compensation, or *ex gratia* payment—we all know what we are talking about—is if he can show his innocence.

I have already said that I do not accept this situation at all because I believe, as most people do, if one is not guilty one is innocent, and that is it. However, as Mr. Dodd points out, if Sir Marcus had this material before him—and it could have been put before him even if we had to put it in an envelope and send it to some undisclosed destination—would he not have come to the same conclusion as the former Chief Crown Prosecutor?

We now claim there is ample reason, as the motion indicates, to justify the Government reconsidering the question. As I have tried to point out, the fact of Gouldham being found not guilty ought to be enough. For those who think that is not enough—and in this we seem to be out on a limb in the spectrum of world opinion—then let these documents be read. Let us belatedly and reluctantly show to the people of Western Australia that Gouldham is innocent, and make amends. That is all I ask.

It seems to me that in recent times people from the political sphere have shown a sudden interest in the young people. I imagine they will show a greater interest in the months and years ahead. It seems to me that the young people are protesting because they hear a lot of words about democracy and what is fair and proper and what should be done, but when they look about them they are unable to see the manifestations of those words.

If we are not careful this view will extend to the Parliament. If, in Parliament, we talk about democratic principles and fair dealings, and if we get a basic case in which to manifest what we express, then we should take some action or we will certainly lose the confidence of the young people. The young people are not always wrong, and I certainly do not say that they are always right; but that is something of a digression. Here we have the opportunity not only to show the young people what is right, but to show all the people what is right: that one does not merely become enmeshed in the establishment — the administration — but that if one makes out a case one has a chance that people in authority will listen. If those people in authority, having listened to that case, will grant a person his just and proper deserts, that is all I have ever asked for. I have asked for no more, and I certainly trust that the House will carry the motion and before long proper amends will be made so that we can forget this business once and for all.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Works).

House adjourned at 10.26 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 8th October, 1970

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

QUESTIONS (15): ON NOTICE

1. MINING

Temporary Reserve No. 2686

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE, to the Minister for Mines:

With reference to Temporary Reserve No. 2686, will the Minister supply the following information:—

(a) has Reserve No. 26890, National Park at Tunnel Creek, ever been declared by the Governor open to mining;

(b) if so, on what date was the notice gazetted;

(c) during each of the periods—

(i) July, 1967, to June, 1969; and

(ii) July, 1969, to June, 1970—

were the terms and conditions of the Temporary Reserve ever applicable to the National Park at Tunnel Creek;

(d) are such terms applicable to the area referred to in (c) at the present time?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(a) No.

(b) Answered by (a).

(c) Temporary Reserve 2686H was created on the 21st March, 1963 and National Park Reserve 26890 was created on the 19th July, 1963. Therefore, the Temporary Reserve was in existence prior to the Land Act Reserve, and no conditions were required as the land was Crown Land under the Mining Act at that time. However, to protect Reserve 26890 it was subsequently excised from the Temporary Reserve in 1968 when application for renewal was dealt with.

(d) Answered by (c).

2. *This question was postponed.*

3. EDUCATION

Gosnells Primary School

The Hon. J. DOLAN, to the Minister for Mines:

(1) Does the Government intend to add the third room to the first section of the cluster classrooms

complex which was occupied at the Gosnells Primary School at the beginning of this year?

(2) If so, when can it be expected that this project will be commenced?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) No.

(2) Further additions at Gosnells school are not contemplated as there is adequate accommodation for anticipated enrolments in 1971.

4. MINING

Temporary Reserve No. 4989

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE, to the Minister for Mines:

Would the Minister supply the following information regarding Temporary Reserve No. 4989—

(a) Reservation—

(i) date of approval by the Minister;

(ii) date of confirmation by the Governor;

(b) occupancy—

(i) date of application;

(ii) date of authorisation by the Minister;

(iii) date of approval by the Governor;

(iv) date of gazettal;

(v) terms and conditions, if any, and were such passed by a resolution of Parliament; and

(vi) date of renewal and Tabling in Parliament?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(a) Reservation—

(i) The 22nd May, 1969.

(ii) The 13th August, 1969.

(b) Occupancy—

(i) The 30th October, 1968.

(ii) The 22nd May, 1969.

(iii) The 13th August, 1969.

(iv) The 22nd August, 1969.

(v) The usual terms and conditions to protect prior interests (copy attached); these were not passed by a Resolution of Parliament as this is not necessary, as in all cases confirmation of Temporary Reserves are laid on the Table.

(vi) The Temporary Reserve has not been renewed. The Company signified in writing that it did not wish to apply for renewal of the occupancy rights, and action for cancellation of the reserve is being taken.

Note.—By Clause 8(4) (e) of the Iron Ore (Nimingarra) Agreement Act the State had an obligation to assist the Company to acquire prospecting rights for limestone and dolomite for which the occupancy rights of Temporary Reserve 4989H were granted.

5. CONSERVATION

Injured Fauna

The Hon. N. McNEILL, to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

In view of the considerable steps that are being taken to conserve this State's native wildlife by the provision of laws for their protection, and the maintenance of reserves and sanctuaries, is any special attention directed to the care of sick or injured fauna?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

The Fauna Conservation Act provides that the wild native fauna should be protected and conserved. To this end, funds as approved by Parliament are allocated annually to the Department of Fisheries and Fauna. These funds are not unlimited and the Department must allocate them to those aspects of conservation and protection which its officers consider most important and urgent.

Except in the case of rare species, the caring for sick, injured and derelict individual animals cannot be said to be of first importance in the preservation of species. It must rank, for example, below such things as the acquisition, care and management of sanctuaries, the control of commercial exploitation and the research work necessary to show how best these things can be done.

There is no doubt, however, that care of unfortunate animals is a most laudable pursuit, nor that a large section of the public expects such a service to be available. To date it has been provided by volunteers who have devoted their own time and money to their self-imposed tasks. Two such persons are Mrs. A. B. Anderson of Bicton, and Miss C. A. Nicholls, of Dalkeith, who have at great personal sacrifice of their own slender financial resources been active in this work for more than a decade.

The Department has encouraged the efforts of these people and provided them with some financial assistance. It has also published brochures on how to care for sick and injured fauna, and co-operated in their collection and ultimate release.

More recently the Government agreed to assist the R.S.P.C.A. with an initial grant of $4,000 to erect a treatment room, holding yards and cages so that they could provide a skilled and humanitarian care for sick and injured wild life on a long term basis. In addition the Government agreed to provide $1,500 each year towards running costs.

Unfortunately, after the R.S.P.C.A. had had the necessary plans drawn up for the extension of its premises at Belmont, the Society was refused permission to proceed by the Shire of Belmont. Further representations have recently been made to the Shire, but the Council has remained adamant in its refusal to allow the Society to extend its premises.

The position now stands that the R.S.P.C.A. has regretfully had to refuse to accept responsibility for this laudable humane community service which would be best provided by a voluntary organisation with some Government assistance.

6. EDUCATION

South Kalgoorlie Primary School

The Hon. J. J. GARRIGAN, to the Minister for Mines:

(1) Was the South Kalgoorlie Parents and Citizens' Association advised by the Minister for Education in June of this year that a three room cluster for the South Kalgoorlie Primary School was listed as a top priority on the replacement list for the 1970-71 financial year?

(2) If so, to what stage has the planning progressed?

(3) When is it expected that work will commence?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) A commission was issued to a private architect on the 6th October, 1970.

(3) Preliminary discussions have been held but no date has been set for tenders to be called.

7. NATIVES

Trackers: Employment

The Hon. R. THOMPSON (for the Hon H. C. Strickland), to the Minister for Mines:

On what wages or salaries and conditions are Aboriginal trackers engaged?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

No regular Aboriginal trackers are employed, but are engaged on a basis of $6.00 per day when required.

8. EDUCATION

School Canteens

The Hon. J. DOLAN, to the Minister for Mines:

With reference to the Press reports on the 25th September, 1970, that the Government was increasing the subsidy on approved Government School Canteens from one-third of the cost with a maximum of $4,000, to one-half of the cost with a maximum of $5,000—

(a) will this increased subsidy apply to canteens approved for construction after the 1st July, 1970; and

(b) if not, what will be the commencing date of the proposed new subsidy?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(a) No.

(b) The 1st January, 1971.

9. ROADS

Murchison-Eyre Electorate

The Hon. G. E. D. BRAND, to the Minister for Mines:

As the Main Roads Department has taken over several main connecting roads in the Murchison-Eyre Electorate, can the Minister advise what action is anticipated to upgrade the following roads which are, at present, in a very poor and dangerous condition:—

(a) Meekatharra to Port Hedland;

(b) Meekatharra to Wiluna; and

(c) Wiluna to Leonora?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(a) to (c) In regard to the Meekatharra-Port Hedland Road, a recent inspection by engineers of the Main Roads Department indicated that for this type of road it was in a reasonable condition.

It must be appreciated that in order to provide improved access to the Pilbara the Main Roads Department has given first priority to the reconstruction and sealing of North West Coastal Highway. Nevertheless substantial funds are still being allocated for the Meekatharra-Port Hedland Road, and in the current programme of works the Department allocated $330,000 for construction improvement

works and $160,000 for maintenance. It can be confidently anticipated that further substantial funds for progressively upgrading and maintaining this road will be provided in future programmes of works.

The other roads—Meekatharra-Wiluna and Wiluna-Leonora—form part of the Kalgoorlie-Meekatharra main road and at the present time are relatively lightly trafficked. There are no plans for major upgrading of this road. Nevertheless, funds are being allocated for both improvement and maintenance. In the Department's current programme $50,000 has been set aside for this work. The Main Roads Department arranged for the various local authorities to carry out maintenance grading of the section of the road in their Shires. However, due to the fact that their plant was committed for work on their local road systems they have only just started spending the funds allocated by the Department. This work is now in hand and should result in a much improved running top.

All these roads will be kept under constant review, and the Main Roads Department will continue to allocate funds in future programmes for both improvement works and maintenance.

10. MEDICAL FACILITIES

Walpole District

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Health:

(1) Has a survey of the Walpole district been recently made to assess the need to establish medical facilities in that area?

(2) If so—

(a) how was the survey conducted;

(b) what were the recommendations made; and

(c) is it intended to establish medical facilities at Walpole in the near future?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

(1) At the request of the Medical Department the Silver Chain Nursing Association has been conducting an investigation into the need for, and possibility of establishing, a Nursing Centre at Walpole.

(2) (a) By Officers of the Silver Chain Nursing Association visiting Walpole.

(b) Up to this time the investigation indicates that a nurse could be occupied only part time because the work load would not require a full time appointment. However, the investigation is not yet finalised as the Association is awaiting comments from a private medical practitioner who serves the area.

(c) No decision has been made yet.

11. EDUCATION

Non-Government Primary Schools

The Hon. J. DOLAN, to the Minister for Mines:

(1) Is the Minister aware that some efficient non-Government primary schools are experiencing financial difficulties because of the delayed payment of the second moiety of the $20 per capita annual Government subsidy?

(2) As this involves the obtaining, by many of these schools, of a bank overdraft of some thousands of dollars for teacher payments and ordinary running costs, is it possible for payment of this Government commitment to be expedited?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Departmental procedures are being examined with a view to expediting payments.

12. AIR TRANSPORT

Jets: North-West

The Hon. G. W. BERRY, to the Minister for Mines:

(1) Is the Carnarvon Airport suitable for the operation of the F.28 Fellowships?

(2) If so, when is it anticipated that the pure jet service will commence?

(3) When is it anticipated that the F.28 Fellowship jets will be operating to and from Learmonth?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) No, but up-grading and installation of technical equipment to meet "F28" requirements is at present being undertaken by the Department of Civil Aviation. It is anticipated that the work will be completed before the end of December.

(2) It is intended that Carnarvon will be included in the pure jet service as soon as practicable after the completion of the work.

(3) I am informed that the Commonwealth Government is considering plans to develop the Learmonth Aerodrome to meet the requirements of the R.A.A.F. The use of

Learmonth by civil jet aircraft will depend upon the progress of the plans but I am not able to advise when this will be.

13. HOSPITAL

Bridgetown

The Hon. V. J. FERRY, to the Minister for Health:

In respect of the Bridgetown Hospital—

(a) is it planned to effect additions and improvements on the present site;

(b) if so, what is the nature of the proposed work, and when will it be carried out;

(c) is a new site being investigated;

(d) if so, what localities are under consideration; and

(e) can any indication be given as to the future medical facilities likely to be provided at Bridgetown, bearing in mind modern treatment needs and the care of the aged in the community?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

(a) No.

(b) Not applicable.

(c) Yes.

(d) Only one locality is being investigated—part of the area bounded by Williams, Hampton and Campbell Streets and Peninsula Road.

(e) When the site is secured it is intended to plan a new acute hospital to replace the existing hospital. Consideration will then be given to the future use of the existing hospital bearing in mind other health needs.

14. EDUCATION

Stencil Cutters

The Hon. J. DOLAN, to the Minister for Mines:

Is there any subsidy payable to a Government school on the purchase of a stencil cutter for school use?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

No.

15. FAUNA PROTECTION ACT

Royalties

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON, to the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

What royalties were paid during the September quarter, 1970, under the Fauna Protection Act?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

Nil.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Election of The Hon. W. F. Willesee

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [2.49 p.m.]: I move—

That in view of the resignation of the Hon. H. C. Strickland from the Standing Orders Committee, the Hon W. F. Willesee be elected to serve on the Committee pursuant to Standing Order No. 37.

It is not usual for me to stand up and read a motion like this one. The usual practice is to say, "I move the motion standing in my name." However, this is a matter on which I would like to make some brief comment because of the reason for the motion.

It is an unfortunate state of affairs that Mr. Strickland has found it necessary to tender to you, Sir, his resignation as a member of the Standing Orders Committee, and I consider that the appreciation of members of the House for the work that Mr. Strickland has performed on the committee over a considerable period of time now should be recorded; and I would simply like that to be done. I feel sure I am expressing the sentiments of every member in this Chamber.

Mr. Strickland has returned to his duties as a member of Parliament, and I trust he will be with us for a long time to come serving Parliament in other respects even though he finds it impossible to carry on as a member of the Standing Orders Committee.

Question put and passed.

BILLS (2): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act Amendment Bill.

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

2. Marketable Securities Transfer Bill.

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

STATE FORESTS

Revocation of Dedication: Assembly's Resolution

Message from the Assembly requesting the Council's concurrence in the following resolution now considered:—

That the proposal for the partial revocation of State Forests Nos. 14, 30 and 65 laid on the Table of the Legislative Assembly by command of His Excellency the Governor on 22nd September, 1970, be carried out.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [2.52 p.m.]: I move—

> That the proposal for the partial revocation of States Forests Nos. 14, 36 and 65, laid on the Table of this House by command of His Excellency the Governor on Tuesday, the 6th October, 1970, be carried out.

On the motion of the Minister for Forests in another place, a resolution has been passed to the effect that the proposals for the partial revocation of State Forests Nos. 14, 36, and 65, laid on the Table of the House by command of His Excellency the Governor be carried out and that such resolution be transmitted to this Chamber for the concurrence of members therein.

In support of this motion, I inform members that three areas are involved as described in lithos and plans already tabled in this House. They will provide members with a detailed description of the lands concerned.

Briefly, these papers make reference in the first instance to a proposal comprising two areas totalling 32 acres sought for exchange by adjoining holders in order to allow easier management of their property by having it all on the western side of the surveyed road.

The acquisition of the eastern portion of Murray Location 202, which is almost all cleared and plantable to pines, will give the Forests Department a more tenable western boundary to the plantation from a fire control point of view.

The next proposal covers an area of about 14 acres sought for exchange by adjoining holders in order to extend their property from the old abandoned road survey to the newly aligned Vasse Highway. The area of State forest to be released is badly infected with jarrah dieback.

The private property which is offered in exchange adjoins the State forest boundary and has a much greater potential being well stocked with good karri regrowth. Its acquisition will simplify fire protection in an area of high scenic value by bringing the State forest boundary to Davidson Road.

The remaining proposal refers to an area of about 700 acres which overlaps the Commonwealth special lease for defence purposes. The Commonwealth has been in occupation of the area for many years when it was inadvertently included in the dedication of State Forest No. 65 in 1959. Permanent improvements made in the area by the Commonwealth include a rifle range, a road, and portion of a landing strip. The area is outside the rationalised pine planting boundary and contains no millable timber. I commend the proposals to the House.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [2.55 p.m.]: I simply wish briefly to indicate that I have had the opportunity to examine the proposals contained in the motion before the House and they meet with my approval. I support the motion as it stands.

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

ROAD AND AIR TRANSPORT COMMISSION 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 to 6 put and passed.

Clause 7: Section 47B added—

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

> Page 4, line 24—Insert after the word "licence" a passage as follows:—
>
> except where in relation to any particular licence or particular renewal of a licence, the Minister by instrument in writing directs that the licence or the renewal shall be granted for such period in excess of three years as the Minister specifies in the instrument

I foreshadowed this amendment when I replied to the debate on the second reading. Members may recollect that at the time I commented that the measure presently provides for permits to be issued for single voyages and for licenses to be given for up to a three-year period.

When I spoke the other evening I mentioned the case of the Cockburn cement ship *Clevedon* and said that the State Shipping Service could not satisfactorily handle cargoes of bulk cement to the north. The Government desires to keep the price of cement down through the process of bulk handling. The *Clevedon* is capable of performing this service and it is because of this that the ship has been in operation on the coast.

The company is about to order a ship costing $2,500,000 to replace the *Clevedon*. This ship will provide a much more efficient service to the north. The Government is anxious that the north should enjoy the benefits of this service.

I am sure the Committee would agree that a license for a three-year period only would not warrant the expenditure of such an outlay.

The adoption by the Committee of the amendment I have moved will give to the Minister discretion to grant a permit for a period of more than three years. I think this is something the Committee would readily agree to in the circumstances.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Before you sit down: Does this vessel carry bulk cement only?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am told the vessel is being constructed for that purpose. I am unable to tell the honourable member whether the vessel can carry anything else, but I understand its principal purpose is the carriage of bulk cement. The note I have is that the company is about to order a $2,500,000 ship which will replace the *Clevedon* and will give a much more efficient service to the north; we are anxious for this to be done. The *Clevedon* is a bulk cement carrier.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 8: Section 47C added—

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

> Page 5, line 13—Add after the passage "cargo;" a passage as follows—
>
> or
>
> (iii) the cargo to be carried by the ship in the course of the coasting trade to which the licence or permit will relate and which is specified in the application for the licence or permit is cargo of such a kind that requires for the purpose of its loading onto, carriage in, or unloading from, the ship, specialised equipment that is in operation in the State for the purpose on the commencement of this section.

The wording of the amendment indicates that the cargo the vessel which is to be licensed for a period longer than three years is to carry has to be specified in the application. The amendment to this clause will be dependent upon the provisions of the new section 47B, in clause 7 of the Bill.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 9 to 12 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 5)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 6th October.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [3.04 p.m.]: When the Minister introduced the Bill he drew attention to several features that were part and parcel of the proposals. On examination of the measure I find that the amendments are of particular importance to many fields of local government. Therefore, the whole proposal establishes itself in my mind as being important, and I hope members will pay particular attention to the legislation in the course of the discussions on the measure in this Chamber.

I shall not deal with all the clauses of the Bill, but there are several which I feel are of sufficient importance to warrant comment. It will be necessary for me to refer to the Bill in much the same way as the Minister did when he introduced it—clause by clause—because it is one of those measures that cannot be dealt with in a general way. Almost every clause deals with a different subject.

In the first instance, the proposal to give continuity of operation to the Boundaries Commission by the appointment of deputy members is a sound idea. If this organisation is to undergo a good deal of work in the future it is essential for it to be given every opportunity to work on a continuing basis with deputies acting when necessary. The fact that the Bill provides for the appointment of deputy members will ensure continuity of operation.

However, I am not particularly in favour of the provisions in clause 4; in fact, I could say that I do not like the clause. The Minister said that eligibility for membership of a council includes an owner, irrespective of whether his name appears on the roll or not. I did not know that was the case.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It has always been the case.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: As a matter of fact, the Minister quoted the Act as it stands at present. The portion of section 35 to which the Minister referred, which he quoted, reads as follows:—

> A person who—
>
> (c) is either an owner of rateable land within the district of the municipality or occupier of rateable land within the district whose name appears on the electoral roll thereof.

Under no circumstances could I accept the view that even though he is not on the electoral roll a person is entitled to representation on the shire simply because he is an owner or occupier. If that is to be the position, at what point do we establish ownership of a property?

Let us say that the rolls have closed and it has been established who are to vote at a particular local government election. If a property changes hands after the shire rolls are closed, how do we establish that the new owner is entitled to stand for election as a representative on the shire?

If we say that it is occupation of the premises, he could still occupy the premises and not be the owner. He could be a prospective owner, but he may not be the owner. How could the returning officer establish that fact? Would we say a man is the owner if he signs a contract of sale

but does not have occupation of the property, although he will have occupation at some point of time after the elections or one day before the elections? Who will take the responsibility of accepting his nomination in a case like that? Does the returning officer wait until the man comes forward and says, "I am not on the electoral roll; I am a new resident in the area, but I can produce a certificate of title for the premises"? I suppose that would be complete proof that he was the owner of the property.

However, what a responsibility is thrown onto the returning officer of the shire! It is all very well for the Minister to say that this has been the position for years, but in principle it has never been known to exist, otherwise we would never have operated under section 35 (1) (c), which clearly and emphatically states that his name shall appear on the electoral roll.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Are you not forgetting the words, "is either an owner . . . or occupier of rateable land . . . whose name appears on the electoral roll"?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: Yes, the owner and the occupier of the ratable land at the time of the election. But if he is not on the roll does the Minister contend that he can just walk up to the returning officer and say he is on the shire roll?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It has always operated that way.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: But it has never operated that way.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Yes it has; always.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I will cite the position of an oil firm which has a branch in the country and nominates its local manager to have the right to vote for the company in respect of the property it owns. He has his name placed on the roll for a particular lot. He is then transferred and the new local manager occupies the premises. Has he a moral right to say to the returning officer, "I claim the right to be elected for this shire. I want to be eligible to vote"? Has he this right, despite the fact that the previous local manager of the firm had his name on the roll at the time it was established?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They are two different sections.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I will leave them to the Minister to explain, but I would point out to him that he will get himself into a great deal of trouble if he places on the returning officer the responsibility to accept a nomination which is not clear. He has no opportunity to say, "I cannot accept your nomination for this particular reason." At present he can say, "You are not on the electoral roll. You are entitled to be on it. This is the method that has been established to enable your name to be placed on it, but until you follow that method I cannot accept your nomination."

Clause 5 of the Bill can be regarded as being in two parts. The Minister quoted a specific instance in connection with the West Kimberley Shire. He said a person could be on a station 183 miles from a polling booth and although he desired a vote he could not obtain it because there were no wards in the single entity of the shire. I should imagine that a similar situation would apply in other instances. The provision in the Bill seeking to overcome this problem is a good one.

However, further on in the clause we find a proposal to change the provision for the application of a postal vote and to adopt the principle that is embodied in the Electoral Act. For this purpose, I am not convinced that the provisions of the Electoral Act are as good as those in the Local Government Act. If a person were five miles away from a polling booth in a shire which did not have wards, I think it is reasonable to assume that an application for a postal vote could be submitted to the returning officer on the day of the election. I will cite an example I have in mind. Still speaking of the West Kimberley Shire, it could be that 15 miles outside Derby is situated a Main Roads Department camp in which there are a dozen local people who have the right to vote. They would be at the camp on the day of the election. They would be advised of the election by the base engineer or some other such person.

It is quite probable that one of the men would be going into town to obtain stores and in doing so he could take all the applications of the men living in that camp on the day of the election to the returning officer so that they would be lodged on that day for voting purposes. However, if we adopt the proposal contained in clause 5, such nominations would have to be lodged one day before election day. The difficulty under this proposal is that these men will have to come into the camp on election day, or apply the day before. For obvious reasons they would not apply the day before, because they would be at work, and no doubt scattered over a wide area. Probably one man would be working on a grader, and another on a tractor, and so on. They would only come into the camp on the day of the election, which is normally a Saturday. Also I do not think they could be expected to take an interest in a local government election that was mentioned to them on that day.

If we desire to create an interest in local government it is our duty to streamline the function of elections; to make it easy for ratepayers to exercise their voting privileges; to streamline the organisation generally so that no hardship is imposed on the voter, and to ensure that a clean election is conducted.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Are you assuming that these men go into the camp only a couple of days before the election?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: I am assuming they have been in the camp for three or four months.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: There is plenty of time for them to know what is going on.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: They might come into the camp only at the time when the election is imminent. Generally, before election day there are various indications that an election is about to be held. For example, a polling booth is erected, and people are often running around with placards and issuing pamphlets. It is this activity that promotes interest. The people could not care less about a local government election on a Saturday, but a good deal of enthusiasm is engendered from Monday until the Saturday by people who are interested in their own issues when they begin to move around.

It does not matter much whether my assumption is wrong on one, two, or three occasions, but if such a situation occurs even now and again, why change the basis? Why not let the position remain as fluid as possible so that a person who wants to vote in a local government election can be given every opportunity to do so, simply and effectively?

The provision in clause 7 of the Bill which deals with authorised witnesses of absent votes is not basically different from the provision which now appears in the Act; at least the provision in clause 7 will be consistent with the provision which now appears in the Electoral Act, and will be similarly worded. If we analyse the existing provision in the Act and the one to be substituted we will find that they are differently worded.

Clause 8 deals with the qualifications of witnesses, and with the actions of supporters of a candidate in the period before an election. I suppose this clause in the Bill has aroused the greatest amount of public interest. In fact, the first account of the Bill to appear in the Press was headed, "Bill Introduced to Amend Vote Procedures." As I have endeavoured to illustrate, the measure contains much more than that.

In the leading article of *The West Australian* of today the following appears:—

> Timid reform
>
> The State Government's steps to exclude candidates from absentee-voting procedures fall a long way short of the need to improve the electoral provisions of the Local Government Act.
>
> It is quite right to debar candidates from posting or delivering absentee-voting papers to a returning officer and from acting for an absentee voter who cannot vote without assistance. To minimise the possibility of votes being manipulated candidates should be excluded from all duties involving handling of ballot papers, but so should their canvassers or agents.

It refers to this particular issue in the Bill as a timid reform. The leading article concludes by saying—

> The remedy lies in making the State electoral authority responsible for local government rolls and elections.

That thought has much to commend it.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Which one?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: That elections be conducted by a single authority set up by the State Electoral Office.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: What about canvassers?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: With regard to that aspect we cannot make the provision strong enough to cover the actions of canvassers. The provision in the Bill is a step forward, but I would like to see it extended. I do not contend that by making provision in the Local Government Act or in the Electoral Act we will be able to stop completely the actions of certain people who think they can beat the law. Where it is explicitly laid down in legislation that a person shall not do something, but nevertheless he does it with his eyes wide open then he must suffer the consequences.

In regard to canvassers I wonder whether a right should be conferred on them to enable them to persist in worrying other people at election time. The public has a definite dislike for canvassers, because in many cases they are over-persistent in their efforts, and the elderly and timid resent such behaviour. In many cases I doubt whether people really exercise their will freely when they vote at elections—at State elections or local government elections.

I certainly do not oppose the provisions in clause 8. In view of the fact that the Minister has projected further legislation I hope he has it in mind to look into this matter more closely and will provide tighter guidelines in the future.

The amendment in clause 9 was brought about as a result of a query raised by the Institute of Municipal Administration. This is an amendment to section 174 of the Act, and is a very good one. It seeks to extend the principle that a member of a council, who has a pecuniary interest in an issue being discussed, shall not be entitled to vote. The provision in clause 9 goes further, and extends the principle to any member of a committee who has a pecuniary interest in an issue being dealt with; and if this clause is agreed to such member of a committee will not be able to vote.

This is a good provision, and it seems strange that we passed the original Act without including it. I think at the time it was felt by members that there was a

moral obligation on members of committees to refrain from voting when they had a pecuniary interest in the issues under discussion, but it was not spelt out in the legislation.

Clause 10 refers, in a particular way, to the Fremantle Cemetery Board which will become non-existent after the passage of this legislation. Mr. Dolan was good enough to look into this matter, and he has assured me that the amendment is exactly along the lines requested by the board. For that reason I have no criticism of it.

The provision in clause 11 rather intrigues me, especially when the Minister had gone sufficiently far into the question to be able to say, "I have given some further consideration to this matter and will possibly seek an amendment at the appropriate time to enable the matter to be first referred to a meeting of the full council before any reference is made to the Minister." This deals with the case where a committee does not agree to a substitute leader. I think the provision before us is quite cumbersome.

As I understand the position, if a committee meets and the members cannot resolve among themselves as to who shall be appointed as deputy leader, then this procedure will be followed: Failure to elect a deputy leader is reported to the Minister; the Minister then orders the calling of a special meeting of all the members previously involved; those members meet again for the same purpose of dealing with a matter in respect of which they had locked horns; if the situation is not resolved at the special meeting ordered by the Minister, he then nominates one of the members to be the person in charge.

I turn once again to the words of the Minister, "I have given some further consideration to this matter and will possibly seek an amendment at the appropriate time to enable the matter to be first referred to a meeting of the full council before any reference is made to the Minister." I think that would be a good thing, but I do not believe it is too onerous to spell out the procedure in the Bill.

The present procedure has been incorporated in the Bill as a matter of convenience. This requires the same people to meet again to deal with a question which has already been debated with negative results. I should point out that in the ultimate the Minister will do what he had in mind before he received the report. If the members lock horns again at the special meeting the Minister will be able to exercise his right to nominate someone; or, alternatively—I believe this to be the better method—submit the matter to the council with the direction that if the members do not resolve the matter themselves the Minister will nominate somebody.

In that regard I think the amendment would have been much tidier had the Minister included in this Bill the idea he has foreshadowed for some future legislation.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I was waiting to hear some debate; I do not expect this Bill to go through this afternoon.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: Clause 12 of the Bill applies to the City of Fremantle. That authority wants the principle of "owner-onus" to be applied with regard to parking by-laws. I have studied the clause closely and I think it is quite clear. The provision applies only to parking by-laws.

Clause 12 deals with the closure of private streets, and seems to me to be rather drastic in that it allows for several people and, I should imagine, businesses, to be concerned in the closure of a street. The law at present allows a street to be closed and the land to be adjoined on one particular title. That title could be held by one person. I realise the difficulties which could obtain in many cases, but I can read nothing in the proposed legislation, nor in the Act, that provides that there should be complete agreement between all the interested parties.

If a right-of-way is divided it is only logical that each person whose land adjoins the right-of-way should have a share of the land which is affected. I do not intend to presume that there would always be a difficulty, but a syndicate of people could own a piece of land and there could be disagreement unless there is provision that before the title to the land is given to a single person, or company, others interested in the adjoining land have signified their agreement to the situation. In other words, the other people concerned will know what is happening at the time, and not be acquainted of the details after the transaction has gone through. That is generally the point where litigation begins.

I would be very interested to hear the Minister's views on this point. There should be some provision for agreement between all interested parties in all cases where land, which is divisible, is given *in toto* to one person.

The final clause in the Bill will delete from the Act the necessity to advertise the rate of interest proposed to be paid on a loan. That is not how the Minister presented the situation, although his reasons were quite clear and sound. I agree with the Minister that having once advertised a loan at a certain rate of interest, it should not be necessary to readvertise if the rate of interest creeps up by a half per cent. in the course of negotiations.

However, if we delete the words set out in the Bill there will be no reason for a shire to advertise the rate of interest at which it intends to borrow money. There should be a reference to the interest rate—it

could be quoted minimum to maximum—because the people should know the amount involved. From an advertisement people should be able to work out what a loan will cost them over a given number of years.

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to absorb any fluctuation or variation of interest rate during negotiations, but if the amendment is passed we will delete from the Act any necessity to advertise the interest rate. I think that would be bad. The interest rate is required in an advertisement concerning a loan because it is of public interest within the shire. Present interest rates make this an important factor, and it could be that the rate of interest could lead to the loan being challenged.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: The rate of interest is laid down at the time of the loan.

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE: The point raised by the Minister is that if a shire advertised a loan at 7 per cent., and the rate of interest rose to 8 per cent. by the time the loan was negotiated, there should be no necessity to advertise again. However, if we delete the words referred to in the clause there will be no other reference in the Act to the rate of interest.

Those are my views on the proposed amendments to the legislation. In some respects I think the Bill does not go far enough, and I do not like some of the provisions. However, the Bill is an attempt to do something in many directions. It seems to me we should proceed with caution, and I would be interested to hear further comment from members after they have examined the various clauses of the measure.

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan) [3.37 p.m.]: I wish to restrict my comments to clause 13 of the Bill. The clause deals with the division of a private street, or a right-of-way amongst adjoining owners. The reference in the Bill is to a private street, but private streets are commonly referred to as rights-of-way.

Clause 13 of the Bill provides that a division may be made of a private street in favour of one owner, rather than amongst several owners. Section 297A of the Act, as it now stands provides that a council may by resolution decide that a private street should be closed. A plan is prepared showing the various lots which abut or adjoin the private street, and a notice in writing is sent to the adjoining owners and various other people showing what is proposed. The plan which is sent out indicates to whom the right-of-way or street is to be made available.

The plan goes out to the adjoining owners, and under the present section in the Act those owners have 30 days in which to lodge objection to the proposal that the street be closed, or to the proposal set out in the plan. The present problem arises because the section refers to division amongst those owners of the land which abuts the private street. Because of the reference to those owners in the plural, it has been found by the local authorities that it is not possible to make an allotment of a street to one owner.

Clearly, a street cannot be divided amongst one person. The proposal is for an allotment of the whole of the street to one person. In the past local authorities have found it desirable, for planning or other reasons, to make an allotment of the street or to make the street available on a freehold basis to one of the adjoining owners rather than to all of the adjoining owners, but they have been unable to do so under the existing wording of section 297A.

The present plan is embodied in clause 13 of the Bill, which provides a new subsection (11), of which paragraph (b) reads as follows:—

> (b) a reference, however expressed, to a proposal for the division of, or the division of, land comprising a private street among certain owners of other land shall be construed as including a proposal for the transfer of, or the transfer of, the land comprising a private street to any one such owner.

In other words, if this Bill becomes law, it will be possible, where there is a private street or way, for a local authority to allot that street to one of a number of adjoining owners.

I can see that in certain circumstances that could be quite a reasonable solution to what might be a difficult problem. There may well be a private right-of-way or street in some part of the State which has a number of blocks adjoining it, and the street might not be used by anybody—it might be a menace or it might grow weeds and nobody looks after it; it might harbour the usual perils that one finds in private streets and right-of-ways. It might be desirable that the street be closed. I can well believe that there are circumstances in which, from a municipal point of view, it is highly desirable that a street should be closed.

I can also believe that Parliament, when it passed section 297A in 1964, in its wisdom decided that such a right-of-way or private street should be divided amongst the adjoining owners. What could be more reasonable? I can go a step further and concede that Parliament might then have provided that in the discretion of the local authority it could be allotted to one of the adjoining owners, if the local authority considered that perhaps one of the adjoining owners had a greater right to it than any of the others, or that one of the adjoining owners might make better use of it,

or that from a municipal or planning point of view it was desirable to put the street into one title rather than into several.

I can therefore concede that when Parliament passed the 1964 amendment it might have included just such a provision as we now see. I do not quarrel with the idea behind this proposal but, having looked more closely into the section, I find it rather obnoxious that there is no provision whatever for the local authority to give any reasons for its decision when it reaches this conclusion and makes this resolution, nor is there any right of appeal for any owner who might feel himself aggrieved. It is true he can lodge his objections with the local authority within 30 days. When the plan goes out to the adjoining owners—and I have here such a plan, prepared by a local authority, showing a right-of-way—all the owners have 30 days within which to lodge objections with the local authority.

Those objections are considered by the local authority, which might then decide to amend the plan, having taken some notice of the objections; or the local authority might resolve to proceed. If the local authority resolves to proceed, it simply submits the papers to the Minister for his concurrence. No further time limit is laid down in the Act. If the Minister concurs, he submits the papers to the Governor and that is the end of the exercise, as far as I can see. If I am wrong, the Minister might let me know where I have erred; and if there is a right of appeal I would like to have particulars of it.

It seems to me that there could be circumstances in which one of the adjoining owners might genuinely believe that if a right-of-way or private street were to be split up he had a right to receive the portion of it which joins onto his block. I have some knowledge of this matter. I have knowledge of a particular case in which an owner received one such plan as this. The plan showed that there were four adjoining owners, of which he was one. The plan also showed that it was proposed that the right-of-way or private street should be given to the owner of the other three lots, they being in one ownership. This particular adjoining owner objected. He said he thought that if the right-of-way was to be divided up he should be entitled to have portion of it added onto his block.

Sitting suspended from 3.46 to 4.03 p.m.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: Before the suspension I had said that there may be very good reasons for the closure of a right-of-way, but that there is no provision in the Bill for any reasons to be stated by the local authority when it closes a right-of-way. No doubt reasons are put forward at the council meeting, and I personally will agree that there could be many good reasons for the closure of rights-of-way. I would support the principle that councils should have that power, but I believe their reasons should be stated—particularly if we are to amend the section and provide that in future a right-of-way does not have to be divided amongst all the adjoining owners, but may be given to one owner. That is the effect of the clause.

I believe that if we are to do that, bearing in mind the rights of private owners, we should in all justice require that the council shall state its reasons. I have a good reason for saying that; namely, that I believe the reasons given would be a guide to the Minister. When all is said and done the plans are submitted to the Minister after the council finally makes its resolution and the Minister, if he concurs, forwards the resolution to the Governor. To all intents and purposes the resolution then takes effect and that is the end of the exercise.

However, I believe it would be of assistance to the Minister if he were given the reasons for the council's decision. They may well be good reasons. For example, one good reason would be that it is obvious that the right-of-way should be attached to one particular block for reasons of town planning, otherwise a town planning problem would be created; or else because a frontage would thereby be enlarged to a proper frontage under a town planning scheme. Another reason could be that there is a sewer or water main on the right-of-way, making it desirable that the right-of-way be attached to one particular block.

I would be the first to agree that there could be good reasons; but I believe the reasons should be stated and there is nothing in the Bill which requires anybody to state any reasons. Admittedly, the matter would be debated in the council chamber of the local authority and, perhaps, views would be expressed one way or the other; but when the resolution is made there is then no provision to require reasons to be given to the Minister. I believe those reasons should have been stated in the particular case to which I referred, which illustrates the point very well. The owner I mentioned, who was one of four adjoining owners, lodged an objection with the local authority. He told the authority he believed it was unfair and that if the right-of-way was to be carved up he should be given the opportunity to have his proportionate share of it. He had a discussion with an officer of the local authority who was responsible for the matter, and the officer said it was just too bad and that the local authority had made up its mind and would take no notice of him.

That particular officer overlooked the provisions of the Local Government Act which require that the council should consider the objection and decide what it is going to do. It is the council that should

make the decision and not the officer concerned. Nevertheless, one cannot help having the feeling that perhaps that person—who may have been a qualified town planner for all I know—was, in fact, expressing a view which would ultimately find favour with the council. Perhaps the private individual came away with the feeling that the matter had been decided and any objection on his part would be futile.

In fact, he lodged an objection and the result was that the council dropped the matter because it did not have the legal power to grant a right-of-way to one individual. I believe the council should have been required to state its reasons because of this very principle: that it should be able to demonstrate publicly to that individual that it had good reasons which had nothing to do with the other owners, and were unconnected with the other owners. In this case the other three blocks happened to be owned by the one person and the council should be able to show that the other person was not in a position to bring any pressure to bear on the council.

I believe these are basic rights which we as a Parliament should cherish. We may believe that the local authority is doing its job properly, but it must demonstrate that it is doing its job properly, and I believe it should be required to state reasons to the Minister. As far as the Minister is concerned, of course, he does not have to concur. I am sure the Minister does not always concur; I am sure he will exercise his judgment and if he feels there is some reason for not giving his concurrence, he will withhold it.

However, there is no time limit. The Minister can give his concurrence the following day. The recommendation comes to the Minister from the local authority together with a statement of objections and if the Minister is not supplied with reasons for the recommendation of the local authority, and if he does not hear any views expressed and accepts what is put to him by the local authority, then it would be difficult for the Minister to find against the local authority unless some very good reason is demonstrated. Therefore it is important that the local authority should supply reasons to the Minister.

On the question of an appeal, the second matter to which I referred, it may be said that the adjoining owner has no right of appeal whatever in the circumstances. Why should he have a right of appeal? He is not losing any property; he did not own the land to start with. This is perfectly true; in many cases the right-of-way is owned by some long deceased person whose name is still on the registered title—for example, "John Smith" of Rockingham—and nobody knows where he is. The land is still in his name and has been left there because nobody bothered about it. The rest of his land may have been sold long ago, apart from the right-of-way.

One may ask, "What right has the adjoining owner to say he should have a right of appeal in such a case? After all, he did not own the right-of-way." That is true, but he has just as much right as the other adjoining owners—they did not own it either—and if he is granted a right of appeal it would be a demonstration that we are prepared to appreciate that people do have equal rights even though they may not have any ownership rights. In the case to which I referred, no-one has ownership rights, not even the local authority.

The local authority did not own the land, it was owned by a long deceased person. Of course, the local authority had got a title to it by closing the right-of-way under the Act. In these circumstances it seems appropriate to me that if we are to give the right to a local authority to make a decision in favour of one particular person, then we should give to the owners who may be aggrieved, or may believe they are aggrieved, a right of appeal.

I commend to the Minister that he consider that suggestion quite seriously. I believe that we as a Parliament are from time to time guilty of unconsciously making what I would call arbitrary law. We sometimes tend to forget the rights between subject and subject and the fact that subjects do have rights and do feel aggrieved. I believe in these times which are far more enlightened than used to be the case we should, if we appreciate this point, seek every opportunity to ensure that the basic principles of justice are incorporated in our legislation, no matter how small we may consider the matter to be.

It may not be a matter of great consequence in the average case whether or not a person has portion of a right-of-way added to his block; but sometimes it is of considerable consequence to the people concerned, particularly if they have been used to having the right-of-way there, used to seeing it there, or used to having some small use of it, if only for the purpose of storing firewood.

Whilst I do not suggest that the storage of firewood or a similar use should be grounds for preventing the closure of a right-of-way, I do believe in these circumstances that if it is to be closed the adjoining owners should all have a right of appeal if the decision is given against them. I believe that we are unconsciously tending to inculcate a paternal attitude in matters such as this. I believe we should not leave this decision entirely in the hands of a local authority so that it can override the rights of people without giving reasons. People should have a right of objection to the acts of local authorities or any other authorities. I believe we should

develop a new attitude on subjects such as this in local government circles.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. Heitman.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD BETTING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [4.15 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill has three objectives, two of which are contained in amendments to section 42 of the Act.

Persons who can be charged with the offence of accepting a bet from persons who have not reached the age of 21 years include under that section of the Act the manager, secretary, officer, employee, or the agent of the board, but no mention is made, however, of an employee of an agent. The Bill seeks an amendment to rectify this latter deficiency.

Section 42 also sets at 21 years the minimum age at which a person may be employed in a T.A.B. agency. The board claims that in all other Australian States and in the Australian Capital Territory, persons aged 18 years and over are entitled legally to work in T.A.B. shops. It has been submitted, in fact, that in some States lads of 16 years can be employed.

The Totalisator Agency Board in this State is anxious to have the right to employ persons aged 18 years and over. I think it should be mentioned that in this connection the board does not seek any lowering of the betting age. If the amendment now proposed, to reduce the age of employment, be agreed to, an agent would still breach his contract if he were to permit an employee to bet and, in doing so, would render himself liable to instant dismissal. It might be suggested that allowing an 18-year-old to be employed in a shop would provide an encouragement for such an employee to indulge in betting, but this would not necessarily be so and the amendment now before members is submitted for their consideration.

The last amendment proposes the insertion of a new section to give added impetus to, and provide a greater evidential value on, the testimony of police officers who, in their search for evidence, become accomplices to an offence—technically at times. Similarly affected are agents who might be engaged by the police for the purpose of obtaining evidence of offences suspected of being committed under the Act.

Similar provisions were made in section 156 of the Liquor Act which was passed earlier this year, in which subsections (1), (2), and (3) gave the force of law to evidence secured by similar means for the purpose of detecting offences under that Act. The effect of those subsections is to remove the taint on such person of being an accomplice to the offence. Additionally, they allow the admission of evidence of a servant or agent of the licensee in proceedings against the said licensee.

The effect of the new section proposed for the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act would be the same as that contained in section 156 of the Liquor Act. This has been redrafted, however, to make what, in the draftsman's view, are considered to be necessary changes and improvements.

The main purpose of the foregoing proposals is to deal with the employees of the board and the prohibition of betting by minors. In Committee in another place, however, a further amendment dealing with the method of betting, moved by Mr. Bertram, was accepted by the Minister for Police, who raised no objection to it as it appeared to be consistent with the principal Act.

This amendment appears as clause 2 of the Bill and its purpose is to leave no doubt that an employee of an agent of the board is personally responsible to the same extent as the agent himself for adhering to the "method of betting" provisions set out in section 33 of the Act.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the Opposition).

BETTING CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [4.19 p.m.] I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is complementary to the small measure which has been introduced to amend the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act.

Its main purpose is to add a new section to the Betting Control Act to give more impetus to, or place greater evidential value on, the testimony of police officers who become accomplices, technically, to an offence in the course of their search for evidence of suspected breaches of the Act. The proposed section also encompasses agents engaged by the police for the purpose of assisting prosecution by obtaining suitable evidence.

The current Bill to amend the T.A.B. legislation enables employment of persons aged 18 years and above and it is considered that a similar amendment to the Betting Control Act, as affecting bookmakers, is necessary if we are to be consistent.

The Parliamentary Draftsman has pointed out that a drafting error occurs in paragraph (b) of subsection (2) of section

23 of the principal Act which makes reference to section 19. The correct reference is to section 21 and the Bill rectifies the error.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the Opposition).

House adjourned at 4.21 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 8th October, 1970.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Guthrie) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (36): ON NOTICE

1. WOOROLOO TRAINING CENTRE

Resident Employees

Mr. MAY, to the Chief Secretary:

How many Prisons Department employees reside at the Wooroloo Training Centre, previously known as the Wooroloo Hospital?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

Twenty-four.

2. WATER SUPPLIES

Treatment Plant: Gnangara Area

Mr. MAY, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

Will he advise the exact location of the proposed water treatment plant being established in the Gnangara area?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The Gnangara water treatment plant is situated at the north-western corner of the junction of Beach Road and Uganda Road, Mirrabooka, within Lots 86 and 87, in the Shire of Wanneroo.

3. TRAFFIC PATROLS

Effect

Mr. GRAHAM, to the Minister for Traffic:

(1) Has he any knowledge of the joint survey carried out recently in England by scientists and police, which has concluded that "the presence of patrolling police on a busy road has no apparent effect on the behaviour of motorists" and that "incidents of bad driving continued in spite of increased patrols"?

(2) Is he aware that Dr. Margaret Greig of Durham University mathematics department, one of the leaders of the survey team, expressed herself in these terms—"It certainly surprised us, but it was a fact of our study. We had expected people to drive more carefully"?

(3) What is the official conclusion here in respect of traffic patrols, and what evidence is there in support?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

(1) No.

(2) No.

(3) It is considered that heavy concentration of police does reduce accidents and induce better driver behaviour. This is borne out by reports by other overseas bodies which have been studied.

4. CARNARVON HOSPITAL

Extensions

Mr. NORTON, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

(1) When will the temporary extensions to the Carnarvon Hospital be completed and in use?

(2) What is the cost of these buildings?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) The units will arrive on site next week and should be ready for occupation in December, 1970.

(2) $70,891, including estimated cost of furniture and equipment.

5. EDUCATION

Carnarvon High School

Mr. NORTON, to the Minister for Education:

(1) What are the extensions which are to be made to the Carnarvon High School this year?

(2) When will tenders be called for this work?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

(1) 1 prevocational centre.

1 art room.

1 staff room, staff toilets.

(2) It is anticipated that tenders will be called during November.

6. LIQUOR ACT

Amendments

Mr. GRAHAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

(1) Has a decision yet been made as to whether legislation will be introduced this session to amend the Liquor Act, at least to correct obvious errors, contradictions, and anomalies discovered since the passage of the measure through Parliament earlier this year?

(2) If not, when will such a decision be made?