

who dies, resigns, or is disqualified. The Bill provides that the member who fills his place shall be treated the same as the member whose place he has filled.

In clause 7 is to be found the method by which the 1968 members are to be allotted provinces. Members will fully appreciate, I am sure, the complexity of the problems faced in the framing of this particular clause. The method set out in the Bill is regarded as a satisfactory solution and is considered as reasonable.

It provides that if only one sitting member applies to sit for an electoral province, he shall be allotted that seat in the new electoral province. If more than one member applies in respect of a province, the decision shall be determined by lot as set out in the Bill. These, of course, are sitting members in each case. There is set out in clause 7 the basis on which the Chief Electoral Officer, being the person responsible, will conduct the lot covering applications made by two members for the same province.

Where a province had not been given or allotted to a member as a result of an application and, as a consequence, one or perhaps two or more seats are left vacant, then it will be competent for the Governor by Order in Council to declare a member to be the member for the province.

In order that there should be no doubt as to the procedure to be followed, the Bill makes provision, with respect to applications for provinces, that the provinces shall be dealt with alphabetically. Otherwise, it would be difficult to determine which provinces should be dealt with first; whether this one should be dealt with or another.

The names which the commissioners are likely to give to the new provinces are not known other than that the Electoral Districts Act now directs that the provinces shall be renamed. There appears to be no fairer way of dealing with this problem.

The procedure provides that all provinces will be dealt with until the members who were due to retire in 1968 have been allotted a province. After that, the Governor will be in a position to allot any remaining provinces to any member who had not been allotted one.

Clause 8 sets out the qualifications and disqualifications of the electors for the Legislative Council. These will, on the passing of this measure be the same as those for the Legislative Assembly. Accordingly, the Bill deletes the property qualifications for an elector. Clause 9 provides for the repeal of the section enabling joint owners and occupiers to be registered as electors. Clause 10 repeals the existing disqualifications for electors of the Legislative Council. Clause 11 contains an amendment which is consequential on the State being divided into five new electoral provinces under the Electoral Districts Act of 1963.

The intention of this measure is to amend the Constitution Acts Amendment Act in as fair a manner as possible to all parties with control sufficient to meet all situations which in our present knowledge might conceivably arise, in particular through the changeover process from 10 provinces of three members to 15 provinces of two members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Hawke (Leader of the Opposition).

### BILLS (3): RETURNED

1. Alumina Refinery Agreement Act Amendment Bill.
2. Mining Act Amendment Bill (No. 3).
3. Administration Act Amendment Bill. Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

### NATIVE WELFARE BILL

#### Council's Message

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had disagreed to the further amendment made by the Assembly to the amendment made by the Council, and insisted on its original amendment.

### ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier)  
[2.36 a.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 11 a.m. today (Friday).

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 2.37 a.m. (Friday)

## Legislative Council

Friday, the 6th December, 1963

### CONTENTS

	Page
<b>ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE : SPECIAL</b>	<b>3827</b>
<b>BILLS—</b>	
Appropriation Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r. ; 2r.	3817
Com.	3822
Report ; 3r.	3822
Constitution Acts Amendment Bill (No. 2)—Returned	3823
Licensing Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—Returned	3813
Assembly's Amendments	3813
Loan Bill, £22,850,000—	
Receipt ; 1r. ; 2r.	3814
Com. ; Report ; 3r.	3817
Mining Act Amendment Bill—Returned	3822
Assembly's Amendment	3822
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—Returned	3810

**CONTENTS—continued**

	Page
<b>BILLS—continued</b>	
Native Welfare Bill—Assembly's Further Message .....	3822
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill—	
Com. ....	3802
Report ; 3r. ....	3808
Assembly's Message .....	3823
<b>CLOSE OF SESSION—</b>	
Complimentary Remarks .....	3823
<b>MOTIONS—</b>	
Prospecting Industry—Inquiry by Select Committee .....	3797
Metropolitan Region Development—Swan River Foreshore Reclamation : Assembly's Resolution .....	3808
.....	3810
<b>SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE—</b>	
State of Notice Paper .....	3808
<b>STATE FORESTS—</b>	
Ministerial Statement on Dieback .....	3808

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

**PROSPECTING INDUSTRY***Inquiry by Select Committee: Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 5th December, on the following motion by the Hon. F. J. S. Wise (Leader of the Opposition):—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into all aspects of the prospecting industry with a view to making recommendations which would bring about a revival in the search for gold.

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [2.34 p.m.]: Mr. Heenan has asked the House to agree that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into all aspects of the prospecting industry with a view to making recommendations which would bring about a revival in the search for gold. I listened with interest to the speeches made last night, particularly those in support of the motion. I have read and reread the motion, and it occurred to me, in the first instance, that the motion was so worded that its field would be limited to the gold-mining industry, because the final words of the motion are—

which would bring about a revival in the search for gold.

I remember that, by way of interjection, Mr. Heenan said he did not think such a Select Committee would necessarily confine itself to gold, and that it might interest itself in other minerals as well. He and other speakers who spoke on this motion very generously said that a move for a Select Committee was not intended

in any way to be a reflection on myself, as Minister in charge of the Mines Department, nor was it intended to reflect upon the department itself.

I appreciate the sentiments that have been expressed, nevertheless I cannot help but feel that the appointment of a Select Committee would be interpreted by some as being not only a reflection on my administration of the department, but a reflection on the administration of Ministers for Mines for some time past; because the situation which existed some years ago still exists, in regard to the efforts of the department and the Ministers for Mines, whatever be their political beliefs. I refer to the efforts they made to encourage and assist prospecting and the interests of goldmining generally, and to their attempts to do what they could to further the search for gold. Always in the back of their minds was the knowledge of the importance and significance of the gold-mining industry to Western Australia over a long period of years.

The search for gold in Western Australia has continued since the 1890s. In that time, with the vast number of men and companies investigating the auriferous areas of this State, the easily found outcrops of gold—those with surface indications—had very obviously been discovered. Now the going will be much tougher; and no longer will prospectors be able to do what I saw one native doing in a certain town; he was walking along specking for fine pieces of gold, and picking them up. The surface indications are not as evident as they used to be.

We have to change our methods of prospecting. It seems apparent to me that some members, fully possessed of the importance of assisting this important industry and desiring to help in every way they can, do not appear to be conscious of the fact that the change I have referred to has taken place over the years, and, in fact, right under their eyes.

The methods of prospecting used today are not the methods used in 1890, and so on, and for very obvious reasons. The methods of prospecting have changed with the different types of equipment; and the obvious location of minerals of all kinds, from a surface point of view, have disappeared. As members for the goldfields know—and they are much more experienced than I am in this matter—the only place we find these minerals now is at greater depths; and the systems and methods which must be used are, of course, of necessity totally different from what they were some 60 or 70 years ago.

I repeat that for many years, Ministers in charge of this department have given much thought to the ways and means by which assistance could be given to the prospector which might bring about new finds of gold. I think that when Mr. Jones

brought this question forward some time ago—he said it would be a good idea if we had a new system of organised groups of prospectors with expert leadership—I said that as far back as 1922 that was done. I was not responsible, of course; but it was done. I regret to say with, no appreciable success.

These organised groups were sent out with experienced leaders in charge, together with all the necessary equipment, but they did not, unfortunately, achieve a great deal of success. Later on the Mines Department had its geologists examine the records and the information available, and diamond drilling of likely gold areas was carried out. Then the information was publicised so that all interested people would have the benefit of it.

In recent years the department has again made another change in the method—and this has been done during the period I have been in charge of the department. It was not an original idea of mine. As a matter of fact it was born in the mind of the member for Murchison (Mr. Burt) who one day at Meekatharra suggested to me that the department might give consideration to buying compressor units to be made available to prospectors. The hire of such units was very reasonable and the prospectors hailed the idea as a favourable one. After a trial period I decided to buy more of the units, and now there are quite a number of them, as Mr. Dellar, Mr. Garrigan, Mr. Heenan, Mr. Stubbs, Mr. Bennetts, and Mr. Teahan would know, and they are scattered throughout the country areas. They have been of tremendous help to prospectors in various places, and not at inconsiderable cost.

For the last 40 odd years, I suppose, the Government has, in addition to the matters mentioned, granted other assistance to the prospectors. Some time back, when speaking on the Supply Bill, I gave Mr. Dellar an idea of the type of equipment prospectors were lent and the type of assistance they received. They are lent tools, gear, and explosives; and assistance with transport is granted to approved prospectors, on the basis of repayment of a percentage of the gold won. Since 1950 the cost of this assistance has been £130,873 and the repayment to the department has been £22,753. If we look at this purely on an economic basis, we could not say it has been very profitable. However, I do realise that, as with the search for oil—mentioned by Mr. Heenan—which has involved millions and millions of pounds without any real success, this type of expenditure, which is great, comparatively, is worth while; because I do appreciate that the discovery of one good goldmine as distinct from the discovery of one oil well producing a limited quantity of oil, can mean so much to a town, as we have seen

in the past. Therefore I do not resent the expenditure from that point of view, but I do wish that it had met with more success. Its lack of success is unfortunate, but nevertheless the people receiving this assistance, I am sure, try very hard.

One or two small mines have been located as a result of this type of prospecting, but the fact is that over a period of years the continued search has, unfortunately, not brought forward much of great consequence.

During the past three years the Amalgamated Prospectors' Association on its own initiative made a great effort to revive prospecting. I am sure Mr. Heenan would remember, as we all do, the very important part played by an old identity of the goldmines—Mr. Jock Walls. He gathered many men together and gave them advice and taught them the loaming methods of discovering gold. The association came to me about this project and I made, I think, quite worth-while rewards available to these people—rewards which, incidentally, were claimed. Unfortunately no vital discovery was made, but the system did engender quite a considerable amount of interest in prospecting, generally. However, I am afraid the same amount of interest does not exist at present. It has gone a bit flat.

Today there are 45 assisted prospectors in the scheme and their average age, for Mr. Dellar's information, is 52. He was not far wrong.

The Hon. D. P. Dellar: Thank you.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Many of them are very old men. I see them when I go through the goldfields. If they know the Minister for Mines is going through some town, they ask to see the Minister. I have learned a lot from them, too. One thing I have learned is the dominance of their makeup; their character. I have also learned of their desire, even with their limited physical ability, failing as it is in some cases, to continue prospecting. It seems that once a prospector of this order, it is a case of being always a prospector of this order. These men would rather trudge the country and get £5 a week in one area of the goldfields and £6 in the other, than accept social service benefits such as the old-age pension. There are a number of these men, as we all know. We admire their type; and, as I have said, we still see some of them when we go around the country.

The ability of these men to prospect in a modern way is naturally limited. It is limited by their physical ability, their age, and the type of equipment that is required. It is just not possible for them to acquire modern equipment, and it is not possible for the Mines Department to provide them with it; and even if the department did provide the equipment they would not have the experience to work it.

These are down-to-earth statements I am making and are not in any way critical of the efforts of the prospectors; and in no way are my remarks to be taken as derogatory of the efforts of prospectors. I sincerely hope they will not be taken that way, because I have demonstrated to the best of my ability my desire to help.

It is no use hiding the fact that the scientific methods of prospecting are no longer those associated with the pick, the shovel, the billy, and the ability to work through country to find surface deposits of gold. The future lies with the scientific methods; the ability to find the deposits of minerals which are lower down in the ground than would be disclosed merely by surface indications. Geochemical methods; geophysical methods; drilling; the use of aircraft; modern methods of mapping, and assimilating the knowledge gained are required today. Modern methods cover thousands of miles of country and then the information is dealt with so that the company concerned can narrow down the areas where it will concentrate its operations.

A short time ago I referred to the fact that I did not think some members were conscious of the fact that this change is taking place, but it is. In Western Australia today we have companies with the knowledge and with the money and willingness to go out to have a look. The expenditure involved in prospecting is extremely great, but the rewards sometimes are also great. Look at the Mt. Goldsworthy people. They have spent nearly £1,000,000 in testing their deposits; finding where a railway should go; examining port sites; and examining water on the coast and water out to sea. What have they been able to get back up to date for their expenditure? Nothing at the moment, unfortunately—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: And no guarantee.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: —but I am sure we all wish them well. They have no guarantee, of course, that they will get 6d. out of their efforts. Mr. Dellar knows the position. Look at the Great Fingal at the present time. I am told that if somebody could find a million pounds to sink a shaft at that mine, there may be a chance of striking gold in payable quantities.

The Hon. D. P. Dellar: Great possibilities.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: But where can we get £1,000,000 for goldmining today?

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: If the price rose tomorrow you would get it like steam.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is a sensible interjection; and that would apply for the very reason that the present price

of gold makes it very difficult for companies to show a profit on the basis of 4 dwt. to 5 dwt. to the ton.

I have said before, and I say again, it is only the spirit that has prevailed between capital and management on the goldfields—particularly on the Golden Mile—that has kept these companies going. I cannot tell the goldfields members anything about that, because they already know of it. Some mines operating today would have gone to the wall some time ago if it had not been for the modern methods of treatment and the fact that they are able to put into the treatment plant dirt which contains gold showing a much lower return than in days gone by.

We dealt with a Bill last night to amend the Alumina Refinery Agreement Act. The modern type of prospecting that went on in the Darling Range was responsible for the discovery of the deposit of bauxite which, in the hands of the Western Mining Corporation has become something worth while. I can go back to early 1959 when that company had a small laboratory at Kalamunda; but it did a tremendous amount of work of a chemical nature there.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: It is a wonderful company.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; I only wish we had more such companies. It is prepared to diversify its interests. It realises that goldmining cannot possibly go on forever, and it has gone into other things such as talc, bauxite, iron ore, and so on. That is what has got to happen in this State, and that is what is happening. The more companies that diversify their interests in this way, the better it will be for them and the better it will be for Western Australia.

Look at the position we are in today in respect of iron ore as a result of the search for minerals. We are in a happy position in respect of the possession of it, and I hope we will be in a happy position in respect of the sale of it overseas and also in respect of having it treated in Western Australia. What has been achieved has come about as a result of modern methods of prospecting.

It is interesting to consider the total amount of assistance that is given to the prospector for gold. On the eastern goldfields he is provided with £5 a week, and on the north-western goldfields he is provided with £6 a week. Mr. Dellar, I think it was, suggested we should give the prospector the basic wage. I am sure that was a well-intentioned suggestion, but I ask the honourable member to think about it for a moment. He might be doing more damage to a lot of these old chaps than he really intends, because if the department had to give £15 to the prospectors who are receiving assistance today, we would just have to sort them out.

The Hon. D. P. Dellar: That is what I said last night.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There would be no right on the part of the department to pay the basic wage to some of them; and when I make that statement I do not say it in a derogatory manner; but some of these old chaps just could not earn the basic wage. We do, however, continue to give them whatever assistance we can.

Incidentally, I brought this figure up to £5 and £6; because not long after becoming the Minister, I gave them a rise. Now, I repeat, prospectors are loaned gear, and are granted loans of money; and, wherever approved by the inspector and recommended by the department, they are given explosives. The ore they raise they can crush at a State battery for 10s. 6d. a ton. Do members know what it costs to crush a ton of ore?

The Hon. D. P. Dellar: £3 17s. a ton.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, that is correct; £3 17s. a ton; and the money going into the State batteries is £250,000 a year. That is no sinecure. The department is doing a great deal to help prospectors throughout the State. Some State batteries, of course, have no ore at grass to keep them going. It is ironical to say that the more ore we crush through the State batteries the greater the return will be, because every time we crush a ton of prospector's ore we lose £3. However, that is not the spirit in which it is accepted. This is regarded as being a service that is rendered to the industry by allowing the prospector to crush his ore at 10s. 6d. a ton. Sometimes it costs us more than £3 17s. a ton to crush a prospector's ore, because he may be eligible for the payment of a subsidy on the cartage of his ore, which costs the department another 7s. 6d. a ton. So, if we add that to the sum of £3 17s., we find it is costing the department £4 4s. 6d. a ton to crush prospectors' ore.

The Hon. D. P. Dellar: That is the average.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: He can receive financial aid to develop his mine if the department considers his application warrants it; and each application for assistance is examined by the inspector of mines, and frequently by the State Mining Engineer. The State Mining Engineer may not inspect all shows worked by prospectors seeking assistance, but all applications are seen by him and then forwarded to the Minister. Whenever I approve of an application for assistance I keep three principal features in mind. I ask myself: Is the man worth while? Is he a man who is going to get the best out of the loan that will be granted to him? Has he a fair chance of repaying to the department the money that has been loaned to him? I might mention here that I am only interested in getting the money back so that I can lend it to someone else. I regret to say, however, that the records show that very rarely is the money repaid to the department.

Compressor units are hired to prospectors at £5 a week and they are in great demand. Assays of prospectors' ore are made at the local School of Mines, the State batteries, and the laboratory free of charge. In order to give general assistance to the mining industry in this State the Mines Department now has 32 geologists on the geological survey staff. When I became Minister for Mines, there were only about 12 or 13 geologists employed. That was one of the features which became so obvious to me after I was appointed as Minister and I had a chance—

The Hon. D. P. Dellar: To get your eye in.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, to gain some experience of what was happening, and it became obvious to me that without the help of research in the mining industry we would not get very far. The medical profession would not have made the advances it has over the years if it had not been for the research that has been undertaken in the medical field. Important functions in any industry, and professions of various kinds require millions of pounds to be spent on research, and I considered that we should have professional men in the field to help the mining men and give them guidance; and, as a result, we now have 32 geologists engaged on various phases of mining work.

It is extremely interesting that Mr. Kelly, the member for Merredin-Yilgarn, placed a question on the Assembly notice paper only yesterday, which was answered today by the Minister representing me in another place. I should have had the answer to the question available yesterday, but I had to compile a good deal of information to answer the question that was asked. I would like to make known to the members of this House some of the information that was obtained as a result of answering this question. Mr. Kelly asked—

What number of prospectors were in receipt of the allowance to prospectors provided by the State in the years 1950-1963 inclusive?

The figures, in answer to that question, are as follows:—

1950—12	1954—69	1958—68	1962—45
1951—20	1955—69	1959—61	1963—48
1952—30	1956—98	1960—53	
1953—79	1957—53	1961—60	

Those figures show that the number of prospectors in the field is diminishing because, as can be understood, many of these old chaps have passed on. In 1950, a prospector operating south of the Tropic of Capricorn was granted 30s. per week and north of the Tropic of Capricorn 40s. a week. In 1959 he was paid £5 a week when operating south of the Tropic of Capricorn, and £6 per week north of the Tropic of Capricorn. Mr. Kelly's next question was—

What was the total sum paid to prospectors?

The answer is: £130,873 1s. 2d. Mr. Kelly then asked—

What amount has been refunded to the Government?

The answer to that question is £22,753 1s. 10d. So we have a deficit in regard to this scheme, but I do not think that really matters. An important question asked by Mr. Kelly was—

What worth-while finds were made during the period?

And the answer is—

No major finds were made.

Since 1950 no major finds have been made as a result of this prospecting scheme. Mr. Kelly then asked—

Is the Government considering raising prospectors' allowances in the near future?

The reply to that question is: Not at this stage.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: We have had two finds during that period, though, have we not?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; there was one out along the trans.-line over which the Western Mining Corporation took an option. That company has also taken over the Mt. Charlotte lease and has put down the deepest drill in mining history. It put a diamond drill hole down several hundred feet below the surface, then deflected the drill along a horizontal path in an endeavour to pick up what the company thought might be the Golden Mile lode.

I repeat, as I said the other evening, we cannot possibly afford to pay the basic wage to prospectors at present. It would be completely unrealistic to do that. If it were paid to them, I think the members who would like to see the prospectors receive this allowance would find that such an increase would put many of these aged prospectors out of employment; and I do not think members want to do that. This would occur because the department would have to examine very carefully every application that was made for assistance, and check the operations in the field before any prospector was granted the allowance, which would be nearly three times that which they are receiving now.

I would like to make it clear that so long as I am holding the portfolio of Mines, I will continue to assist the prospectors to the best of my ability. I say quite modestly that I never feel ashamed to attend a prospectors' meeting, quite apart from the type of men they are and the warm welcome they give one. I have never felt ashamed when attending any of their meetings, because I feel sure they appreciate what has been done for them.

We now have to get down to the question of what the appointment of a Select Committee could do. What could it

achieve? Unfortunately, I do not think it could achieve very much. When I say this, I know something has to be lost, but I regret that Mr. Heenan left this move so late in the session—two days before its conclusion. This Select Committee, if appointed, would have to be turned into an Honorary Royal Commission, because it would sit out of session. Personally I would not mind that if I thought it would achieve anything. The principal thing it would do, if appointed, would be to find out the things we know now—the disabilities of which we are aware at the present time, and the efforts that different Governments have made.

I have heard it said that the Mines Department is one of the best of the Government services. I heartily agree with that remark. One of my blessings in the Mines Department is the fact that it has an under-secretary with great knowledge and understanding of the industry; and he is a man who, I am glad to say, is prepared to advise me of all the problems, and to help me with the administration, of the department. I cannot find words that would too highly praise the efforts of not only Mr. Teffer, but the whole of his staff throughout the country. They are a very good class of fellow. I seldom go through a country district without going in to say "Good day" to the fellows who help the prospectors and give advice in the field of mineral development in this State in every way they possibly can.

I cannot see that this Select Committee is going to achieve anything at this point of time. However, I will undertake to examine more closely the remarks made by members to see what the Government can provide, but I cannot agree that the appointment would achieve very much, if anything. I am sorry, but I must oppose the appointment of a Select Committee into this matter.

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [3.12 p.m.]: Mr. President—

*Point of Order*

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Will the honourable member please resume his seat. Standing Order No. 388 is as follows:—

In all cases the reply of the Mover of the original Question shall close the Debate.

Mr. Wise was the mover, but he did this on behalf of Mr. Heenan.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Would it be out of order if I asked Mr. Heenan to reply on my behalf?

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): I think it would be out of order for the honourable member to ask him to do that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am sorry this situation has occurred. The honourable member was unavoidably absent, and the Standing Orders provide that motions must be the first item on the notice paper. Mr. Wise stepped into the breach, and I am sorry that Mr. Heenan cannot reply to his own motion.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): I am sorry I have no alternative at this juncture.

*Debate (on motion) Resumed*

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North—Leader of the Opposition) [3.15 p.m.]: I took no notes whatever when the Minister was speaking, but I have rather a clear recollection of some of the matters to which he referred. I would like to impress on members that assistance to prospectors has evolved over a long period, and cannot be accredited to any one individual in any particular; and all of the matters referred to by the Minister have been advocated by many people over a long time.

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

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Goldfields members in this House and in another place have advocated all of the things which prospectors require in order to assist them; and there is no doubt that if there is to be something ancillary to deep drilling, it will be something in the nature of a find by a prospecting party. That has been the history of goldmining in Western Australia.

As I mentioned in my initial remarks, one field alone in Western Australia has been responsible for the production of gold exceeding £4,000,000; and the greenstone belt that runs from Kalgoorlie right through as far as Marble Bar has, in the intervening places, vast lines of country that even in the year, 1963, have merely been scratched. The area is well known to the honourable member who sponsored this motion, and also to his colleagues of the North-East and South-East Provinces. They know the prospectors are anxious to be victualled; are anxious to be helped; are anxious to have another look for something they know of; something that is in existence and is in their memory, which carries them through the years.

The Hon. D. P. Dellar: Quite true.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: We should compensate these people for the great hardships they are prepared to endure, as the discoveries they have made through the years have been an investment for many people. I am sorry the Minister feels such an inquiry is unlikely to do any good. The good it would do is this: It would give a stimulus in half a dozen centres to people who just want that little urge; that little encouragement; that little feeling that somebody is still anxious about them. Day in and day out from the cradle to the grave, that little incentive and

acknowledgment that someone is interested in one's well-being is important. It gives one the urge to do just a little better; and that is what Mr. Heenan is trying to inspire by this motion.

After all, gold is where it is. We may find the conglomerates of Nullagine may be worked, or those of the Peak Hill region. It will be the results obtained from these sources that will give a stimulus to gold-mining. It will happen at some isolated place—something of high value will be found via the media of the prospector. I am sorry the Minister put such a dampener on this matter when he replied—this will locate nothing; this will discover nothing. But it would inspire very many people, and even the little towns, some dead, some half-dead, and some dying. It would give those little towns some satisfaction—places as far afield as Laverton; and districts made famous by mines such as Lancefield, and others. All would receive more than an interest out of this. They would get a lift. They would get something to inspire some likely person to back somebody with knowledge of this industry. I strongly support this motion, and I hope it will be carried.

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

*Ayes—11*

Hon. D. P. Dellar	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	(Teller.)

*Noes—12*

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. H. R. Robinson
Hon. J. Heitman	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. J. G. Hlasop	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. J. Murray

(Teller.)

*Pairs*

<i>Ayes</i>	<i>Noes</i>
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. J. D. Teahan	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. J. M. Thomson

Majority against—1.

Question thus negatived.

Motion defeated.

## WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) 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: First Schedule amended—

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I did not attempt to give certain information yesterday because I felt that it would be more appropriate to make this explanation when the Bill reached the Committee stage. One of the reasons for the delay—if not the

reason for the delay—in introducing this Bill is that we have been waiting for the report on silicosis. Since I was responsible for appointing the committee, I hoped that we would receive the report prior to this and that we could have given consideration to it. The Government would have liked to give effect to some of the recommendations that might appear in the report, and to give effect to those recommendations in connection with this Bill. Therefore the Minister for Labour in another place waited as long as he could.

I realise I told the House some time ago that I was not hopeful the report would be received in time. A considerable amount of evidence was taken, and it appeared that the report would not be available for consideration this session. In addition, the Government has been extremely busy, as members know. We have dealt with approximately 100 Bills, and we cannot do everything at once. It looks as though the report will not be available this session, and it was therefore decided that the Bill, as it is now before us, should be brought to the House.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I move an amendment—

Page 2—Insert after paragraph (d) in lines 21 to 26 the following new paragraphs:—

- (e) by adding after the word "factory" being the last word in paragraph (c) of the proviso to paragraph (c) of clause one, the words—

Provided further that a worker is deemed to have suffered personal injury by accident arising out of or in the course of his employment where he suffers an injury while travelling between such establishment and his place of residence or between his place of residence and such establishment; and

- (f) by deleting the words "sixty-six and two-thirds per centum" in lines 5 and 6 of clause 3.

On page 959 of *Hansard*, 1962, Mr. Wild in another place is reported to have said, on the 12th September, 1962, that one of the earliest Bills to be introduced in the next session of Parliament would be one dealing with workers' compensation, and he said that two points in Mr. W. Hegney's motion would be taken into consideration. When I was speaking to the second reading debate last night I said that one portion of the Minister's promise had been honoured, but that the second portion had not been honoured, in respect of a worker being covered by workers' compensation when travelling to and from his home and his place of employment.

I pointed out further that this is the only State in Australia where a provision such as this, in some shape or form, is not in existence. It is bad, inasmuch as workers who are attracted to Western Australia from time to time, by major development or expansion works, are amazed to find that we have not got such a provision in our Act, and they want to know why.

The reason is obvious. Every time this has been asked of the Government, the Government has hedged about it; and when Labor Governments have tried to introduce it, the provision has been given short shrift in this Chamber. The point could be argued that this amendment is not in its correct place in the Act.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Were you conscious of that when you moved your amendment?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Before the Minister raises his point of order, I will answer him.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Then you must be conscious of it.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Yes, I was conscious of it, and I have had it meticulously checked by an eminent draftsman. If the Minister checks with the Act he will find it is quite in order, and it fits in with the schedule. It would be another subterfuge to raise the point that the amendment would not be in its correct place.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Where otherwise do you think it could be.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am going on what the draftsman told me. I would say it could go in half a dozen other places in the Bill. If the Minister does not agree that it is in the right place, but is prepared to accept the principle, I will readily alter my amendment to put it in the right place, or where he thinks it should be. I am easy about it. The Minister can alter the verbiage if he wants to do so, but now we will have a little test of sincerity.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am only out to do what the Standing Orders say we can do.

#### Point of Order

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I think we should consider and appreciate the nature of the Bill which is before us. It is not a Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Act; it is merely a Bill to amend section 8 and 9 and the first schedule of the Workers' Compensation Act. Whatever amendments we may have been minded to move are circumscribed by the nature of the Bill before us; because it simply seeks to amend two sections of the Act on the technical side, and on the merits simply seeks to increase hospital allowances.



If we look at the construction of the Act we find that section 7 sets forth the liability of employers to workers for injuries. It declares that if a person suffers injury or accident arising out of or in the course of employment the employer shall be liable to pay compensation in accordance with the first schedule. In my submission the first schedule merely sets out the compensation which is payable in connection with any liability set forth in section 7.

Section 7, in addition to setting out the main obligation, then goes on to provide that where a worker is injured while travelling from his place of employment to a trade establishment or technical school during his working hours, he shall be deemed to have suffered an accident during the course of his employment. In other words, there is a limited to-and-from provision in section 7.

In my submission, if it is desired to enlarge on the to-and-from provision, as Mr. Thompson desires, section 7 is really the only appropriate place where that amendment could appear. I submit it could not appear in the first schedule, but must appear in section 7; and it is not open to this Committee to amend that section. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask for your ruling as to whether the amendment is in order.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): I shall leave the Chair until the ringing of the bells.

*Sitting suspended from 3.40 to 4.19 p.m.*

#### *Chairman's Ruling*

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): The title of the Bill is to amend sections 8 and 9 of the first schedule to the Act. Clause 3, which the honourable member seeks to amend, deals with the first schedule, which sets out the amount of compensation payable, and artificial aids to be provided for disabled workers.

The amendment, being an extension of the employee's liability, which is dealt with in section 7 of the Act, could not properly be inserted in the schedule, and I therefore rule the first part of the amendment, paragraph (e), out of order.

As far as the second part, paragraph (f), of the amendment is concerned, I believe there is some relationship to the subject matter of the Bill, and I am prepared to accept this part of the amendment.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: What relationship do you find between the second amendment and the Bill?

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): The second part of the amendment deals with weekly payments.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Are weekly payments referred to in the schedule?

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): Yes.

#### *Committee Resumed*

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and move an amendment—

Page 2—Insert after paragraph (d) in lines 21 to 26 the following new paragraph:—

(e) by deleting the words "sixty-six and two-thirds per centum of" in lines 5 and 6 of clause 3.

Under my amendment an incapacitated worker would be entitled to receive the full amount of money he would receive if he were still employed; and why should he not? After all, no employer wants his employee injured any more than the employee himself wants to be injured; and it is not just that a person's financial status should be reduced as a result of incapacity. It must be remembered that a lot of people have financial commitments and find themselves in difficulties when their expected income is reduced.

Most employers will make up the difference between the amount the employee receives in compensation and his normal wage. It is only that ruthless group of employers who wish to get the last drop out of each worker who are opposed to this amendment. I would like to hear the arguments of not only one or two members, but of every member on this matter.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I was at first inclined to believe that this amendment had no relationship to the schedule; but I see I was wrong. The amendment deals with partial incapacity. However, I suggest there should be some consistency preserved between the various benefits given under the Act. It has been found necessary in all States to place a maximum on the rate of weekly compensation payable to a man who is totally incapacitated; and, therefore, it is hardly logical to suggest there should be more generous treatment of a partially incapacitated worker, which would be the case if this amendment were accepted.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Minister spoke of consistency, but of course he was thinking of it in a different light. I believe there should be consistency, too. I believe that a worker who has been incapacitated through no fault of his own should not suffer financial loss. I do not believe any member of this Committee can say that if someone is seriously injured—and he must be seriously injured to be in the 50 per cent. bracket, and must be incapable of carrying out his previous duties—he should receive only three-quarters of the money to which he was entitled when he was 100 per cent. fit.

To the best of my knowledge this provision was in the original Act of 1912, and we are now living in 1963. It is time we

had due regard for the worker and the employer. We should see that justice is done to the worker.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: This has always been a difficult proposition, and it is something we could not alter without considerable investigation. It is possible that 66½ per cent. is too low a standard, but there is a grave danger to a number of workers if we allow an injured worker to receive the full wage during his period of treatment. If we gave everybody who was injured full compensation, we would be doing a great wrong to quite a number of other people.

Human nature is an extraordinary thing. Accidents do not only confer upon people a physical disability but, frequently, a disability of a psychological type. Quite a number of individuals who are awarded compensation improve very considerably when the case is financially concluded. The same thing happens to a large extent in regard to the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust. Some people who have been in an accident, particularly those with a head injury, suffer psychoneurotic conditions; but the moment the matter is settled by compensation, the difference in the individual is sometimes nothing short of amazing. In the 40 years I have been practising I have seen a lot of these cases, and at times I have not known how to distinguish between the individual who is really handicapped in respect of working, and the individual who is only so handicapped until such time as his case is settled. This is a matter that should be looked at very thoroughly.

We also have to take this factor into consideration when deciding the degree of pension to be given to people with loss of wage earning capacity. If we pensioned people fully, quite a percentage would not go back to work; and that would not be in their best interests. The granting of the invalid pension—and full compensation is virtually the same—would be against the best interests of quite a number of people; but how to get over the problem. I do not know. It is a facet of human understanding, or lack of it, that has puzzled my profession for years.

I believe we could get nearer to full compensation than we are at the moment. In my work at the rehabilitation centre I have seen individuals who have been on a pension. Quite a number come back time after time to be examined because they would like to get off the pension and do some work; and every effort is made to find some vocation for them. I certainly do what I can for them. But there is an equal number of others on the pension who will not make an effort. They have lost motivation for work; and that is a serious matter.

The difference of two-thirds is, perhaps, too small. It might be better to work it up to some other amount; but I am not certain about making it 100 per cent. Some individuals who have been injured in car accidents and have received a broken spine thus becoming paraplegics or quadraplegics have, to a large extent, overcome their disability and have pushed themselves around in chairs. Some have become accountants, and so on. They have done that purely from the point of view of pure psychology. I do not know the answer to all this, but it is something that might have to be taken into account. That is why workers' compensation is a difficult and complex subject. The specialists who are dealing with it should be called in to give advice.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I could not argue against anything Dr. Hislop has said. It does not matter what law is made—whether it be the Companies Act, the Workers' Compensation Act, the Traffic Act, or some other Act—there will always be individuals who will get underneath it. Dr. Hislop summed up the question fully by saying that in some cases a lump sum settlement is the best cure that people can get. But that applies to the minority; it does not apply to the general run of people.

I have had experience of dealing with workers in this connection, and at times I have had to tell them I did not think they were playing the game, and that I was not interested in their case. I think 66½ per cent. is too low; and I think Dr. Hislop agrees with that. I am not dogmatic; I am prepared to compromise. I would like to be given leave to withdraw portion of my amendment so that in place of the words "sixty-six and two-thirds per centum" I can substitute the words "eighty-five per centum."

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): I think the honourable member had better ask leave to withdraw his amendment and substitute another one.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Very well. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

**Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.**

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I move an amendment—

Page 2—Add after paragraph (d) in lines 21 to 26 the following new paragraph:—

- (e) by deleting the words "sixty-six and two-thirds" and substituting the words "eighty-five" in lines 5 and 6 of clause 3.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I oppose the amendment for two or three reasons. Firstly, I oppose it for the same reasons as those outlined by Dr. Hislop. Secondly, the Workers' Compensation Act is not

something that has been landed on our plate this afternoon. It has been developed and evolved in the light of experience over many years, for better or worse, by those who know something about the question, and they decided that 66½ per cent. of the normal wage is a fair percentage. As Dr. Hislop indicated, it is certainly a fair thing to help a man to get back to work. If it were 100 per cent., I should say it would be comparable with the man being granted a social service payment equivalent to the basic wage.

For the same reason that social service payments do not equal the full basic wage, so it is that the payments made under the Workers' Compensation Act do not provide for a full 100 per cent. payment equal to the basic wage. Despite this, and within my own experience, it is often the case—as Mr. Thompson mentioned—that in many instances an employer, even when an employee has suffered a serious illness, has paid him his full wages from the provident fund, and has even packed him off on a holiday to recuperate.

The Hon. R. Thompson: That is the normal type of employer, though.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: No, I am speaking of a big employer; one employing 300, 400, or 500 employees. I am now speaking in the abstract. For those reasons, without wishing in any way to be offensive, it appears to me that the amendment which was moved and then withdrawn, and the amendment now before the Chair, have been put forward merely for the sake of amending. If there is a case for the figure of 66½ per cent. to be increased by even 1 per cent., I do not think that such an increase has been justified this afternoon.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I raised no objection to the honourable member's request to withdraw his previous amendment, because, in any event, the matter can be dealt with on its merits. We cannot apply workers' compensation payments on a by-guess-or-by-God method. The figure of 66½ per cent. has been set on a careful calculation of the liabilities involved in this phase of workers' compensation. When the honourable member foreshadowed that he would withdraw his amendment, I imagined he was trying to work out a suitable figure.

The Hon. R. Thompson: I went half way.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I thank the honourable member for the explanation. On a quick calculation the difference between 66½ per cent. and 100 per cent. is not half way.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: His half and your half are totally different.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; it is like some people's interpretation of the word, "compromise". I cannot agree to

the amendment for the reasons already stated, plus the fact that a percentage cannot be assessed on the spur of the moment.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am sure that every member must encounter distressing cases of hardship as the result of workers being injured and receiving workers' compensation payments well below their weekly wage. What can a member of Parliament, a union, or anyone else do about it? As stated previously, I have known injured workers who have had to maintain a wife and seven or eight children on workers' compensation payments; and, as a result, they had to relinquish many of the domestic appliances which they had been acquiring by hire purchase, after paying at least half or two-thirds of the purchase price, which represents a great loss to such people.

This is not an amendment I have moved lightly. I was quite sincere in asking for an increase in this percentage, because I am fully aware of the problems that are faced by working people in these circumstances; and in an endeavour to fix the amount at an even figure, I suggested it be 85 per cent. which would be a fair and equitable compromise. I would not be certain, but I think the existing provision has been in the Act since 1912; and there is no doubt that all commodities are more costly today.

The Hon. J. Heitman: The amount is in comparison with the present day wages.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No, it is not; because the cost structure has risen in excess of the basic wage. No-one can deny that. One can go as far back as 1932, when the basic wage dropped to £3 12s. If we take the cost of commodities in those days, and then compare the basic wage today with the present cost of commodities, it will soon be realised that the cost structure is greatly in excess of the basic wage. I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: There appears to be some misconception in the minds of a few members as to the implications of clause 3. In the first schedule there is provision for payment of compensation during the period a man is partially or totally incapacitated, and the maximum amounts are prescribed. But the implications in this clause deal with the man who has had an accident and, as a consequence, is forced to leave work for, say, three months. After the expiration of that period the doctor certifies, as a result of his partial incapacity, he is fit for work, but not, say, as a machine miner, which was his vocation previously.

The worker is then forced to relinquish his job as a machine miner for which he had been paid £30 a week, and he may then be successful in getting a job with the road board as a gardener or a night

watchman. However, for this work he is paid only £18 a week, and thereby he is losing £12 a week in wages, in comparison with what he earned previously.

Imagine his position. Perhaps he is buying a house and has a wife and family to keep. In addition he will have assumed liabilities and obligations based on his income of £30 per week, just as the average person does. Even a member of Parliament knows he has a certain amount coming in which enables him to undertake certain obligations. If a person loses £12 per week, he cannot be compensated above two-thirds of his loss. In other words, he cannot get more than £8 per week. He does not have to get £8, but that is the limit to which he can be compensated.

I would have liked to see Mr. Ron Thompson persist with his amendment to eliminate the percentage altogether, but he is now prepared to make some compromise. I think we should support his efforts to increase the percentage above 66 per cent., because we must remember we are dealing with workers' compensation; and, if I understand it aright, the object of the Workers' Compensation Act is to compensate.

If one insures a house for £10,000 and it is burned down, while one does not get the full £10,000, one does get the full amount of the assessment. It seems wrong to me in the case I quoted of the machine miner that, through no fault of his own, he has to give up the job at which he has been engaged for most of his working life and take on one as a night watchman, a gardener, or something of that kind. In my view, he should be compensated for the total loss he sustains. There is a principle involved in this matter, and it is one to which we should give serious consideration; and, if we do, we will agree with the amendment proposed by Mr. Thompson.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I remember Mr. Jack Thompson some eight or 10 years ago speaking on a Workers' Compensation Act amendment Bill, and saying the Act had grown because of applications made by the Labor Party for increased benefits over a period of years. He also said, at that time, that he was not prepared to agree to the amendment we wanted. He said, "Mark my words, the Australian Labor Party representatives in Parliament will see, from time to time, that if they do not get it this year they will attempt to get it next." That is exactly what we are trying to do.

In 1959 at the elections, the Government said it would give consideration to amending the Workers' Compensation Act; but at the end of its fifth year in office this Bill is the best it can do. As Mr. Ron Thompson pointed out, we must remember that the value of money has decreased. Retired members of Parliament who contributed to the superannuation fund in the early days paid in money worth 16s. 3d.

in the pound sterling, but today they are being paid at 6s. 7d. in the pound. So the equity so far as these people are concerned is not what it should be. While an employee is in hospital his family suffers. I know it is not a good thing to speak of one's own case in Parliament, but I am going to do so. I was working for the Commonwealth Oil Refineries, and I received an injury when the *Sussex* arrived at Fremantle on its maiden voyage.

I was on workers' compensation for 17 weeks. At that time I was earning £6 13s. per week driving a 20-ton semi-trailer truck. My wife could not meet her obligations to the family on £4 5s. per week, so I went to the doctor and told him my injury was practically healed and I wanted to go back to work. He told me that if I went back to work he could not help it; but he, Dr. Baker, signed me off. I went back to work, but my injuries became infected and I spent 14 months in the Perth Hospital, receiving 18s. per week compensation from social services.

Not every worker who goes on compensation is a crook or a rook. Most are anxious to get back to their employment, because they cannot afford to live on the amount paid as compensation. The employer does not have to pay for any increase in compensation. He pays a premium which covers him against any injury his employees may receive.

It is eight years since any worth-while amendments were included in the Workers' Compensation Act in this State, and there has been no great increase in premiums. I remember the late Harry Hearn saying that industry could not carry these increases. However, industry has carried them for eight years, and industry can carry what is involved in the present proposal before the Chair. I ask the Committee to agree to this amendment.

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

**Ayes—10**

Hon. D. P. Dellar	Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs
Hon. J. Dolan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	Hon. H. C. Strickland

(Teller)

**Noes—12**

Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. J. Heltman	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. H. R. Robinson
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. A. L. Loton	Hon. H. K. Watson

(Teller)

**Pairs**

Ayes	Noes
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. C. R. Abbey
Hon. J. D. Teahan	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. F. D. Willmott

**Majority against—2.**

**Amendment thus negatived.**

**Clause put and passed.**

**Title—**

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move an amendment—

Page 1—Delete the words "sections eight and nine" and substitute the words "section eight."

**Amendment put and passed.**

**Title, as amended, put and passed.**

**Report**

Bill reported, with an amendment to the title, and the report adopted.

**Third Reading**

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and returned to the Assembly with an amendment to the title.

**STATE FORESTS***Ministerial Statement on Dieback*

**THE HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [5.20 p.m.]: During the debate on the revocation of State Forests, Mr. Murray raised a question regarding dieback. I promised to furnish him with a reply before the end of the session. I would ask for leave, Sir, to read out the reply to the honourable member.

**Leave granted.**

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The reply reads as follows:—

This phenomenon has been observed in cut over Eucalyptus forests in other Australian States besides Western Australia, and has been known there for 50 years or more. Similar occurrences are reported in forests in other parts of the world. It has apparently followed the initial heavy cutting of the virgin forest. Mostly occurring in the heads of flat gullies or saddles in the hills, it is believed to be the result of disturbed soil water levels due to changes following logging, together with long periods of below normal annual rainfall, such as have occurred in the past decade. There is no indication that it is due to a disease.

In time nature would regenerate these areas with young forest growth; however, the Forests Department has been carrying out extensive experiments with the conversion of such areas to faster growing pine and some other species, with promising results.

The matter has been undergoing study for a considerable period, and over the past 3½ years the Western Australian Research Branch of the Commonwealth Forestry and Timber Bureau has been helping in the investigation.

**SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE***State of Notice Paper*

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [5.23 p.m.]: The business on the notice paper at the moment has been completed, but we still have business before the House in respect of Bills which have been sent to another place. I would like to respectfully suggest, Sir, that before leaving the Chair until the ringing of the bells an indication be given to members that the bells will not be rung before 8 p.m.

The **PRESIDENT** (The Hon. L. C. Diver): I will leave the Chair until the ringing of the bells, which will not take place before 8 p.m.

*House suspended from 5.24 to 8.11 p.m.*

**METROPOLITAN REGION DEVELOPMENT***Swan River Foreshore Reclamation: Assembly's Resolution*

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting concurrence in the following resolution:—

That this House do consent, pursuant to section twenty-two of the Swan River Conservation Act, 1958, to the resumption and filling in of an area of about nineteen acres of the Swan River as shown in the plan deposited in the Main Roads Department and marked M.R.D., W.A. No. 3077 and therein coloured green, and as so shown in the copy of that plan laid on the Table of the House, and that the Legislative Council be requested to so consent.

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [8.11 p.m.]: I move—

That the resolution be agreed to. In commencing my remarks on this motion, I wish to indicate to the House that I will lay this plan which I have in front of me on the Table of the House, from which members will see, outlined in green, the area of approximately 19 acres, the subject of the motion. Furthermore, there are some plans immediately outside the Chamber which are fairly large, and therefore they could not be brought into the Chamber without some little inconvenience. They will be readily available, however, to the scrutiny of members, so that they can glean from them further details of the proposal.

It has been estimated that traffic flows of the order of 180,000 vehicles a day will be established by the year 1985 on the northern approaches to the Narrows Bridge. A design is accordingly being prepared for a complex interchange facility to accommodate future traffic flows from Mounts Bay Road, the Narrows

Bridge, Riverside Drive, and the Mitchell Freeway. The traffic volumes anticipated could not be accommodated by a simple roundabout approach as provided at the Causeway approaches, for instance.

The problem at the Narrows will need to be resolved by grade separated structures, and generous layout design. Unfortunately, sufficient land is not available in the vicinity for this purpose. As a consequence, it will be essential, if this traffic demand is to be adequately coped with, to make preparations now for the reclamation of portion of the Swan River foreshore. Nineteen acres of land will be needed for this purpose along the north shore line of Perth Waters between the Narrows Bridge and the foot of Barrack Street.

The area of Perth Water which will remain after these 19 acres have been reclaimed will still encompass 850 acres. That is the area of water lying between the Causeway and the Narrows Bridge, but excluding the area of Heirisson Island downstream from the Causeway. The eventual development of the interchange will entail the construction of four separate parallel roadways on the reclaimed area. Members may be interested in the following extract from a report by the consultants, which reads as follows:—

As a result of our investigations over a period of two years this interchange, both the ultimate and the interim stages of development, will require land reclamation between the Narrows Bridge and Barrack Street jetty. The extent of reclamation needed for this purpose is essentially the same as proposed in the Stephenson-Hepburn Plan.

The report continues—

Because of the time-consuming operations of reclaiming and stabilising the needed area, reclamation work should be started at the earliest possible date.

It may be interesting to members, Mr. President, if I were to give some idea of the anticipations in respect of traffic figures. The substantial increase in motor vehicle registrations in the metropolitan area is illustrated by the figures I am now about to outline. In December, 1954, motor vehicle registrations totalled more than 84,000. In the same month, in 1958, the total was over 107,000, and in the same month of 1962, it was more than 142,000; an annual rate of increase of over 7 per cent. At this rate of growth, registrations by the year 1972 will double; that is, the number will increase to approximately 280,000.

Bypassable traffic; namely, traffic which would avail itself of the Mitchell Freeway, amounts to nearly 40 per cent. of the total traffic entering and leaving the city

during peak hours. At the present rate of increase the bypassable traffic will amount to 50 per cent. of all traffic entering the city area by the year 1967.

Recent traffic counts carried out by the Main Roads Department indicate that by the year 1967 the total traffic wishing to enter the city is expected to amount to about 40,000 vehicles, and of this number approximately half will be only passing through the city to reach destinations outside.

Already on the north side of the city many access roads are operating at maximum capacity; and, based on the estimate of figures, it will be appreciated that by 1967 relief will have to be provided to handle the situation arising from twice the amount of traffic using those roads today.

For example, the West Perth subway reached maximum capacity three or four years ago; similarly the William Street-Wellington Street intersection, and the Barrack Street-Wellington Street intersection recently reached maximum capacity. The Thomas Street bridge is in the same position.

The Narrows Bridge, which was opened in 1959, is now carrying 3,700 vehicles in the morning peak hours, whereas in July 1960, 2,200 vehicles were recorded in the same hours; this represents an increase of 20 per cent. per annum.

All these figures indicate a pressing need for the Mitchell Freeway, of which this reclamation scheme is a necessary part; indeed, the south-west interchange cannot be constructed to adequate geometric design unless this reclamation is proceeded with. There is some need to get on with this job.

I am advised that the first function, if this House concurs with the resolution of the Assembly—and I hope it will—is to start the work with grabs, as was done with the Mounts Bay Road reclamation, to establish a retaining bank for the fillings pumped from the river bed. A small dredge will be used at first, and one is available; others will become available as and when required. Where necessary land-fill will be used, as was the case previously, and that will be supplemented by dredging of the river bed. Traffic will not be able to traverse this roadway, when it is made, until proper consolidation of the area has taken place. There is some need to get on with the job.

During the tea suspension I had a look at the Swan River Conservation Act. The provision with which we are concerned is section 22, which sets out the functions of the board. They include the authority to formulate and implement schemes, not involving expenditure by the board, for co-ordinated action in the abatement, control, and prevention of pollution, by owners and occupiers of land.

Further on in the same section it is provided that no resumption or filling-in of an area greater than 10 acres of the Swan River shall be undertaken until the consent of both Houses of Parliament has been given. That Act was passed in 1958 as a result of a Bill introduced by the then Minister for Works (Mr. Tonkin). I believe that during the debate on that Bill, the Opposition at that time was successful in moving an amendment which provided that no resumption of an area exceeding 10 acres shall be undertaken without the consent of Parliament.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It is a very good provision.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Previously there was no restraint. That provision is a good one, and, in a case like the one before us, Parliament should be asked to give its consent. Personally I do not like to see any encroachment of the Swan River but when a necessity arises, we have to face up to the position. It appears from the plan, and from the advice of the engineers, that this project will not be a feasible proposition without the area to be reclaimed for the purpose of construction.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What is the anticipated completion date of the Mitchell Freeway?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I cannot say off-hand. If that is important to the honourable member, I shall find out if at all possible. This motion has been passed by the Legislative Assembly, and sent to this House. On behalf of the Government I seek the concurrence of the Council.

*[The plan was tabled.]*

Debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by The Hon. F. J. S. Wise (Leader of the Opposition).

### **MOTOR VEHICLE (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

*Returned*

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

*Sitting suspended from 8.27 to 9.5 p.m.*

### **METROPOLITAN REGION DEVELOPMENT**

*Swan River Foreshore Reclamation:  
Assembly's Resolution*

Debate resumed, from an earlier stage of the sitting, on the motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) to concur in the Assembly's resolution as follows:—

That this House do consent, pursuant to section twenty-two of the Swan River Conservation Act, 1958, to

the resumption and filling in of an area of about nineteen acres of the Swan River as shown in the plan deposited in the Main Roads Department and marked M.R.D. W.A. No. 3077 and therein coloured green, and as so shown in the copy of that plan laid on the Table of the House, and that the Legislative Council be requested to so consent.

**THE HON. F. J. S. WISE** (North—Leader of the Opposition) [9.5 p.m.]: Obviously, of necessity I adjourned this motion to a later stage of the sitting, so as to provide myself with the opportunity of even a cursory examination of the plans, and to enable some slight consideration of the subject matter relative to the reclamation proposals for the new Mitchell Freeway.

It appears there can be no qualification to the statement made by the Minister that the basis of the scheme is the pressing need for the Mitchell Freeway, which makes the reclamation proposal one of great urgency, because of the motor vehicle build-up which can be shown in the figures of licenses and in the vehicles moving through the city streets and roads, and because of the fact that this has particularly increased since the year 1954; and, anticipating a constant increase at the rate mentioned, it will mean there will be 280,000 vehicles on the road by 1972.

To give effect to the plan brings us to the need, in this proposal, to reclaim 19 acres of the river land, and to the need to obtain the fill from the river by dredging, and also from the land side; and to decrease the area available in Perth Water by much the same acreage. In examining the plans, it appears to be a matter of very considerable regret that a day or two before Parliament is due to rise, the first announcement is made in the Press of the whole of this scheme.

The first announcement we saw was on Monday, the 2nd December, when we were told that 19 acres of the river may go to roads; and the first we knew of it in Parliament was two days ago. This is said to be a matter of very great urgency; and many arguments can be advanced to prove it is a matter of urgency.

It is interesting to observe that on the designs and the progressive plans on which this final sketch was based, there is the date of the 11th May, 1963. Today is the 6th December, 1963. I think that is not quite a fair thing. It is not a fair thing to Parliament; it is not a fair thing to the public; and the Ministers of the Government are not doing themselves justice in the matter. It has been known for a long time that this proposal, dovetailing as it does into the Stephenson-Hepburn Plan—or part of it—would be necessary if the Mitchell Freeway was to be planned for

five years hence as part of the road system to be conjoined with the existing system over the Narrows Bridge. Of necessity this had to be planned for very early this year, if work was to be commenced upon it early next year. It had to be planned for almost immediately.

It has been my experience in matters of administration—and I think it has been the experience of many people in administrative matters of great seriousness, and of great import—that the more pressure that is put on one to deal with a matter as one of extreme urgency, the more one is told that it must be signed today, or approved today, or tomorrow, the more one must resist the signing of it that day, or the next.

That is the time to stop and have another look. When a signature was required to approve many things of great importance; and when an officer and senior personnel had stressed the vital need to sign something on a Saturday morning, or a Saturday afternoon—something which appeared to be of an imperative nature, and could not be delayed, I was one who felt that was the time to delay it. That is the time to have another look; that is the time to play safe; that is the time to be sure.

I have no hesitation in saying that is the category into which this proposal falls, by the very nature of its approach. Anything that is rushed, or is violently urgent, always requires a further good look; it is always wise to wait a bit. At the other end of this important matter I do support the suggestion that it is one of urgency; that reclamation should commence at an early date; that there is nothing wrong with it on the surface—at least not from what I could see on the surface; because, I repeat, I only scanned it cursorily for a few minutes.

I do think we have a very great responsibility. I was very interested in the leading article in *The West Australian* of Wednesday, in which it almost implored the Government to be very careful, and to have another look; and Parliament should have a look at both sides. It suggested that the Government, and Parliament, to justify the reclamation, should be able to assure the public that the credits would exceed the debits. I think that is likely and possible. *The West Australian* is very frank in its views on this matter.

It states that the Government and the opposition have a common interest in the work that began with the Narrows Bridge; that one is resuming where the other left off. Do we not all recall what happened when the decision was made to fill Matilda Bay? Do we not know how many people were up in arms at that proposal; especially some of the older residents? Do we not remember the reaction when the pool at South Perth was filled, because of its

association with the Old Mill site, with the Shenton family, and so on? But as time wore on we found that those objections disappeared. The proof was in the result; and I think the same will be the case with this proposition.

I do think, however, we would be far wiser, and more justified, if we were really sure of this proposal. I understand that today a suggestion was made, and indeed a motion moved, that this matter be referred to a Select Committee. It may be that the importance of the subject warrants such action, but that would be a very delaying action. That could mean we could lose the effects of the drainage and the drying of a great part of one summer, and put back for one year the ability to use much of the land to be reclaimed.

I feel, however, there is something we can do. I think there is something we should do; and I propose to outline to the House what I think we should do. I propose to amend the resolution; and I would ask all members to give earnest consideration to this proposition. After the word "consent" in line one of the motion I propose to add the words—

conditionally upon a favourable report being made by a joint committee of ten members to be appointed from both Houses comprised of three members representing the Government and two members representing the Opposition in each House and to which the question is hereby referred.

I would like to see a Government chairman of that committee. I would like to see these members able to call for all papers, to have discussions with all officers and experts in their spheres at the highest level. This is not a Select Committee. It is not bound by Parliament. It does not have to report to Parliament. It simply has to express to the public views representing the conjoint views of Parliament. We would have confidence in those appointed; and the public would be assured this proposal was essential to the plan of the Mitchell Freeway, and that the job should proceed.

I do not think the whole story is in this motion, because where the plan shows the reclamation at Union Jack Square, that is not the ultimate end of the reclamation. That is a dead-end. There will be roads adjoining and approaching from that end. There will be other reclamations upstream from that point. There are many things that will interlock into this plan, and now is the time we should know about them.

I think this is so important in the future planning of the city of Perth that even the youngest member present, by his decision approving a plan of his kind, will not see the whole thing completed. He will not live long enough. So we have a responsibility right into the future; and surely we should have confidence in six members from the Government side



of the two Houses and four from the Opposition to see if these men are prepared to back this scheme, not with any nonsense of attempting to hold it up, but to allow it to proceed. If, on the other hand, there can be very strong objections, they will be valid; and surely we would support them in those reasons. There could be no unfairness and nothing political about it.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: To whom would the committee report?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I would say to the Minister in charge of this work. It would advise him of its endorsement of the proposals. It is very difficult to put that sort of thing in such a motion.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You say, "conditionally upon a favourable report."

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That does not say, "a unanimous report."

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: No.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It would not matter if there were a minority report against the favourable report?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I would say it would not matter at all. I repeat: The very construction made in this suggestion ensures an inquiry of a valid kind without it being in any way presumed to be unfair, prejudiced, or jaundiced, because of politics. Looking at this in its broadest sense, it is something worth supporting. It is something that Parliament, representing the people says should proceed; and I think the public would have a much greater faith in the proposal.

#### *Amendment to Assembly's Resolution*

I move—

That the Assembly's resolution be amended by inserting after the word "consent" in line 1 the following words:—

conditionally upon a favourable report being made by a joint committee of ten members to be appointed from both Houses comprised of three members representing the Government and two members representing the Opposition in each House and to which the question is hereby referred.

Debate adjourned until a later stage of the sitting, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines).

(Continued below)

Sitting suspended from 9.23 to 10.58 p.m.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [10.58 p.m.]: During the break an opportunity was afforded me to examine the amendment moved by Mr. Wise; and not only did I examine the Act, but I also took the opportunity of communicating with the Solicitor-General; because I had reason to believe that the amendment moved by the honourable

member could be out of context with the motion and the original intention of the Act.

I am now satisfied—the Solicitor-General satisfied me—that in fact the amendment moved by the honourable member is in conflict with section 22 of the Swan River Conservation Act. I should like to read the proviso to paragraph (a) of the section. Paragraph (a) sets out some of the functions of the board and then it states—

Provided no resumption or filling in of an area greater than 10 acres of the Swan River shall be undertaken until the consent of both Houses of Parliament has been given.

The wording of that proviso contemplates that the action will be subject to the approval of both houses of Parliament, but it does not contemplate that either House of Parliament, or both Houses of Parliament should or can place any conditional provisions on the consent that is requested. The consent must have been intended to be absolute; or the consent must have been intended to be withheld. That is the plain and simple fact of the matter. The proviso did not contemplate that the consent of this Parliament, or of either House of Parliament, would be conditional upon some other provision.

One House may, if it were valid for it to do so, impose a condition which would not be agreeable to the other House. One House could provide a set of provisional conditions, if it were valid for it to do so, separate, apart, and distinct from, the provisions provided in another House. If these conditions could be validly imposed, then the concurrence of the other House would not necessarily have to be obtained. We would then find ourselves in quite an impossible situation.

I think this brings us to the point of the motion moved and carried in the Legislative Assembly, in which I have asked the Legislative Council to concur. Mr. Wise now seeks to amend that motion, and I do not think the amendment should be accepted, because, if it is, it will be in complete conflict with section 22 (a) of the Swan River Conservation Act. Rather than being able to get on with this task, which is an important one, we will have conflict between the two Houses, which will result in a great deal of delay. Mr. Wise said he realised the importance of the whole function, and I would put it to him that since, in the opinion of the Solicitor-General there would be a conflict with the proviso of section 22, perhaps he might be good enough not to proceed with his amendment, because it would put us in an invidious position to say the least.

I am prepared to leave it at that, confident in the knowledge, and with the Solicitor-General's opinion, that the amendment is in conflict with section 22 (a) of the Act.

**THE HON. F. J. S. WISE** (North—Leader of the Opposition) [11.4 p.m.]: I know I have no right to reply, but I listened intently to the ruling sought from and given by the Solicitor-General. Needless to say, together with other members, I studied section 22 of the Swan River Conservation Act, and the proviso to paragraph (a). I am ready to concede there is some doubt. As there is some doubt, and as the Solicitor-General has ruled that it is in conflict with section 22, it would mean that the motion would not be valid. It is not my wish to upset this motion to that degree. I have other views as to its passing, but not in that particular. I have stated my views in that regard. I therefore feel I must accept the ruling of the Solicitor-General, and ask the leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

**Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.**

**Question put and passed, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.**

## LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

### *Returned*

Bill returned from the Assembly with amendments.

### *Assembly's Amendments: In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Justice) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Amendment No. 1 made by the Assembly is as follows:—

#### No. 1.

Clause 3, page 2, lines 4 to 9—  
Delete paragraph (a).

#### Consequential amendments:

Paragraph designations (b), (c), (d), and (e) to read (a), (b), (c), and (d).

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move—

That amendment No. 1 made by the Assembly be agreed to.

The member for Maylands raised the question of the validity of the interpretation of the word "bottle" in the Bill, and I undertook to confer with the draftsman about the matter, and with Crown Law Department generally. Investigations found him to be correct, and the amendment now takes out the interpretation of bottle.

**Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.**

The CHAIRMAN: Amendment No. 2 made by the Assembly is as follows:—

#### No. 2.

Clause 14, page 8, lines 12 and 13—  
Delete "or Christmas Day".

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This amendment is in a different category. I feel myself in much the same position as I was a few months ago, when I ran the risk

of losing a Bill which meant a lot to the administration of the Act, as does this one. I do not wish to raise any objection to the amendment, for fear that I might lose the Bill, and I move—

That amendment No. 2 made by the Assembly be agreed to.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I am not happy with this amendment. I feel Christmas Day is one on which people should forgo this privilege. There is ample opportunity to get all the liquor refreshment they require. I am in complete opposition to the amendment.

**Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.**

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): Amendment No. 3 made by the Assembly is as follows:—

#### No. 3.

Clause 19, page 9, line 30—Insert after the word "amended" the following passage:—

—(a) by inserting after the word "bottle" in line three, the passage "can"; and

#### (b)

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move—

That amendment No. 3 made by the Assembly be agreed to.

**Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.**

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): Amendment No. 4 made by the Assembly is as follows:—

#### No. 4.

Clause 21, page 11, lines 7 and 8—  
Delete the words "or Christmas Day".

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This amendment is in the same category, and I am not going to run the risk of losing this Bill. I move—

That amendment No. 4 made by the Assembly be agreed to.

**Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.**

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): Amendment No. 5 made by the Assembly is as follows:—

#### No. 5.

Clause 44, page 21, line 21—Insert after the word "amended" the designation "—(a)".

Clause 44, page 21, line 24—Insert after line 24 the following paragraphs:—

(b) by inserting after the word "bottle", in line two of subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (c) of subsection (2), the passage "or in a can, or in any container of any kind having a capacity exceeding one reputed quart

(other than a jug when the liquor contained therein is to be consumed on the premises),"; and

- (c) by substituting for the words "so sold in quantities of not more than two bottles" in lines five and six of subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (c) of subsection (2), the passage "sold by the bottle or in a bottle or in a can, the capacity of which bottle or can does not exceed one reputed quart, in quantities of not more than two reputed quarts."

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move—

That amendment No. 5 made by the Assembly be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): Amendment No. 6 made by the Assembly is as follows:—

No. 6.

Clause 66, page 30, lines 3 to 11—Delete paragraphs (a) and (b).

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move—

That amendment No. 6 made by the Assembly be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN (The Hon. N. E. Baxter): Amendment No. 7 made by the Assembly is as follows:—

No. 7.

Clause 66, page 30—After the word "amended" in line 2, insert new paragraphs as follows:—

- (a) by inserting after the word "bottle", secondly occurring in line two of paragraph (c) of subsection (2), the passage "or in a can, or in any container of any kind having a capacity exceeding one reputed quart (other than a jug when the liquor contained therein is to be consumed on the club premises)";
- (b) by inserting after the word "bottle", secondly occurring in line four of paragraph (d) of subsection (2), the passage "or in a can, the capacity of which bottle or can does not exceed one reputed quart,"; and
- (c) by substituting for the word "bottles", in line five of paragraph (d) of subsection (2), the words "reputed quarts."

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move—

That amendment No. 7 made by the Assembly be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

### Report

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

## LOAN BILL, £22,850,000

### Receipt and First Reading

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

### Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [11.24 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to authorise the raising of Loan Funds amounting to £22,850,000 required for the purposes which are detailed in its schedule. In this connection, it might be mentioned that the new authorities provided in the schedule do not necessarily coincide with expenditure which has been estimated in respect of those items during the current financial year.

There has been taken into account the unspent balance of previous authorisations. Funds sufficient to permit works of a continuing nature to be carried on for a period of approximately six months after the close of the financial year are also covered. Obviously, this ensures continuity in the progress of works pending the passing of a later Loan Act.

Members may desire to peruse full details of the various loan authorisations. These are contained in pages 14 to 17 of the Loan Estimates. Information is also shown in respect of authorisations to be carried forward at the 30th June, 1964. In these pages of the Loan Estimates may be found also the appropriation of loan repayments received during 1962-63.

This Bill also authorises the payment of interest and sinking fund in respect of loan authorisation. These payments are to be charged to Consolidated Revenue Fund and, consequently, no further appropriation will be required to be sought from Parliament.

This measure seeks authority to reappropriate authorisations which are in excess of immediate requirements. There is set out in the second schedule the amount to be reappropriated. The items to which the funds are to be now applied are contained in the third schedule.

**THE HON. F. J. S. WISE** (North—Leader of the Opposition) [11.26 p.m.]: I think a few remarks should be spoken in connection with the passing of an appropriation for £22,850,000. It is not an unusual loan schedule, but it is noticeable how the amount is creeping up year by year and how fortunate this State has been in being able to obtain the loan funds so necessary for many of its works. In addition to the specified loan works, we have been privileged to have so much money by way of special grants for special undertakings that does not appear either in our Appropriation Bill or in our loan raisings—money for works such as those associated with the Ord River project, and money that comes to us through Commonwealth grants.

The moneys that come to us under section 96 of the Constitution and the moneys that come to us from the Main Roads Trust Account have all now reached very large figures compared with what they were even a decade ago. They are necessary in this State's development, and, provided they are properly applied, it is a good thing to see moneys which can be used satisfactorily; and to see large debts, when incurred, satisfactorily serviced from the earnings.

One of the major difficulties we have had and still have is the unproductive works which are such a big burden and charge on our revenues. Unfortunately, they are not decreasing substantially. The unproductive assets of this State are very considerable. We were led to believe a few years ago—within the last two years—according to the Minister, that everything was bidding so fair in connection with the railways, but we have learned there will be a substantial deficit experienced in the future. This year we saw a very large sum as a loss from that instrumentality. So it will be through the years with other State undertakings which return so little towards even the interest of the undertakings.

We have deprived ourselves of the sales of some of the industries which might have been great investments, but which have been handed over by this Government to other people. I think it is very regrettable where loan funds have been used to build up industries that, simply because of politics, they are passed from State ownership into ownership which gives to private undertakings profits; whereas the State Treasury and instrumentalities of the State, for many years, have had to bear the burden of finance and see that interest was met when losses occurred.

However, there is little that is new in the schedules to this Bill. I would like to see, for example, much more spent in connection with some items. I think we are spending too little of our loan funds in reforestation. This is something in connection with which a neighbouring nation

—New Zealand—has done startling things in the last few years. According to the Loan Estimates we are to spend, in regard to pine planting, £150,000. I think we could afford to spend £1,500,000, and it would be a very great investment for the future.

There are very many things that one could find to talk about and, indeed, to find fault with. I can only hope that the trend in the investment of loan moneys will be such that they will be invested in entities and undertakings which will give a fair return, by way of interest, to assist, through the sinking fund, in the repayment of the loans to the Commonwealth.

**THE HON. N. E. BAXTER** (Central) [11.32 p.m.]: This is a rather interesting Bill to study, particularly from the documentary point of view. On page 5 there are details of general loan funds. The figure of £4,824,000 is shown for the railways. I suppose that money is to help cover the deficit shown by the railways during the past financial year. The next item is Public Works, for which the figure is £11,054,712. This is an item in which I am interested. I believe that more could be done, and I have expressed this opinion in the House before.

**The Hon. L. A. Logan**: You are on the wrong Bill.

**The Hon. N. E. BAXTER**: I find I am speaking to the wrong Bill, Mr. President. I apologise.

**THE HON. R. THOMPSON** (West) [11.34 p.m.]: I wish to take the opportunity of raising two matters. I could raise the matters in connection with this Bill or the next, but it will be just as well if I do it in connection with this one. The first schedule deals with the Kwinana deviation for the alumina works. The matter comes under railways. A new road has been constructed which, I should imagine, will be called Cockburn Road. The official name has not been given, but it is a continuation of the Cockburn Road or the Rockingham Road. At the junction of this road and Thomas Road, in the vicinity of the Medina township, there is a diamond in the roadway. Members of the Kwinana Shire Council are most concerned about this diamond. I had a close look at it last week. The road coming from Medina in a westerly direction is on a banked curve. It meets Cockburn Road at a junction, and the junction is also on a curve. If one is travelling from Medina to Fremantle, it is impossible for one to go around the diamond in safety. I give our main roads engineers credit for the work they are doing, but they will have to have a second look at this particular junction.

Most of us are safety conscious; and if this difficulty is not remedied very quickly a lot of lives could be lost at this

junction. Members of the shire council contacted me, and I visited the area last week. I promised I would raise the matter. I would suggest that if any member has the necessary time, he should visit this junction. He should drive up the road 100 yards towards Medina, turn, and drive back towards Fremantle. He will find it is a very dangerous junction. I realise the engineers have a difficult job.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: If an alteration is made when the road is carried through, will that answer the problem?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No, it will not. If two islands were constructed in the roadway they might still allow for the flow of cross traffic. It is difficult to drive around the diamond without cutting the road or having another car clip one's own car. A car clipped me recently when I was coming from Fremantle.

It is a dangerous intersection at the moment, if we can call it an intersection; and I feel we could avert accidents if something were done quickly.

During the Address-in-Reply debate, I raised the question of school teacher accommodation at Carnamah. I think the Minister mentioned that he would send a Housing Commission inspector to Carnamah; and I believe the promise was honoured, and the inspector did go there. However, he did not contact any of the people concerned in respect of this accommodation. I discussed the matter with the Premier last week, when I questioned him about additional classrooms to be completed by the end of March for the Carnamah Junior High School.

The teachers have been living with the townspeople. I am advised that when the school opens for the 1964 school year, there will be five teachers without accommodation. They are unable to find accommodation in the town.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Are they married teachers?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: No, they are all single.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What do you expect the Housing Commission to do?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Another two teachers will be appointed when the two new classrooms are constructed. It is not a question of what the Housing Commission is going to do. In country towns most people have been prepared to accept teachers at a reasonable rental. Townspeople have played their part; but now, with all the development that is going on in the area, they have to look after themselves. Space is not available. The hotel is not interested in taking permanent guests. I think the hotel charges £19 10s. per week. I am not blaming the Housing Commission; nor am I trying to take the Minister to task. There are going to be seven teachers in the town who will be without accommodation. There will be

five in February and another two in March. I understand that the teachers concerned will all be applying for a transfer from the school unless something is done quickly.

I pointed out this position in August. I realise the difficulty faced by the Housing Commission. I know its hands are tied so far as single-unit accommodation is concerned. But the school teachers' union has had a running battle for some years. Although promises have been made, to the best of my knowledge there has been no definite proposition put forward to the Teachers Union as to what is to be done in regard to single-unit accommodation. Most single teachers like going to country towns; but unless accommodation is provided they will want to move out, as they will not be able to live in those towns.

**THE HON. N. E. BAXTER** (Central) [11.43 p.m.]: I regret that I spoke to the wrong Bill on the last occasion. I am interested in the amount to be allocated to the Country High School Hostels Authority. There is an amount of £25,000 shown in the first schedule.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Country High School Hostels Authority has, within its own Statute, the authority to raise money.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: One hundred thousand pounds.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: That is quite correct. But apparently there will be an additional amount of £25,000 allocated from loan moneys to the Country High School Hostels Authority. I just want to get that clear.

**THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY** (West) [11.44 p.m.]: I wish to speak in connection with item No. 47, the Rural and Industries Bank. The figure shown is £500,000. I wish to make a complaint in regard to the advances from the bank for housing. It has been my privilege in the last year to take two people to that bank to enable them to get assistance for housing. In one case, the lady concerned had some money of her own. She had a block of land, for which she had paid over £900. The block is located in Applecross, and she required £3,500 for building purposes. I was told by an officer of the bank that there was no money available for such purposes, but he said he could recommend some place where she could go to obtain this financial accommodation. The second person I took to the bank was treated in a similar manner.

I have been wondering ever since whether it is in the interests of the State that I should take people to the R. & I. Bank to obtain finance for housing, or whether I should go direct to the Commonwealth Bank. I was always under the impression that the R. & I. Bank was established to assist the development of

our own State. We have been told only recently that the bank is able to supply finance to the Midland Railway Company and other large enterprises; but I am extremely concerned when one makes approaches to the bank for financial assistance for housing and one is advised to go to the Commonwealth Bank. I have also been wondering whether the bank has been acting in its own interests, or as an agent for the Commonwealth Bank.

Another question I want to raise concerns the blue beacon which stands on the top of the R. & I. Bank Building. In my opinion this beacon is completely unnecessary. It has been of no assistance in reducing the death toll on the roads since it was placed in that position. On the other hand, many people who have lost a member of their family as a result of a road accident object to its significance and the fact that it is in such a prominent position, because it reminds them of their loss.

I am, therefore, wondering whether the beacon could not be used for some other purpose not so macabre. Unfortunately, when the blue light is turned on it is to acquaint all and sundry that some person has lost his life as a result of a road accident, but despite this the road accident toll is just as high this year as it was last year. I think this beacon is completely unnecessary on our skyline, and is no credit to the R. & I. Bank.

I now wish to refer to water supplies. I am wondering whether the promise made by the Minister for Water Supplies will be honoured now that it is proposed that a water board shall take over the administration of the Metropolitan Water Supply Department. Will it be any easier for people who live on the perimeter of the metropolitan area to obtain a water supply? At the moment there is a group of valuable houses in Burke Drive, Attadale, some of which are worth £7,000 or £8,000. Further, some of them have been erected for over two years, and they are still without a water connection. When people are residing practically in the heart of the city without the benefit of an adequate water supply, I am wondering how people living at the extremities of the metropolitan area are ever going to obtain their water supply.

I am asking why these houses should be refused a water supply connection merely because they are situated in an isolated spot. In one of these houses in Burke Street there is a woman whose husband is in hospital, and she has to cart water about 200 yards in a bucket. The house which she occupies has been erected for two years.

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [11.49 p.m.]: The only questions I wish to answer are those which have been raised by Mr. Lavery. In

the first place the water board is not yet in operation. I should hope that when it does come into operation its administration of the metropolitan water supply will not be as loose as it is now. If the board is to get on its feet it must, first of all, take steps to stem the losses that are at present being incurred. That is the situation.

In respect of the R. & I. Bank, that is an autonomous body, and if a client approaches that bank and the bank refuses to advance the client any money, that is a matter which is completely within its own control. I know that the R. & I. Bank has done a good deal towards assisting housing in this State. I was responsible for the bank agreeing to undertake the financing of a small house plan to something of the order of £1,000,000; and I hope the State Government and the R. & I. Bank will be able to get together to put in train more of such plans, because they are very worth while indeed. I am not going to endeavour to give an explanation of what happened between the honourable member and the person he took to the R. & I. Bank, because that is purely a matter for the bank itself.

**Question put and passed.**

**Bill read a second time.**

*In Committee, etc.*

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

*Third Reading*

**Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and passed.**

## **APPROPRIATION BILL**

*Receipt and First Reading*

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

*Second Reading*

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [11.56 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Funds required for Government services this financial year are detailed in the Consolidated Revenue Fund and the General Loan Fund Expenditure Estimates. One of the principal purposes in the Appropriation Bill being introduced is to appropriate the money required to meet this expenditure.

The Bill contains provisions which grant supply for the remainder of the financial year in addition to that provided under the Supply Bills already passed this session. Supply is granted in total amounts from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and

General Loan Fund and this Bill appropriates these amounts under the respective heads of expenditure as detailed in the Estimates.

The purposes for which the appropriation known as the "Advance to Treasurer" is required appear in a schedule to this Bill. In addition to authorising the provision of funds for this financial year, the Bill also ratifies the excess amounts spent over and above that estimated for the last financial year. Finally, the Bill appropriates funds for a scheme of expenditure under the Forests Improvements and Reforestation Fund. This is in accord with the scheme laid on the Table of the House under section 41 of the Forests Act, 1918-1954.

**THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE** (North) [11.57 p.m.]: Traditionally this Bill is brought forward at this stage of the session every year, and as I can see nothing objectionable in it, I support it.

**THE HON. J. M. THOMSON** (South) [11.58 p.m.]: If it were not for the tenor of the answers I received to the questions I asked yesterday I would not now be speaking to the Bill before the House. In answer to my question I was told that the total amount paid by the Crown to cover the costs and damages awarded in the case of Constable V. S. Marshall v. Roman Iwankiw was £1,971 1s. 9d.

If the person who was responsible for the compilation of the reply handed to the Minister yesterday was content to fool himself, I wish to assure the House he has not succeeded in fooling me by those replies. I refer to question (f), which was the final one relating to testimonials. I will direct this question back to the department, or the officer, from whence it came because I feel Iwankiw has been grievously wronged. Why did Marshall consider that a testimonial was so desirable and necessary if he had acted in accordance with the requirements of his duties? Why was a testimonial necessary at all under those circumstances?

To say that the testimonial was unsolicited by Marshall is to treat the true position with scant respect; to say that the testimonial was signed by the whole population in Denmark is a deliberate falsehood. I have personally read the testimonial and the names appearing thereon; knowing the population of Denmark and its district, I can only conclude that the person who prepared the reply to my question had not the slightest inkling of the number of people there.

I say without fear of contradiction that had there been a testimonial to testify to Mr. Iwankiw's honesty and business acumen, a similar number of signatures would be on it. So much for testimonials!

After studying the stationery on which the testimonial was typed and written—and it consisted of a few sheets of paper—I suggest Marshall had full knowledge of

the preparation of those sheets of paper comprising the testimonial; because that stationery is similar to stationery prepared and supplied by the printing shop at the Fremantle Gaol, or by the Government Printing Office. This was similar to the scribbling paper that we, as members of Parliament, see within Government departments.

Why did Marshall think it was so essential to have signatures from Morawa, Wiluna, and Albany? Little did I think, when I observed Marshall's car—a Ford Zephyr—outside the house of a particular person, that I would see that person's name on the testimonial. Some people were not overkeen to sign that testimonial, which was prepared and presented to them, because Marshall was the local policeman and they did not know how long he would remain in Denmark. They thought it would be unwise not to put their signatures on that testimonial. So much for unsolicited testimonials.

With reference to paragraph (c) of the answer to my question, magistrate H. R. Smith of Albany—I have the greatest respect and admiration for him in the performance of the duties of his high office—heard the case. I have studied the transcript of evidence in the case heard in Mr. Smith's court. I have studied it not only once, but on numerous occasions. Therefore I consider I have a very good knowledge of what that evidence is. I cannot recall reading the words which are contained in the answer given to my question: "That any injuries Iwankiw received in effect he brought upon himself." This transcript is in my possession, but not within the precincts of this House.

In case I have erred by turning over a page or two unconsciously, upon my return home tomorrow I shall check the transcript again to see if those words are in it. If they are, I shall duly notify the Minister of that fact; but if they are not I shall cause a question to be asked when the House next assembles, and it will be a very pertinent question. However, mistakes can be made, and that applies to me. If the words are in the transcript, I shall acknowledge that and notify the Minister accordingly.

Dealing with the question of malice and viciousness, certainly viciousness was shown by Marshall in his treatment of Mr. Iwankiw on the sand track off the bitumen road which he had traversed and recently left, and which led to the home of Mr. Iwankiw. Surely for a man of the stature of Marshall to hold down a man similar in stature to myself, handcuffed on the ground, well out of the view of other people—so Marshall thought—and to unmercifully kick and continue to kick that man and only to cease kicking when a voice behind Marshall said, "What is the matter and what goes on?" is vicious. I, and other people, want to know what else it could be called.

Upon hearing the voice Marshall lifted Iwankiw, handcuffed as he was, from the ground, placed him in his car and drove him back to the police station. There Marshall charged Iwankiw quite lawfully with the offence for which Iwankiw was charged. Throughout the night Iwankiw was held as a prisoner in a cell. He called out in agony for attention and relief, but none was offering.

The following morning—and Iwankiw had sustained all this suffering from the hands and boots of Marshall; had been confined in the cell; and Marshall had refused to attend to his needs—Mrs. Iwankiw was on the way from her farm to bail him out; and to illustrate malice and viciousness so far as Marshall is concerned, I detail the following events: Marshall was aware that Mrs. Iwankiw was on her way from the farm, as a result of a telephone communication between the officer in charge of the Denmark police station and her. Yet Marshall crudely and cruelly jibed at Iwankiw by inquiring if he—that is Marshall—could send for one—whose name I shall not mention—to bail Iwankiw out. Of course Marshall knew that at any moment Mrs. Iwankiw would be in to do that very thing.

It would be appropriate for me to say that this person, whom I shall refer to as Johnnie, is Iwankiw's opposition in business. Johnnie strongly resented opposition to his business, and, as a result a bitter feeling existed between the two men. Marshall was fully aware of that, yet he cruelly and cunningly inquired of Iwankiw whether Iwankiw desired him to send for Johnnie to bail him out.

On being released on bail, Iwankiw was admitted to the Denmark Hospital. Later he was transferred to the Albany District Hospital where an emergency operation was performed on a ruptured bladder. The evidence of the surgeon was that the injury was "caused by force per medium of a boot and punching." This evidence, and the evidence of the farmer who heard the cries of Iwankiw, who was being assaulted, no doubt influenced the minds of the jury in coming to their decision in the Supreme Court, and in awarding damages against Marshall.

Naturally, as we can well imagine, this legal action did not make for a friendly disposition or attitude between the two men. While Marshall was waiting to appeal against the decision of the Supreme Court to the Full Court he availed himself of the opportunity to again arrest Iwankiw. Because of Marshall's known intolerance of, and contempt for, New Australians, coupled with his attitude previously displayed, he questionably again arrested Iwankiw. I refer again to the answers which were given to the questions which I asked yesterday afternoon in this House.

If it is considered that the facts, as borne out in evidence, show no semblance of viciousness, malice, intolerance, and lack of control over one's personal prejudices; and if it is considered "reasonable force in affecting an arrest" to hold a man handcuffed down on the ground and kick him unmercifully in and around the bladder region, I venture to suggest that many people have yet to learn the real full meaning of those words.

Before I resume my seat, I wish to refer particularly to the file on this case. I have perused it on two occasions. The first time I was very interested to see a particular piece of stationery of a certain type which contained a note. It was a very short one and was over the signature of a very senior officer of the Police Department. It referred to the Supreme Court hearing at which Iwankiw was awarded damages. The note was as follows, or very near it:—

It is unfortunate that this case was heard before a judge and a jury. If heard by a judge only, Marshall would not have lost his case.

What does this very senior officer wish to imply by such a statement as that?

On the second occasion I studied the file this note had been removed, and another, similar in wording, but over the signature of a less senior officer, was in its place. Incidentally this file was on the Table of the House.

Because of the expressed opinion of the senior officers of the Police Department as to the disadvantage of a jury in the case which Marshall lost, the question has been asked, and will continue to be asked, whether this was the reason why, when Iwankiw was charged on the second occasion by Marshall, he was refused the opportunity of being heard before a jury. He was sentenced by the acting magistrate at Albany to two months' gaol, portion of which he spent at Fremantle.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: Who was the magistrate?

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: If the honourable member would like to know the name I will be very please to show him the transcript.

This whole case leaves a particularly nasty stench in the nostrils of those who still place some value on truth, honour, and fair play. I hope that under a Bill such as we are discussing now, we will never again have occasion to include a sum of money for such a purpose as I have indicated in connection with Marshall. It is a disgraceful state of affairs, and I regret very much indeed that I have had to come to the House to make the full facts of the case known. What I have said is substantiated by the evidence taken at the Supreme Court and the Local Court. I think that to receive the impudent reply I received reflected no credit



on the person concerned in compiling it; and, to say the least, it was a despicable reply. I support the Bill.

**THE HON. N. E. BAXTER** (Central) [12.21 a.m.]: The various sums being appropriated under this Bill raise quite a lot of questions when we consider the different financial reports of the State.

On page 5 of the Bill is an allocation of £4,824,000 for Railways, which is quite possibly to help cover last year's total deficit. When we realise that the estimated deficit for the coming financial year is some £3,430,000 it is apparent that £4,000,000 odd will not go too far.

One of the interesting items, I feel, is that of Public Works, which is to be provided with £11,054,712. From my point of view it is particularly interesting, because I feel that this money could be stretched a lot further. I believe there are ways and means which could be found to make much more use of the money allocated through loan funds in this State towards our public buildings.

I spoke earlier in this session on another Bill, and I have also approached the Minister for Education in connection with school buildings. I am not entirely satisfied that the Government has done all in its power to try to find some way to reduce the cost of public buildings, and particularly school buildings. I was advised, after I had spoken earlier in the session, that the Premier had been overseas, as had also the Director of Education, and that they had made preliminary inquiries into the cost of school buildings in the United Kingdom. It was indicated that the Government intended to send several officers of the Education Department, or the Public Works Department, to the United Kingdom to study this particular subject. Whether this has been done, I do not know, because I have received no advice.

However, I cannot see that money spent in sending several departmental officers to the United Kingdom would be well spent, because we would gain no further information in any way to help reduce the cost of public buildings in this State, particularly school buildings. There are too many facets in this business, especially in regard to the relative financial set-up in the United Kingdom as compared with Western Australia.

The basic wage structure is different; the cost structure generally is different; and I think the solution of the question raised in this State is for the Government to get down to brass tacks and make a study of the matter. I did make a suggestion earlier in the session that architectural costs be gone into and that a basic plan be used, particularly for primary schools.

I do not think it is necessary for officers of any department here to go to the United Kingdom in order to arrive at a solution in that direction. Not only do I not think

it is necessary; I am sure it is not necessary. All it would achieve would be to provide a good trip for several officers who would go to the United Kingdom and come back and tell us nothing.

**The Hon. A. F. Griffith**: None went, you know.

**The Hon. N. E. BAXTER**: None went, as far as I know. However, I was advised that that was the intention.

**The Hon. A. F. Griffith**: You were advised by me that there was a recommendation that some officers should go.

**The Hon. N. E. BAXTER**: That is quite right.

**The Hon. A. F. Griffith**: The Government did not accept that recommendation.

**The Hon. N. E. BAXTER**: I was told it was a recommendation, and subsequently I spoke to the Minister for Education, who informed me along similar lines. I took this matter up 12 months ago—

**The Hon. A. F. Griffith**: I do not think any of them went.

**The Hon. N. E. BAXTER**: It is just as well. It is a jolly good job they did not go. They would not do anything for the State.

**The Hon. A. F. Griffith**: That is why they did not go.

**The Hon. N. E. BAXTER**: I did ask the Government to go into the matter very deeply to see what could be done to reduce the costs because, if this were done, loan funds in this State could go a lot further than they do. I dealt with that matter specifically for that purpose.

I would like now to speak further on finance, not that I profess to be any expert on this matter. However, I have made a study of a document called the *Commonwealth Grants Commission Thirtieth Report (1963)* and I think it is a document that every member of this Chamber and every member of the other place should read. It does give one an insight into some of the financial aspects of the State as compared with the standard States of New South Wales and Victoria, and the other claimant State, Tasmania, particularly in relation to the Bills that impose taxes.

The commission's report contains details of the special disabilities grant made to this State. That disabilities grant is calculated in two sections. Firstly it deals with the Budget adjustments, and then it follows up with the general adjustments all through. To summarise this first section of the Grants Commission's findings in respect of the first portion of the grant, I have taken out a few figures to try to simplify how the commission arrives at the first portion of the grant of £172,000. After some correction, the Budget deficit for this particular year was £933,000.

I do not want to go into the details of the adjustments there, because they are contained in the report. From that, the commission has deducted the unfavourable adjustments, arrived at in its calculations, of some £686,000. It is rather interesting to note that in the year 1960-61 the total unfavourable adjustments were £873,000.

In the year 1961-62 there was an unfavourable adjustment of £686,000, and the big difference in those two figures was the differential impact of the financial results of business undertakings for the two years. We know that during 1960-61 the unfavourable adjustment was £687,000, and for the year 1961-62 it was £336,000. But there was also a difference in our favourable adjustments in those two years, and they came into the aspect of the severity of non-income taxation.

We know that in 1960-61 there was a favourable adjustment of £250,000, and during 1961-62 the favourable adjustment dropped, if I can use that term, to £131,000. This raises a query as to why from one year to the other we find such a severe drop in the favourable adjustments in this State.

It made me query the position and have a look at the Grants Commission report to try to arrive at the reason. From my study of the document the only answer I can get to the problem up to the present is that the Grants Commission in its report has indicated that it has ceased to take into account motor taxation as compared with the standard States. There may be one or two other items that I have not uncovered up to the present, but it brings me back to the situation that we have been told over the years that the necessity to impose increased taxation on motor vehicle owners is because of the unfavourable adjustments from the Grants Commission.

Is this story a true one? I am not blaming the Government, but when one looks at the words of the Premier, when speaking on the Estimates in another place, one begins to wonder whether even the Premier himself is not being misled in this direction.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: By whom?

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: There could be only one person who could mislead the Premier and that would be the Under-Treasurer. He is the man who should know the position.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: He does know it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: He knows it all right.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I will read what the Premier had to say in this respect—

The result of the recent move of the commission will be to require the State to use an even greater proportion of

its loan funds for deficit funding, and the compounding effect of this latest penalty could make serious inroads into future loan allocations unless steps are taken to reduce adverse adjustments.

It is for this reason that the Government has had to give serious consideration to the reduction of adverse adjustments when framing the Budget for this current year and explains why hospital fees, rail, and M.T.T. fares must rise.

The decision to impose an *ad valorem* stamp duty on the registration of new and used motor vehicles also stems from the need to reduce adverse adjustments, for the simple reason that New South Wales introduced a similar measure during last financial year.

By imposing this duty, New South Wales has altered our relative position with respect to State taxes as assessed by the Grants Commission. As a result, our adjustment for relative severity of taxation will now contain an unfavourable element on this account which we cannot afford to ignore.

I think that is clear enough; and in his speech the Premier indicated that it was necessary to impose taxation on motor vehicles to avoid further unfavourable adjustments.

The Grants Commission report in this respect stated that it had ceased to take into consideration motor taxation because it considered that as being applicable to the road finance of the State. I do not think anything can be clearer than that; yet we have the statement by the Premier which I read. I do not blame the Premier.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You are getting mixed up in two types of taxes.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I do not think I am.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I am sure you are.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I do not think I am. If the Minister reads the Grants Commission report—or if he has read it—he will find it is clear enough there; and I do not think there is any doubt about the fact that the taxes referred to are one and the same tax.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: No.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: There is one thing clear to me and that is the Under-Treasurer would not mislead the Premier.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: It seems very peculiar to me that the Premier made the statement which I read, and yet we see a statement by the Grants Commission that it has disregarded motor taxation. If the Minister for Local Government wants to justify the statement that there are two different taxes, I am quite willing to listen to him, but I cannot see how there can

be any differentiation; because the Premier referred to motor taxation, and the Grants Commission referred to motor taxation. So how can there be two different sets of motor taxation; one referred to by the Premier, and one referred to by the Grants Commission?

As I said previously, I do not put myself up as a financial expert, but when one looks at these things one asks oneself whether they are true or not; they are certainly confusing. I have always objected to motor taxation because I believe it is sectional; and when one sees these statements one begins to wonder if one, as well as Parliament, is being led up the garden path; and if we are it is a very bad thing.

I have pointed that out because I would like members to take every opportunity possible, in the limited time they have available—I know the Ministers' time is well occupied, and other members' time is limited—before the next session of Parliament to study the report closely. I have studied it, and I recommend that every other member read the report, because it is an interesting document and gives one a close insight into the financial aspects of the State, and enables us to deal more adequately with the taxation measures that are introduced. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I will have your remarks examined and let you have the information.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Thank you.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4 put and passed.

Schedules A to D put and passed.

Schedule E—

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: In this Bill, which appropriates some £94,000,000, I notice, on page 8, under the resounding title of "Mandurah Shire Council for Foreshore and River Improvement" there is the sum of £2. Can the Minister advise us the nature of the improvements?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No, except to say they are obviously very extensive!

Schedule put and passed.

Schedules F to G put and passed.

Preamble put and passed.

Title put and passed.

#### *Report*

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), and passed.

### **NATIVE WELFARE BILL**

#### *Assembly's Further Message*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it did not insist upon its further amendment, and that it had agreed to the Council's original amendment.

*Sitting suspended from 12.46 to 2.35 a.m.*

### **MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Returned*

Bill returned from the Assembly with an amendment.

#### *Assembly's Amendment: In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment made by the Assembly is as follows:—

Clause 5, page 2, line 24—Delete the word "repealed" and substitute the following passage:—

amended by adding after the word, "holding," being the last word in the section, the passage, "without the authority, in writing, of the Minister first obtained and any such authority granted may be revoked by the Minister at any time."

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I intend to ask the Committee to agree to this amendment. The amendment merely means that the provisions of section 291 are still maintained, except that the written authority of the Minister must be obtained before permission can be given. Mr. Graham moved to add the words "and any such authority granted may be revoked by the Minister at any time." That amendment was accepted by the Minister for Lands, who represents me in the Legislative Assembly.

I hope this will be a satisfactory compromise on what I can only say was an unfortunate set of circumstances. As late as today I saw certain remarks in the Press about angry scenes in the Legislative Assembly in connection with this debate. I heard one or two what I can only regard as very uncomplimentary remarks concerning me made by some members in another place.

All I can say is that it is a great pity that in trying to debate the merits and demerits of a Bill some members of Parliament have to get down to the points that were reached in connection with this debate. Personally I have no resentment

in my own mind about it: I only feel sorry for those who have to resort to this sort of thing to try to justify something that I think has just been devilled up to a point where it is intended to mean something that it does not really mean. That is unfortunate.

However, if the Committee is prepared to accept the amendment, section 291 will remain as it is, except that the Minister will be able to give permission in writing, and he will be able to revoke it if he desires so to do. The revocation of the authority is something that I personally am prepared to accept, because I think it is a good principle that if one has the authority to give something then one should have the authority to take it away, particularly in a case like this. I move—

That the amendment made by the Assembly be agreed to.

**Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.**

#### *Report*

**Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.**

### **WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Assembly's Message*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Legislative Council to the title of the Bill.

*Sitting suspended from 2.44 to 2.52 a.m.*

### **CONSTITUTION ACTS AMEND- MENT BILL (No. 2)**

#### *Returned*

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

### **CLOSE OF SESSION**

#### *Complimentary Remarks*

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [2.54 a.m.]: Mr. President, the receipt of the message you have just read to us completes the business of this House for the second session of the 24th Parliament. We are now finished with a clean notice paper, after having dealt with 95 Bills this session. I think it will be agreed by members that the Government produced quite a comprehensive range of legislation.

I cannot help feeling, personally—and I am sure my colleague, Mr. Logan, shares my sentiments—that perhaps there were too many Bills.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Hear, hear!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I never cease to wonder how it is that, from one session of Parliament to the next, Governments are

able, of necessity, to produce so much legislation. I think up to this session of Parliament, being the fifth one in which I have been in this position, we have dealt with 500 separate Bills. Not only does it constitute a great deal of work for the Ministers, but it also means a great deal of work for the Leader of the Opposition, and the members of this House who, during this session, have, as usual, made valuable contributions to the debates.

I regard this session as a satisfactory one. I must confess I am not sorry it is over, because in some respects it has been quite tiring. We have had our periods of spirited debate, but right through the session the decorum of the House has been maintained. I feel that in this respect you, Sir, are very largely responsible, by the way in which you guide and assist us in our deliberations.

Members of the House respect your high position, and co-operate with you in the exercise of the decorum of the House. I would personally like to thank you for your consideration and your help, which you appear to have so tirelessly given to my colleague, Mr. Logan, and myself in the job of work we have had to do as Ministers.

I offer my thanks to Mr. Baxter as Chairman of Committees, and to his deputies for their understanding, and for their rulings on occasions. We do not always agree with their rulings, but I thank them for their continued co-operation and help.

I thank Mr. Wise (the Leader of the Opposition) in many ways. As is only natural, he and I have on occasions severely crossed swords, but I have always known that this was from the point of view of the beliefs one holds, and the way one is prepared to stand up for those beliefs. I am always satisfied that these things are never reduced to personal issues; and when the debates are over, we have always maintained our friendly personal relationship. I am sure that all members feel as I do in this matter. We all appreciate the fact that we are able to maintain our friendly relations outside the Chamber.

I would like to thank Mr. Murray, the Whip, for the very important function he has played. The Whip in Parliament is the man with his ear to the ground, and he should be of great assistance to the Minister and to the Government. Mr. Murray has been of great assistance, and I thank him for his efforts.

I would also like to extend my sincere thanks to Mr. Roberts, and his staff, including Mr. Ashley, Mr. Hoft, Mr. Carrick, Mr. Joyner, and Mr. Sancerster. Mr. Roberts, and his staff, are always prepared to help us, and give us the advice we need, and to guide us when we are making mistakes. We are ever grateful

for their assistance. I think the little diary we received tonight was a very pleasant thought on the part of Mr. Roberts, and I would like to take the opportunity to thank him for it.

To the *Hansard* staff—who even at this point of time, I am sure, are still taking down what we are saying—we owe our thanks. I would like to express on behalf of the House, to Mr. Chinery and all of his staff, our sincere appreciation for their efforts. They work hard, as we know, even when we have to keep these long hours. They do this as their job, and they do it very well indeed.

We would not get very far without Mr. Burton the Controller of the House, and his staff, because while the hours are long sometimes, Mr. Burton's staff makes sure we are nourished and sufficiently well-fed in order to keep going.

Generally speaking, hard work and general co-operation have enabled the business of the House to be attended to, so enabling the session to be brought to a successful conclusion within a reasonable period. Even tonight we are not going to be as late as at one stage of the proceedings I thought we might be.

Before I conclude, I would like to say a special word of thanks to a section of one of my departments not very much heard of except sometimes in a critical way. I refer to the draftsman. We often hear, "Why hasn't the draftsman done this?", or, "The draftsman should have attended to that." However, I would like to assure members that in the drafting section of the department in recent weeks there have been some very red eyes. Mr. Walsh and his assistants have been prepared to work long hours to produce the Bills the Government has asked for, and I think great credit goes to those men. They realise that parliamentary work must go on; and one thing is certain—it cannot proceed unless the Bills are here. Mr. Walsh and his assistants are always anxious to help. It does not matter what time of the day or night they are phoned, they are always ready to give advice and help, and are always on the job while Parliament is in session. I would like to have my appreciation of the work they do recorded in *Hansard*.

I think it correct, too, to mention Mr. Whitely, my secretary, who helps us with this work. He works quite tirelessly to gather information which members seek. He goes to the departments to make many inquiries in respect of queries members raise on Bills, and, in a hundred other little ways, which perhaps members do not appreciate, he assists. He gathers all the information which Mr. Logan and I require to pass on to members.

I would simply like to say, in conclusion that this is one of the uneven years. When I say that, I mean that normally there would have been an election in 1964, but

that will not take place now because of the changeover. Therefore there is no occasion for me to wish those contesting seats every success. I will leave that, therefore, till next year.

I would like to take the opportunity to say to you, Mr. President, and to all the members here and those who, unfortunately, through sickness, cannot be here at the conclusion of the session, just a word of thanks and appreciation, and to wish you the very best for the coming festive season. I hope that you have a happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year, and I look forward to seeing you again at the next session of Parliament. Now this one is behind us, I feel I can say that.

In the meantime, I hope you all have a rest. I am going to try to have a short rest, one which I rather badly need. Please convey to your wives and families my very best wishes for a successful 1964.

**THE HON. F. J. S. WISE** (North—Leader of the Opposition) [3.5 a.m.]: Even things which appear interminable ultimately come to an end, and although this session has passed reasonably quickly, there have been times when the hours have dragged a little. I wish to pay a great tribute to those who have been associated with me in my party, for the great loyalty and help they have given me in a not-so-easy position. It has been a position which has at times posed some difficult problems, but these we have all accepted and shared.

With regard to the Minister leading the House, and his colleague, with whom, as the Minister for Mines has said, I sometimes cross swords—somewhat vigorously at times, and pleasantly at others—I appreciate very greatly their industry and the work they have done and the great achievements on their part in the presentation of their work to this Parliament. I was in Parliament for very many years when the Minister in charge of this House entered Parliament in another place. I think, indeed, I was the Leader of the Opposition when he entered Parliament, so it must have been a long time ago. I have watched him grow in stature to this position which he so capably occupies. His colleague also is tireless and industrious and I think he, too, has achieved much in the interests of this State, by the contribution he has made through sheer energy and the application of his ability to his tasks. We have received a lot of kindness and friendly advice from them together with a lot of help and tolerance.

About you, Sir, one can only speak in the highest terms of the manner in which you occupy the position you so graciously hold. It is not only the position that we are respectful of, in your case; it includes to such a great extent the person; and we are all, I am sure, deeply grateful for your kindly counsel and help and consideration. You know always when we err, and

we know how kindly and tolerantly you treat us. This has been a very interesting session, too, in regard to rulings from the Presidential Chair. I think you have made some wonderful rulings, Sir, and some very sound ones. I have agreed with every one of them.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They must have been good!

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: In any case, it has been a great pleasure indeed once again to work under your guidance.

I also wish to pay a tribute to the Chairman of Committees and his deputies for the way they have carried out their duties during the session.

About Mr. Roberts and his staff, one cannot speak in meagre terms of the great service they render to all of us. With no exception the whole lot of them are ever anxious to help; indeed, one has only to think of a service required, and the attention is there and the task is done. In this position, where knowing at times what we want, with very little time to obtain all that we need to carry out the task effectively, we have to lean a good deal on Mr. Roberts and his staff. Speaking for myself, I have had the utmost courtesy and kindness and generous treatment from them, and I appreciate it very much.

*Hansard*, of course, is so close to me that I have a job in talking to my colleague next to me, for I often find, when I read someone else's speech that what I have said has become an interjection. They not only render to us a very kindly service, but make quite decent addresses out of seemingly unimportant comments.

Mr. President, one could, I am sure, continue to specify, and therefore dangerously omit, many people who contribute to the conduct of Parliament—not only the controller, but all those others. To the printer, and to the other people who serve us all, we are deeply grateful; including the gentleman behind the clock who looks down upon us and who works so assiduously, but whose work it appears to me is not very generously regarded.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It is not his fault, though.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think it is not his fault; but I think it deserves a mention. Despite the unpleasantness which at times passes between individuals in this Chamber, sometimes because of ill-temper of individuals such as myself, sometimes because of strong opinions held of things for which we are fighting, there remains the respect one holds for one's opponents and their views. While we can continue to respect strongly the right of the other person to have those views, we will not go very far wrong.

I wish you, Sir, and your family the very best in this festive season, and I hope that all those who surround us and help us will

also have a happy time. I wish members one and all a happy festive Christmas season and New Year.

**THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West)**  
[3.13 a.m.]: I would like to add one name to the list already given and that is the name of a person who is retiring after having been here for 46½ years. I refer to Miss Gwendolen Watkin. I think all of us must at some time or another have felt how much we appreciate the work she has done for us all. As I have said, she will be retiring, and will be doing so before we meet again. I am sure you, Sir, would like me to add her name to the list. I wish you, yourself, all the best for the coming season.

**THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central)**  
[3.14 a.m.]: It does not seem a long time since this session started in August. Looking back over the several months that have elapsed, it is obvious that we have covered a lot of ground, and I would like to thank you, Sir, for your kindly assistance during the past months, in this my first year as Chairman of Committees. I would also like to thank the Ministers, who have co-operated very well in this respect.

Mr. Griffith raised the question of the rulings I gave this session, and the fact that he did not always agree with me. I did chalk one up last evening, because I gave a ruling which was agreed to; and that does give one a little heart.

I do wish to thank the Ministers. I realise what a really tough job they have in this Chamber, as both Ministers have to handle practically all the legislation that comes into this House; and one feels that by the end of the session, they have done a wonderful job and deserve every possible praise. Although at times there may have been a few semi-hot words between members of the Chamber and the Ministers, no-one will deny that they have done a wonderful job.

I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his kindly assistance during the year. I can tell him it was very much appreciated. I also thank the Deputy Chairmen (Mr. MacKinnon, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Lavery) very sincerely for their help during the session. They have done a sterling job in assisting me during the Committee stages. As Chairman of Committees, I have tried, as far as possible, to be fair all round. I feel that I have achieved that this year; and I have tried to make everyone happy with the situation.

To Mr. Roberts and to Mr. Ashley, I would like to express my sincere appreciation. I honestly do not know how I could have come through this session as chairman without their wonderful assistance. To the other members of the staff—Mr.

Carrick, Mr. Joyner, and Mr. Sancaster—I express my sincere appreciation for their kindness and assistance; and for the fact that if at any time I wanted anything, they did not hesitate to help me in any way.

To the *Hansard* staff I would like to express my appreciation for their assistance in connection with the speeches I made during the year. They did a very good job, and if I was not quite right on some matters they put themselves out to make sure that my remarks were put in the right perspective. To all other members of the staff I would like to express these words of appreciation. I think we have a particularly good staff here. At no stage have I found any fault with them. I express my sincere appreciation to everyone concerned.

Finally, I would like to wish you, Sir, and Mrs. Diver, and also every member in this Chamber, and the members of the staff and their wives and families a very happy Christmas and a merry and prosperous New Year.

**THE PRESIDENT** (The Hon. L. C. Diver) [3.19 a.m.]: Firstly, I would like to thank the Minister for Mines, Mr. Wise, and Mr. Baxter for their seasonal greetings extended to Mrs. Diver and myself and our family. I feel that at this time I must record the sorrow I feel at the absence from this Chamber of three of our members owing to sickness. I trust that when we meet again they will be restored to health and will be able to take an active part in the debates.

My thanks go to the Minister for Mines, to the Minister for Local Government, and to the Leader of the Opposition, as the respective spearheads of the debates in this Chamber, for the manner in which they have tempered their remarks and assisted me in order that I might maintain the decorum that this Chamber is noted for. I thank members, one and all, for the way they have conducted themselves.

At one time we might have wondered how we would get through a particular debate that was hovering over our heads and which received much Press publicity; but I am sure members will agree that the great traditions of this Chamber were maintained throughout the whole of that debate, and I am deeply grateful to all members for it.

I wish to add my thanks to those extended to Mr. Roberts, to Mr. Ashley, and to the remainder of the Legislative Council staff for the able manner in which they have assisted me in the discharge of my duties. I have endeavoured to maintain the conduct of this House at the high standard that existed when I first became President.

I would like to make mention of Miss Gwendolen Watkin, who is retiring from the position of secretary-stenographer after a lifetime of service to the institution of Parliament. I think I would be echoing the thoughts of every member when I say that she has discharged her duties with the grace becoming a lady in her position. I hope that her successor will maintain that high standard and will carry it into the future for the benefit of all concerned.

There is no question that we have passed some momentous legislation during this session; and, with the passage of time, we will see some considerable changes as a result of that legislation. It has been an honour for me to sit here as your President during the discharge of it. I am sure that in the years to come the passing of that legislation will be appreciated by the citizens of Western Australia, and they will appreciate the heights to which members rose on the occasion of the passing of it.

Mr. Wise referred to the rulings I have given during this session. They have been numerous. I trust that over the years, after I have vacated this high position, those rulings will be quoted by succeeding Presidents as having been given on sound premises.

To Mr. Burton and his staff I record the thanks of the House Committee and all members of Parliament for playing their part in the functioning of this House.

As members are aware, in the next few weeks we will see the completion of the additions to Parliament House. This is something which was started at the turn of the century when motions were passed by the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council. I venture to suggest that the sponsors of those original motions did not think that it would be 1963 before their dreams of a completed Parliament House would come to pass. It has been most interesting to occupy the position of President of the Legislative Council and Chairman of the Joint House Committee during the period of the last 18 months, at a time when all these works have been completed. Certainly it has called for extra effort beyond what might have been expected of the President; but I have enjoyed every moment of it.

I have made a lot of decisions in co-operation with the Joint House Committee. Perhaps we have made some mistakes; but when members come to consider the decisions which we have had to make, I am sure they will reach the conclusion that any mistakes which might have been made would not be very important ones.

I trust that during the next session of Parliament there will be far more interest displayed by the editors of *The West Australian*. That newspaper is largely responsible for reporting what takes place in the Legislative Council. Mr. Paddick, who is our Press representative, writes

many features and many articles on matters that are worth publicising, and while we do get some publicity I hope that we will receive considerably more next session.

I wish all members and staff a very merry Christmas. May you all be blessed with good health in the New Year, and may good luck go with you.

## ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [3.28 a.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn to a date to be fixed by the President.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 3.29 a.m. (Saturday)

# Legislative Assembly

Friday, the 6th December, 1963

	CONTENTS	Page
ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE :		
SPECIAL		3937
BILLS—		
Appropriation Bill—		
Message : Appropriation		3892
All Stages		3892
Returned		3917
Companies Act Amendment Bill—2r.		3935
Constitution Acts Amendment Bill (No. 2)—		
2r.		3917
Com. ; Report ; 3r.		3920
Drugless Practitioners Bill—		
2r.		3935
Defeated		3936
Electoral Act Amendment Bill—		
2r.		3920
Defeated		3921
Licensing Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—		
Com.		3877
Report ; 3r.		3883
Council's Message		3917
Loan Bill, £22,850,000—		
Intro. ; 1r.		3889
Message : Appropriation		3889
2r.		3889
Com.		3889
Report ; 3r.		3891
Returned		3917
Local Government Act Amendment Bill—		
2r.		3923
Defeated		3930
Medical Act Amendment Bill—Order Discharged		3936
Mining Act Amendment Bill—		
2r.		3844
Com.		3892
Report ; 3r.		3915
Council's Message		3917
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—		
2r.		3875
Com. ; Report ; 3r.		3877

	Page
Native Welfare Bill—Council's Message	3892
Physically Handicapped Children's Welfare Trust Bill—Order Discharged	3923
Physiotherapists Act Amendment Bill—Order Discharged	3936
Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—Order Discharged	3923
Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act Amendment Bill (No. 3)—	
2r.	3925
Defeated	3928
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill—	
Returned	3883
Council's Amendment	3917
CLOSE OF SESSION—	
Complimentary Remarks	3936
LOAN ESTIMATES, 1963-64—	
Com.	3883
MOTIONS—	
Appointment of Parliamentary Commissioner : Introduction of Legislation—	
Motion	3923
Defeated	3924
Constitution and Electoral Acts : Amending Legislation—	
Motion	3922
Order Discharged	3923
Electricity and Gas Supplies : Uniformity of Charges—	
Motion	3924
Defeated	3924
Fire Brigades Act : Amendment of Regulation 124—Ruled Out	3923
Metropolitan Region Development : Swan River Foreshore Reclamation—	
Council's Message	3917
Motion	3837
	3868
Onslow Town and Port : Rehabilitation—	
Motion	3930
Defeated	3935
Town Planning and Development Act : Disallowance of Regulations—	
Motion	3924
Order Discharged	3925
Zoning of Western Australia—Extension of Concessions to 30th Parallel	3921
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Albany Harbour Development—Availability of Master Plan	3830
Artificial Insemination—	
Importation of Semen from Eastern States	3828
Services of Government Inseminators	3829
B.H.P., Kwinana—Rail Freight Concession to Eastern States	3828
Bread Doughs—Action against P. A. Tolcan : Tabling of File	3833
Bridge Over Hotham River—Reason for Slow Progress, and Completion Date	3829
Education—	
Banksiadale School : Future Plans	3829
Carlisle Students : Attendance at Governor Stirling High School, and Transport	3831
Dwellingup School : Accommodation of Children from Banksiadale	3829
Education on Pastoral Stations : Need for Increased Subsidy	3834