus contracts to engineering firms. If we are going to champion private industry, we should give it the facilities to earn money and provide employment at Fremantle, and in Western Australia generally. I consider that a dock in the Fremantle area is essential. I support the Bill.

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (Suburban) [8.43]: In supporting the Supply Bill I wish to turn to one subject which is becoming a hardy annual in my speech. Mr. Watson claimed that this House was a buffer in respect of legislation; and he suggested that money Bills should be introduced in this Chamber. I forget exactly what he said, but it was a first class attempt at camouflage in regard to what we should do and what we actually do. He also said that 40,000 electors voted for him. However, he forgot to say that that figure represented only one-third of the number of people who should have a right to vote in his province; as in mine.

Since my last speech in this Chamber, I have taken the trouble to make a survey throughout the province I represent; and I asked people independently—I had no idea of their political affiliations—in most of the suburbs what their opinion was in connection with voting for the Legislative Council. Not one person interviewed agreed with the present position; they all said they would vote for a change if they had the opportunity.

I am serious about what I am bringing forward. It is wrong at this stage of our society to have a restricted franchise in a Legislative Council, and an adult franchise in a Legislative Assembly. Although a person has to vote for the Legislative Assembly, or be fined £2 for not doing so, only about one-third of the people have the right to vote for this Chamber, through which every piece of legislation has to pass before it becomes law.

I did ask the Minister whether he considered amending the law to permit of adult franchise, and the answer I got was, "No." I then asked would he at least consider giving the vote to the housewives, who, I think are the most wronged of all the people because they are the ones who bear the burden of rearing the families. Widows living on their own have the right to vote. Single women, who are not fulfilling their full duty to society—the raising of a family; that is our whole duty to society—also have the right to vote for the Legislative Council, when they are either householders or own a house; but the housewife is denied the right to vote.

for this Chamber unless she has a share, with her husband, in the home in which they live.

Years ago, when I was a young woman, we did not question the matter of putting a house in both names. We took for granted that the husband was sufficiently responsible to do this and that he would consider that half of what he had was his wife's; and that if he died before she did, everything he had would be hers. I am talking of the family unit. But this attitude does not apply today. We have now arrived at the stage where the housewife is disfranchised because the property is in her husband's name.

I have asked several people about this, and one of them said that had he known the position, when he bought the property, he would certainly have put the house in his wife's name as well as in his own. He said, "I consider that half of what I have is hers, and that if I pass on before she does, everything I have will be hers; but now we are not in sufficiently good circumstances to pay the cost of transferring the house into both our names in order that she may get the vote." I consider the present position to be most undemocratic.

I really did make the survey; and I am speaking the truth when I say that. Last year, or towards the end of the previous year—I do not remember quite when—*The West Australian* published a leader stating that the time had arrived for the reform of the franchise for the Legislative Council. If *The West Australian* can do that, I should say we are doubly right in making a move in this House to give every voter the franchise. When I hear a man who has been in the Legislative Council for as long as Mr. Watson has, come up with the camouflage that he used yesterday—I use that word advisedly—I am shocked.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think the honourable member has any right to reflect on another member.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Perhaps if Mr. Watson were here, he could tell me what he meant; but he is not here; and that is what I really thought.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There are frequent occasions when the honourable member is absent from the Chamber, but we do not take advantage of her absence.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I made the remark unthinkingly. I do not think the assertion that this House should be made a buffer, was a very good one.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Surely the Government could bring down a Bill to correct the position.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: If the Government does not soon bring down a Bill to correct the position it will find, as it did in connection with the jury Bill, that it will be faced with a social question that will become stronger each day. We

know that the franchise has only been widened to the extent it is, because it became a burning social question. If the Government does not act of its own volition, it will be forced to do something in the near future, because the people are aware that they are being deprived of the democratic right that belongs to every person in a country which claims to be a democracy. It is the fundamental right of every person in Australia to have the vote for whatever Houses of Parliament pertain at the time.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: Hursey did not have the right to vote in a union ballot.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: What is the analogy between the fundamental right to vote for a House of legislative power, the franchise for which is extended to about one-third of the people, and the right to vote at a union ballot which probably involves no more than from a few men up to, perhaps, 2,000.

I have made my point, and I am not going to labour it; because I really made the survey. I have found that the women are resentful about the present position; and I will take up a petition if members like, and present it to the House so that members can see what these people think. This anomaly is maintained only by the Conservative Government. The Labor Party has voted against the present position for as long as I can remember; and it is only by fighting strenuously that we can get wrongs righted for the people. With this contribution, I support the Bill.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines—in reply) [8.53]: I wish first of all to thank all members for their contributions to the debate. As they will realise, it is difficult for me to reply at length to the various points that were raised. I propose, however, to adopt the same method as I did on the Address-in-reply; that is to answer where possible the speeches made by members.

The comments made by Mr. Wise were divided into three categories. He mentioned the North-West; and we all know of his keen and intimate knowledge of that area. He dealt with the attitude of the Government to State trading concerns; and the third question that he raised concerned the relationship of the parties in the coalition Government. In regard to the last mentioned matter, the honourable member will be disappointed when I inform him that the relationship between the Government parties is in first class order; the coalition is going along in a magnificent manner; and we are a happy Government, determined to see Western Australia prosper.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: You will be disappointed to know that I am pleased to hear it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not disappointed to hear that at all. The second question dealt with by Mr. Wise concerned the State trading concerns. Here again it was probably some disappointment to the honourable member to know that, in answering the questions on behalf of the Government, I was not prepared to say definitely whether the Government would take action in selling this particular State enterprise or that one. But I say to him that these matters will be treated on their merits as the opportunity and circumstances arise. I can assure the honourable member that the closest examination possible will be given before any action is taken in this connection. The honourable gentleman took the Minister for the North-West to task for not inviting other members of Parliament—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You must be more careful in your choice of words. I did not take him to task.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I withdraw those words.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I was pleased that the Minister was there; but how were we to tag along behind him?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is what I was referring to when I used the words, "took to task." However, Mr. Wise mentioned that the Minister for the North-West did not include State parliamentary members for the North-West in a party that recently visited that area. In this connection, I emphatically assure the honourable member that there was no discourtesy intended by the Minister for the North-West. This visit was organised by the Commonwealth Government Members' Food and Agriculture Committee, who are all Government back-bench members. The survey they made of the North-West and Kimberleys was arranged by themselves and not by the Commonwealth or State Governments.

An invitation was extended by the committee to the Minister for the North-West, and it was considered by the Government that it was most important that the Minister should accompany the party. The visit was arranged in a considerable hurry to enable the survey to be undertaken before yesterday's sitting of the Commonwealth Parliament. In the circumstances, it was not practicable to invite other members of the State Parliament to accompany the Minister. The members for the respective districts traversed by the party can be assured that there was no intention on the part of the Minister for the North-West to overlook or in any way to be discourteous to the members concerned. He himself was in the party purely by courtesy of the committee.

I can also assure members that the visit was not party political. The Minister was careful to avoid any such suggestion

on the visit; and Press reports and discussions with local people will confirm this. The Minister's attendance with the party was necessary and desirable, and strictly in accordance with the requirements of his office. I have discussed the matter with the Minister for the North-West, and he is giving consideration to the practicability of Mr. Wise's suggestion to take a parliamentary party through the North-West during the life of the present Parliament. Members will appreciate that there are certain practical difficulties which cannot be ignored so far as transport and accommodation are concerned when large parties are moving in the North.

I, as Minister for Mines, went into the Murchison and Pilbara areas; and it was not possible for me to take, in one car, everyone who was interested. I did take with me Mr. Hall; and I also took the member for Murchison (Mr. Burt). At Marble Bar we met Mr. Willesee and the Legislative Assembly member for the district, Mr. Bickerton. Had all the Legislative Assembly members for those districts, as well as the Council members for the North and North-West provinces, desired to accompany me, I would have needed not one, but two, or maybe three, cars.

Both Mr. Wise and Mr. Strickland will know that transport is a problem on such occasions. When a Minister visits a district by air the question of providing transport or accommodation for other members does not arise, because he simply goes there as an individual; and as he travels from one point to the other he meets the various members for the districts concerned. I would like members to have regard for the point of view of the Minister for the North-West, and he will see what can be done regarding their requests.

Incidentally, I think members would like to know that, in discussions I have had with the Minister for the North-West, he has told of the great value he expects from the visit of the party of Federal Government back-bench members. The survey party was most keen, and worked extremely hard in the time available to them to acquaint themselves with the broad picture of what the Government hopes to achieve. He said that it was an inspiration to find a team of back-benchers prepared to leave the narrow confines of their own electorates and, at considerable personal inconvenience and expense, travel to observe the prospects and problems of North-Western Australia. It is safe to say that we now have at Canberra a body of back-bench members who are much better informed than they were on what can and should be done in the North-West.

As I said earlier, Mr. Wise—and probably other members; but more particularly Mr. Wise because of his association with

the North—knows that the North-West faces great problems. I think he will agree with me when I say that the pastoral industry alone will not develop the North in the speedy manner in which we hope to see it developed. Personally I have hopes that the mining industry will help in this regard, because mining can and does offer an opportunity for quick development. As Minister for Mines, it is my fervent desire to do everything I can to see the State's mineral resources in those areas developed because, in addition to being of great general value to the State, it will be one means of getting people to go to the North-West.

Mr. Murray advised the Government it would be wise to repeal Regulation 132 made under the Betting Control Act, if it were intended to impose a sliding scale of turnover taxation. I have referred this suggestion to the Minister for Police. The honourable member did not appear satisfied with the comment I provided him with during the Address-in-reply regarding release of water to settlers from the Serpentine Dam. His comments have been forwarded to the Minister for Water Supplies.

When speaking on the Address-in-reply debate, I advised the House I was having boring done at Marble Bar and Bamboo Creek in an effort to solve water problems in those areas. Members representing the North-West, and, no doubt, other members, will be interested to hear that this morning a telegram was received reporting that at Bamboo Creek water had been found at 60 feet. The flow at 65 feet was 500 gallons per day; at 70 feet 1,700 gallons daily; and at 77 feet it was 2,400 gallons. Boring is proceeding, and I am awaiting further advice with keen interest. Samples of the water are being sent to the Mines Department laboratories for analysis.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: Is that continual pumping?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not aware of that. All I have received is a telegram telling me what has been discovered to this point of time.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: There is no indication of the quality?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No; it is hard to assess the quality of water without analysing it. Of course, this is for battery purposes because there is a State battery at Bamboo Creek. It has not been operating for some time because of the lack of water.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: It can be done on the job.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: You mean an analysis of the water?

The Hon. L. C. Diver: Yes.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: All I know is that a sample of the water has been sent down for analysis, and I am satisfied with that for the moment.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: Would they refer to a 24-hour day when they spoke of the pumping per day?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I presume so. It is not a large flow of water as we think of water in the metropolitan area, or even in some other parts of the State.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: I am thinking of the low-grade ore they will be treating there.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think that battery will require about 5,000 gallons a day to allow it to operate successfully; but, of course, it can be accumulated to a point where there is sufficient to operate the battery. However, I think members for the North-West will agree that this is very good news.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: It is a lot more water than no water at all.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is a very sound way of looking at it. I am only too pleased that some success has been achieved. I remember the geologist's report on this matter; he said that he did not think there was much hope of water being found. However, I was prepared to give it a trial, because, when I was at Bamboo Creek, I saw what water meant to the people there.

It has cost £4,000 or £5,000 to do the drilling, but it will prove to be a worthwhile expenditure if water can be found, because there are a couple of good producing mines in the district.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: They are promising results through a bore hole.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member would know more about that country than I do. It is a long haul from Bamboo Creek to Marble Bar; and I had a request from one mineowner for a subsidy to cart 500 tons of ore from the mine to Marble Bar. It was broken ore; and it was in the way of his mining operations, and he wanted to get it shifted. We will do something about that. The water supply is about 1½ miles from the Bamboo Creek settlement, and a pipeline will have to be put down to take the supply into the battery.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That quantity need not necessarily be a full day's pumping; it would be to the limit of the forking of the bore.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is so. The water may be accumulated to a point where the battery has sufficient to enable it to operate. Of course, the battery does not work for the 24 hours of the day; it will crush whatever ore is available.

During the Address-in-reply debate, Mr. Teahan stated that facilities at the Kalgoorlie railway station should be improved, particularly those in the refreshment rooms. The new Commissioner of Railways inspected these premises on the 29th

July, and, as a result, has arranged for the refreshment rooms to be embellished and renovated. It is expected that this work will be completed within the next few months.

Mr. Jones' suggestions regarding the outfitting of prospecting parties of two men with drilling and hauling equipment were constructive and helpful, and will be carefully considered by the Mines Department. The department, over the years, has tried out various prospecting schemes, from specially-selected and specially-equipped parties of eight to 10 men under leadership, to parties of two. That has not proved completely successful. At present, parties of two are provided with sustenance and simple prospecting tools. If they locate prospects worthy of development, they can be loaned money for development and for the purchase of more elaborate equipment under the provisions of the Mining Development Act.

A number of requests are being made to the Mines Department in this regard, and each request is closely examined by departmental officers. Where it is considered warranted, assistance is given to miners and prospectors along the lines I have indicated.

As members are aware, only a limited number of men are prepared these days to give up wages jobs for prospecting. The younger men prefer to obtain regular well-paid employment in places where educational, medical and other facilities are available for their families. Most minerals, particularly gold, are becoming increasingly hard to locate, as the easily-found ones—those with outcrops or surface indications—are now very scarce. This experience is shared by many of the big companies which for years have sent out their own organised prospecting parties, and by the department through the State-assisted parties.

The Mines Department is gradually increasing its stocks of equipment for hire or loan to operators. This includes compressor units, prospecting drills, etc. A new compressor unit has just been ordered and will be stationed at Meekatharra. This compressor was bought as a result of requests made to me when I went through the area some weeks ago.

I listened with interest to Dr. Hislop's remarks and will endeavour to benefit from and act on the advice he tendered. His comments in connection with the Murray report on universities has been conveyed to the appropriate authorities, as have been his remarks on the nursing profession and the Health Education Council.

I can assure the honourable member that the views he expressed during the Address-in-reply debate on the sale of milk in cartons was referred at once to the Minister for Agriculture. The Minister,

however, was then in the Eastern States, as was the Director of Agriculture, and they did not return until some time later. The Minister is investigating this matter; and I am awaiting advice from him which I will, when I receive it, communicate to the honourable member.

The honourable member's request for the re-establishment of a private parking area for doctors outside the Mount Hospital has been sent to the Minister for Transport. I understand this parking area was cancelled late in 1957 by the previous Government, which suggested the use of the hospital grounds for parking. I am very much in sympathy with this particular point of view. I took up with the previous Minister for Transport the ridiculous position of some suburban doctors who live, perhaps, near a picture theatre. The regulations, or whoever is in control of the situation will not allow a "no parking" sign to be placed on the road outside a doctor's driveway. Because of this, some doctors have found cars parked in their driveways; and when they have been called out at night, while the pictures have been in progress, they have had to call taxis to take them on their calls. Such a state of affairs is ridiculous, and I hope the present Minister for Transport will do something about it.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: Hear! hear!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is absurd to think that a doctor who is called upon at unreasonable hours, should have to put up with that sort of thing. After all, people do not call a doctor for nothing. They expect him to be there, and it is ridiculous to think that he cannot attend because he cannot get out of his own driveway.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: That also applies to a private individual.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, but I am sure the honourable member will appreciate that it applies more specifically to a doctor. Mr. Teahan made a plea for the relief of entertainment tax where functions are conducted by honorary organisations and by railway institutes. I would remind the honourable member that this is the tax that the Government, of which he was a supporter—although I do not think he was in the House at the time the legislation was introduced—eagerly re-imposed in 1955, when the Commonwealth Government relinquished its authority over that tax.

I agree entirely with the honourable member's suggestion that homes should be exempt from probate duty. In his policy speech, the present Premier envisaged that relief would be given from probate duty in connection with family homes up to a value of £4,000; this undertaking will be put into effect as soon as possible.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: This House agreed with that principle three years ago, but the Hawke Government refused to accept it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I remember the occasion when the particular Bill was introduced. I said at the time, and I say again, that probate duty is an iniquitous tax. A man spends his life getting a home together for his wife and family, and, on his death, it cannot be handed over to her without its being taxed by the State. A comparison was made by Mr. MacKinnon of the cost of rent collecting at Bunbury by a private organisation, with the cost entailed by the State Housing Commission's office in that town. The figures he quoted were 4s. 7½d. per house per month for the private organisation, as against 9s. 4½d. for the Commission. It is a matter of simple mathematics to know that the difference in cost by comparison is 100 per cent. in round figures. The honourable member lives in the town himself, and I think he will agree that a better service is now given to the public in respect to arrangements that exist there.

If, however, there is something particular that the honourable member would like me to look into, I would be glad if he would mention it to me privately, because I could then have the matter investigated. I remind the honourable member that the instalments on purchase homes are also going to be collected by the State officers at Bunbury; and that will increase the work by about 30 per cent. Mr. MacKinnon could see little reason why the North-West should receive any particular consideration.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I did not quite say that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Any special consideration, then.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: He did not say, "Nothing is too good for them."

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The return from the North is not inconsiderable; and its potentialities are vast. I repeat the remarks I made a few moments ago; namely, that the North, in many respects, and in many parts, is rich in minerals, and when exploited properly can bring quick development.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Do you think that is the only part of the State to which those remarks apply?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No; they apply to the whole of the State where there is a potential to be developed. But the North-West and the South-West are not comparable in climate; in geographical construction; or in the riches with which they are endowed. We must develop each of these areas in a manner suitable to it. Mr. MacKinnon took the

House for a quick trip round the South-West. He showed how Busselton had prospered because of the attention to the tourist trade; but he said that other areas of the State had not achieved the same result. The citizens of Busselton are to be congratulated on their efforts. There are many countries whose economy relies, to a great extent, on their tourist trade. The Premier himself has taken over the portfolio of tourism, and he is quite determined to do whatever he can to increase the tourist trade of Western Australia. It was stated by Mr. Mattiske that full use was not being made of the brain power in this Chamber.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Use is being made of only two members at the moment!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: He suggested that more valuable work could be done by members. Beyond that I will make no further reference to the brain power of this Chamber! The honourable member instanced inquiries he had made, and information he had garnered in regard to the iron and steel, and the sugar industries; and he said that this had proved valuable in certain quarters. I am sure it has.

I did not expect Mr. Watson to agree with the information with which I provided him—when I spoke on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply—in connection with his proposals for the abolition of stamp and probate duty. I might say that I personally agree with the honourable member; and, to a certain extent, I go along with him in his views.

The remarks made by Mr. Bennetts concerning water supplies, and school hostels, have been noted and passed on to the appropriate authorities. This was where we were taken on a trip through the South-East Province.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: It was very nice.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member hoped that my Government would not be hoodwinked into spending large sums of money in connection with the Empire Games. I point out that any commitments we have in this regard are the result of honouring the arrangements made by the previous Government. I have no illusions whatever concerning the Empire Games coming to Western Australia in 1962. Without being the least disrespectful, I think it will be similar to the honourable member giving a magnificent party to members of this House; inviting us to come along; and, having dined and wine-d us well, he being left to clean up the mess.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: He has a tape-recorder.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That could easily be the case in connection with the Empire Games. They could be costly to

the State. We are, however, committed to the project; and we are accordingly prepared to do whatever we can to carry out our obligations to the best of our ability. The one redeeming feature is that if my approaches to the Commonwealth Government for more money are successful, this £800,000—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It could be sent across.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not mind how it is sent. If I am wanted to go over and bring it back in a bag, I am quite prepared to do so. However, if we are successful in obtaining this additional grant, it will assist in the employment of more men in the building industry.

I thank Mr. Diver for his congratulatory remarks. His comments on supplementary bus services for less settled areas, I have conveyed to the Minister for Transport; and, in like manner, I have forwarded to the Minister for Agriculture his interesting advice on the wholemilk problem.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: You will need whip and spurs in regard to the wholemilk problem.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I use whip and spurs when dealing with matters in my own department; and I am sure the Minister for Agriculture will do the same when I pass this information on to him.

Mr. Willmott advised the Government not to introduce a civilian land settlement scheme at this juncture, and he drew attention to the shortcomings of the war service land settlement scheme. His remarks, as always on such subjects, were characterized by clear thinking; and they will be studied carefully.

Mr. Davies asked whether information could be obtained regarding future use of the land at Fremantle occupied mainly by the Commonwealth Government and partly by the Water Supply Department.

If I can, I will obtain information about the Commonwealth angle; but I doubt whether the State Government can achieve much in this direction. The area held by the Water Supply Department is very small, measuring only 22 ft. by 50 ft., so it could be of little value for municipal or private purposes. The department desires to retain it for a future high-level water supply tank.

I regret the delay that members and others have experienced in obtaining information regarding the exchange of land between the State Government and the Fremantle City Council. If I can assist in expediting this matter, I will do so.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: I did not expect the Minister to have the information by now because the Lands Department has been dealing with it since 1954.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: As the honourable member has informed us, he has had considerable difficulty in endeavouring to obtain a decision on this matter; and I do not know what I can do to help, but I will certainly do all I can. Other members this evening made some comments which I do not propose to answer in general at this stage. I would prefer to hand their suggestions on to the Ministers concerned; and any relevant information I am able to obtain I shall forward on to them by letter.

I now wish to reply to some of the views expressed by Mr. Strickland when he was speaking in regard to the search for oil. He said that many people had asked him what was going on about the oil search, but he was unable to give them much information.

I am rather surprised because, in the 4½ months that this Government has been in office, he has been able to obtain the answers to the questions he has put to me. The answers were quite open, and supplied to the honourable member all the information in the possession of the Mines Department and the company itself. On the 29th July, he asked me the following question:—

Could a much larger quantity of oil be taken from the well if pumping equipment were installed?

My reply to him was as follows:—

Some additional oil could be produced by installation of pumping equipment. However, the natural oil flow is governed by a very active natural drive, and pumping at a higher rate would lower the efficiency of production just as flowing at a higher rate than 385 barrels per day would do.

On the following day, the honourable member asked me a further question concerning my attitude, as Minister for Mines, to this company. I told him that it had spent a large sum of money on exploration in this area and, with its new partner, the Shell Oil Co., it proposed to engage in further search in the area.

The Government of which Mr. Strickland was a member was in office for a period of six years. Oil was first discovered in this State in 1953. Therefore, surely he was in a position to ascertain all the information he desired from his ministerial colleague, the then Minister for Mines. It is rather strange that now, when the honourable member is in Opposition, he starts asking questions that he could have asked during the six years that his Government was in office. Nevertheless, I have no hesitation in telling the honourable member of what I know of the situation concerning oil.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Do you think the area might be broken up?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In view of the fact that this company has spent a great deal of money in the area, it is only reasonable that it should be granted a fair time for it to re-establish itself and to make a decision on what is to be done. It must also be borne in mind that other companies have extremely large areas of land which have been granted to them to carry out their exploration work, and they cannot all bore in the one region at the same time. Therefore, they transfer their drilling rigs to various places in an endeavour to find oil in commercial quantities.

Mr. Strickland probably knows better than I do that since oil was first discovered in 1953, the company has sunk many holes all around that area in a further endeavour to find oil in commercial quantities. To date, however, its efforts have been in vain. For an oilfield to be established, it is essential that sufficient oil be discovered to make it an economic proposition. It is no use building a hotel in the middle of the Sahara Desert if there are no customers to drink the beer; and, in the same way, it is no use having several oil wells unless they produce a sufficient quantity of oil to enable an oilfield to be developed on economic lines.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: What is the quantity necessary to make it a commercial proposition?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In regard to that, I have already supplied the honourable member with answers to his questions. I am no authority on this subject, and I repeat that I know no more about it than the honourable member. I am extremely anxious to see the oil search in the North-West produce results, and I am sure the honourable member adopts a similar view. If an oilfield producing oil in commercial quantities were discovered, it would assist tremendously the development of this State, which the honourable member is so anxious to foster. There is no desire on my part to withhold information concerning oil; but I repeat that it is only fair to give the company already in the field, reasonable time to continue with its exploration; and I can assure the honourable member and the House that the position will be closely watched.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time and passed.

CATTLE TRESPASS, FENCING, AND IMPOUNDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. L. LOTON (South) [9.38] in moving the second reading said: It is a long time since I gave notice of my intention to introduce this measure. When one checks back, one will find that notice to introduce the Bill was given on the 30th June; and today is the 12th August.

Members will recall that last session I introduced a somewhat similar measure, and 16 members spoke during the second reading debate. When it reached the Committee stage there was also lengthy discussion; therefore the provisions of that Bill are still fresh in the minds of most of us.

On this occasion I have included in this Bill two small amendments which did not appear in the previous measure. In the Bill of last year, it was provided that if the owner of land made a complaint that a person was wilfully trespassing, the latter was subject to a penalty. On this occasion the provision is that a complaint has to be made and proved before a justice of the peace before a fine can be imposed.

Cases of trespass are becoming more frequent. More people nowadays own motorcars. In the spring, in particular, when mushrooms make their appearance, many motorists decide on a trip into the country. The first paddock they see becomes a fair prospect for mushroom-hunting. They get out of the car and climb through, over or under the fence, into private property and play "larry-do."

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: Some of these people consider the paddocks to be public property.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: They appear to be everybody's property. For that reason, I have tried to obtain some protection for the owner of private land.

The Hon. A. R. Jones: What do you mean by "larry-do"?

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: My colleague has been here long enough to know what that means. Last year, when a similar measure was discussed in Committee, there was much opposition to the provisions in the Bill applying to the whole State. At the suggestion of Mr. Wise, I amended the Bill so that it would apply only to the South-West Land Division. I was left somewhat stranded by my colleagues, because they wanted it to apply to the whole State. The Bill passed this House; but as a result of the delay which occurred here, and the opposition which was raised in another place, the measure died as a sweet innocent; because it was not concluded when the session ended.

On this occasion I have brought forward the same Bill with two different provisions. The measure seeks firstly to amend section 13A of the parent Act in the following terms:—

Notwithstanding the provisions of section thirteen of this Act, where a person proves on complaint made by him to a Justice of the Peace that while he was in possession of enclosed country land, a person intentionally and without lawful reason or excuse entered on the land, the Justice shall, whether or not, the entry has caused any damage, order the defendant to pay to the complainant on account of the entry, a sum of not less than two pounds or more than ten pounds.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: The fine depends on the amount of mushrooms the trespasser has obtained.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: The fine is for the trespass. The amounts contained in that provision were taken from the Cattle Trespass Act. The second provision in the Bill is that the sum ordered to be paid is in addition to, and not in substitution for, any damages that may be awarded. That is only fair. The third provision reads as follows:—

Where a person in possession of enclosed country land, an employee of, or a member of the family of that person, on reasonable grounds suspects another person has intentionally and without lawful reason or excuse entered on the land, he may require of the other person his name and address.

This provision gives the owner, the employee, or a member of the owner's family the right to demand the name and address of any person who is considered to be wilfully trespassing.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: I am afraid he will get some rude replies.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: The owners of land are prepared for the rude replies, because they have the answer to this problem in their own hands. Any person who refuses to give his name and address, or gives a false name and address, commits an offence. Some of the trespassers would think twice before giving rude replies. People may be encouraged to give rude replies if they are not aware that failure to give the name and address is an offence. Under this Bill it is an offence. The penalty for this offence is a maximum fine of £5, but the exact amount will be fixed at the discretion of a justice of the peace.

The fifth provision states that the Bill is to apply only to the South-West Land Division. For the benefit of members, I shall read section 28 of the Land Act, which defines that division; and so that the members representing the Goldfields who asked for the Goldfields area to be excluded on

the last occasion, will not be under any false impressions. The South-West Land Division, as defined in the Land Act of 1933, is as follows:—

Bounded by lines starting from the seashore at a point situate West from the cairn on Bompas Hill, and extending East to the Murchison River; thence South-Easterly along the said river to a point situate North from the trigonometrical station near Talerling Peak; thence South to the said trigonometrical station; thence South-Easterly through the cairn on Mugga Mugga Hill to the summit of Mount Gibson; thence Easterly to trigonometrical station K83; thence East to the No. 1 line of the rabbit-proof fence; thence Southerly along the said fence to the seashore, and thence Westerly and Northerly along the seashore, including the islands adjacent, to the starting point.

Roughly, that area extends from the Murchison River to Burracoppin, and finishing at the coast at Hopetoun; and it omits practically all pastoral country and the Goldfields area.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: We do not get mushrooms there.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: There could be trespassers all the same. The Bill does not only deal with mushrooms; it deals with trespassers. I hope it will receive the support of members, because those from country and suburban provinces must realise that a person who owns land is entitled to have a say as to who shall enter on to it. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Hon. E. M. Heenan, debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 9.48 to 10.10 p.m.

LICENSING ACT

Printing of Parliamentary Committee's Report

Debate resumed from the 6th August on the following motion by the Hon. F. R. H. Lavery:—

That the report of the Parliamentary Committee of 1958 on the Licensing Act be printed.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [10.10]: I think I might be able to assist members to short-circuit their speeches on this matter by informing the House that the Government has agreed to the printing of the report. The chairman of the committee (Mr. Heenan) has already been informed by letter that such will be the case. I cannot forecast any date for the printing, but the Government has given its assurance that the report will be printed.

Order Discharged

THE HON. G. E. JEFFERY (Suburban) [10.12]: In view of the assurance given by the Government, and on behalf of Mr. Lavery, I move—

That the order of the day be discharged from the notice paper.

Motion put and passed.

Order discharged.

TRANSFER OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the previous day.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [10.13]: This short Bill is as simple as it appears, and its intention is as explained by the Minister. It amends two sections of the Transfer of Land Act to enable, on the one hand, documents to be destroyed if they are no longer needed; and, on the other hand, copies of titles to be made by photostats. The necessity for this is obvious; because in times of emergency the possession of such copies would be very important, and would avoid many difficulties which could otherwise arise.

Dealing with the first point—the approval to destroy any record, document, instrument, diagram, and so on—I believe that it is a very important provision. As all of us know, papers, etc., accumulate even in Parliament.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You're telling me!

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Not only in Parliament; but they accumulate also in one's office and home, and periodically a bonfire is necessary to destroy things that at some time or other were considered to be of value. I am sure the Minister would have knowledge of what happens in the destruction of public documents, and prior to their destruction.

To be quite fair on this, I think it was the McLarty-Watts Government which, in 1950, introduced the practice that no official document of any department can be destroyed unless the archivists of this State have given a certificate to say that the documents are of no interest whatever, even from an historic point of view. That was a direction which went out from the Premier's Department in 1950 to all departments; and I know it was renewed last year. It is an excellent idea; because our archives have benefited materially by matter which, from a departmental point of view, has ceased to be of interest.

In this case mortgages which have been redeemed, and the list of documents mentioned in the Bill and referred to by the Minister, cannot be required in connection with the transfer of land. The register, the book of titles, is sacrosanct. That is never interfered with; and the duplicate records are never interfered with; but these irrelevant documents will be permitted to

be destroyed, together with all the accumulation of useless material, if the Bill is passed.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: These are regarded as public documents, as against Government documents.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: That is so. I think the second requirement of the measure will fill a need; that if a section or all of the register book is not available, a photostat will be available; and so the Bill makes provision for the two essentials. I think the measure should pass without difficulty, and I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

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.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3—Section 239 amended:

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: In lines 27 to 32 on page 2 we read—

If the register book is not readily available, the Registrar may produce to that person instead of the register book a print, whether enlarged or not, made from a photographic film.

Could the Minister explain whether the production of an unenlarged print would be regarded as a sufficient discharge of that public service? If an unenlarged print were produced, should not a magnifying glass also be produced, as otherwise it might be difficult to follow?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The instruction I have is that the photographic copies will be of microfilm and ordinary-sized types. Members are aware that a photostat is largely an automatic method of making photographic copies. Beyond that I am not aware of what size the photostat would be. However, photostats can be boosted up; and if necessary a magnifying glass could be used. Photostats are accurate in the reproduction of any material photographed.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: A member of another place asked me to find out whether a copy of the document dealing with the 3,500 farms scheme was available. So far I have been unable to find any copy of the report of Dr. Teakle. All that can be ascertained is that some report was made.

I do not know whether there is any report in existence in the State, but there is not one at Parliament House. This is a report that would have been of some interest, because today there is a move afoot to do something in that area. At that stage Dr. Teakle's report was adverse; and the British Government, which was going to finance the scheme, would not proceed with

it. I think it is essential to preserve some of these documents in the same way as the first newspaper in this State is preserved in the library upstairs.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: All this Bill will give us the right to do is to destroy what are known as public documents; whereas the document referred to by the honourable member would be a Government document. Such a document would be destroyed only if instructions were issued by the Government. Under this Bill nothing but public documents will be destroyed.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

CHILD WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON (Suburban) [10.25]: When I secured the adjournment of the debate, I felt sure of what I intended to say in regard to the Bill. But as I started to inquire into some of the facets of the Child Welfare Act, I became uncertain on points about which I was sure in the first place.

One clause of the Bill refers to the deletion of a portion of section 34, under which the court can commit a child to an industrial school. The amendment will enable the court to commit a child to the care of the department for treatment. My first thought about the amendment was that it would be a danger because it would be taking something away from the court, since the court proceedings are open to the public and publicity can be given to what takes place. I was thinking of the need to protect a child during legal proceedings. However, since then I have gone further into the matter; and although I am not entirely satisfied with the amendment in the Bill, I can see the Director's point.

Time moves on, and we are constantly improving our methods of treatment in the Child Welfare Department. In 1946, I travelled through New South Wales looking at homes in that State. In those days our treatment of the children was not what it should have been; and even at that time the Government of New South Wales was spending £2 per child, while we were spending only 7s. There was also a great difference in the approach of the authorities in this State and those in New South Wales. I went through most of the schools there, and I found they had some very up-to-date methods of treatment.

At the girls' schools, instead of having only laundry work, as they had in this State, girls who were sent by the court to the schools were allotted private rooms in lovely homes. They had a new system of education. The girls were taught dressmaking, and they were allowed to choose their own materials and take the clothes home with them when they left the schools. They were taught other trades; and some were nurses. That treatment was far superior to what was in existence in that State five years earlier when I had examined the position.

I would like the matter inquired into further, because I am not at all satisfied that what the Minister wants to do should be done without more consideration being given to it. I am on the horns of a dilemma because, when I inquired about the methods of training here, I found that the present methods were far different from those employed a few years ago. Previously the Director of Child Welfare was the complainant when a child was taken to court; and it was for the court to assess the guilt or otherwise of a child, and to pass sentence. But so many new methods have been introduced that I decided to have a look at the situation. Today I visited the new home for delinquent boys at Caversham.

It depresses me that we have to have institutions of this kind in our midst; but I think this home is the right approach to the problem. At the home, the lay-out is very good, and the workshops are excellent. I did not like to look at the cells because they looked such lonely little places; but when I thought of the courtyard, and how the boys would be protected, and the amount of training they would get, I realised that the home would pay dividends. I know that a team of teachers is being trained specially for this work.

The boys are being trained on lines similar to those I saw in New South Wales. For these boys who are rebels in society, a workroom for leatherwork, a room for woodwork, and so on are to be provided. There is also a school at which they are taught elementary education and economics for a start. A recreation hall, chapel, and yard are also provided. In fact, the facilities are all that I expected, and I came away very satisfied indeed. I then started to imagine what the effect would be. I ask the Minister most earnestly to see whether some committee, or some form of liaison, cannot be established between the court and the department, from which he could draw advice on some of these children in certain cases.

We all know how times have changed as compared with those that existed a few years ago. We know how our attitude has altered towards children smoking. I would point out, however, that it is quite illegal to give a child a cigarette.

The Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: They issue them with cigarettes in some homes.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: They do so because it is accepted social practice at the moment. I must confess that, when I was dealing with some of these boys, I took many of them and found them homes on farms. They worked on these farms and did all right. Mr. Tonkin was Minister for Education at the time, and he will bear me out on that. These lads never again fell into the hands of the police. Once they were placed in these congenial occupations, they more or less succeeded, and were content in their employment.

A welfare board was established to sit at these homes with a view to finding jobs for these boys. I do not think very much was done, and it was a great cause of dissension. There is one lad in particular whose records I could produce for the Minister's perusal, who was committed to one of these homes for a not-very-serious offence. All he wanted was a job. His pleas fell on deaf ears, and he finished up by absconding. The result was that he had a few more charges laid against him.

When a boy absconds, he generally has no money and no food; and he is compelled to steal in order to provide himself with necessities. The result is that, before he knows where he is, he finds himself being tried on two or three criminal charges. All this could be avoided if the matter were handled differently. I would point out to members that a bad boy is a very lonely, and a very poor boy. I know that girls come into a different category altogether, and I will touch on that aspect later. Some of these lads pile up criminal records because of a lack of proper education and opportunity.

I suppose the institution at Caversham is the ultimate in punishment for these delinquent boys. Those who are to be sent there would be the incorrigibles; and I hope that the institution will be of assistance to them and this State. I think members appreciate that there is a vast field for electric light globe smashers and children with similar sentiments; but if the court should order a boy to be placed in a home and recommended that he be forbidden leave, and that he be not given cigarettes, one can imagine the effect it would have on him if he saw other boys who were given cigarettes for good behaviour. That aspect does not appeal to me. In cases like that, I would say the Child Welfare Department would be the best judge.

On the other hand, we all know the results that have accrued from giving departments too much control. These delinquent children are entitled to the protection of British justice, just like any other child in the State. Could we provide these children with that protection, and at the same time give the Child Welfare Department an opportunity to take

a boy, if he is responding well, and place him on parole with a view to quicker release? I have been out of touch for a year or two, and am not too conversant with what is being done at the moment.

I revert for a moment to this question of children smoking. There are quite a number of laws on our statute book which are completely out of date; and I think perhaps it would be well for us to inquire into this aspect with a view to bringing them up to date, to enable us to deal with these particular problems more carefully. The effect of the move in New South Wales fired my imagination no end.

I have never been able to understand why a child should be relegated two or three steps further down the social ladder merely because it has been left an orphan, or because it has got into trouble, as a result of poor conditions at home. That is what happens when a child is left without parents, and without any decent home influence in its life. I cannot see why these orphanages are not treated at college standard. The children are not unintelligent; they are merely the victims of unfortunate circumstances which they cannot avoid. It is possible that a broken home might be the cause of their misfortune. It would be a step in the right direction to set these institutions up on the same lines as colleges.

In New South Wales I saw an old Wesley College in a country district, which was used to house boys who were truants. I only want to make that one point; and I hope that what I have said will be carefully considered. The right of the child should not be clouded over; and I hope that something will be set up in the interim to find out whether the department and court are at one in their approach to this problem.

It is also hoped that good liaison may break down any difficulty experienced. I therefore trust that this matter will be given careful consideration. We are now beginning to alter our ideas concerning under-privileged children, and also mental illnesses; and I hope that further advances will be made to enlighten the public in regard to these matters. Unfortunately, in this age of jet airliners, guided missiles, etc., we are still using the same methods that were used in the horse-and-buggy days; and it is high time we streamlined our ideas. I support the Bill.

On motion by the Hon. J. G. Hislop, debate adjourned until Tuesday, the 18th August.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL

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

That the House at its rising adjourn till 2.30 p.m. tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.42. p.m.