

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 1st October, 1968

The SPEAKER (Mr. Guthrie) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

ACTS (11): ASSENT

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator received and read notifying assent to the following Acts:—

1. Cremation Act Amendment Act.
2. Coal Miners' Welfare Act Amendment Act.
3. Rural and Industries Bank Act Amendment Act.
4. Dried Fruits Act Amendment Act.
5. Road and Air Transport Commission Act Amendment Act.
6. Artificial Breeding Board Act Amendment Act.
7. Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement Act Amendment Act.
8. State Trading Concerns Act Amendment Act.
9. Geraldton Port Authority Act.
10. Esperance Port Authority Act.
11. Liquid Petroleum Gas Act Amendment Act.

QUESTIONS (26): ON NOTICE

TRAINEE NURSES

Wages and Deductions

1. Mr. TOMS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) How is the wage structure of trainee nurses graduated in each year of the trainee course?
- (2) What deductions are made for living in during each year?
- (3) Are any further deductions made; if so, what are they?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1)

		Percentage of Female Basic Wage	Per Week
Student nurses (female)			\$
First year	52½	15.51
Second year	60	15.44
Third year	68	17.50
Fourth year	84	21.61
		Percentage of Male Basic Wage	Per Week
Student nurses (male)			\$
First year	50	17.05
Second year	65	22.17
Third year	80	27.28
Fourth year	95	32.40

(2) Nil.

(3) No.

NICHOLSON ROAD

Widening

2. Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister for Works:

In view of the excess traffic on Nicholson Road, Canning Vale, will he advise—

- (1) If it is proposed to widen this road?
- (2) If so, when will this work begin?

Mr. COURT (for Mr. Ross Hutchinson) replied:

- (1) This road is under the control of the Canning and Gosnells shire councils. It is not known if there is any proposal for its widening.
- (2) Answered by (1).

CANNING-ARMADALE CORRIDOR

Rezoning

3. Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

In view of the area south of the Roe Freeway and adjoining Canning Vale being left rural in the proposed Canning-Armadale corridor despite the fact it has little rural value, will he advise when it is anticipated this area may become urban?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

It is frequently argued that, as land is not suitable for economic rural use, it should be included in the urban zone. This, however, cannot be accepted as a sound planning argument. Such an argument should be based on the suitability of the land for urban zoning rather than on its unsuitability for rural use.

As stated in the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority's determination to objection 15 in the Canning-Armadale corridor submission, the authority sees advantages in accepting the alignment of the standard gauge railway as the limit, in the Canning Vale area, of the urban core of the region, and in relocating the alignment of the Roe Freeway in this area closer to the railway. The realignment of the freeway, however, is the subject of very careful examination as yet uncompleted. When a decision is reached as to the possibility of realignment, the authority will consider an amendment of the scheme to relocate the reservation and redefine the urban zone.

SCIENTOLOGY

Action against Minister

4. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:
Respecting the reported defence of the Minister for Health against whom action is being taken by the Hubbard Association of Scientologists International for statements allegedly made by him, will he be personally liable for any legal and other costs incurred, or will the taxpayers be required to shoulder the burden?

Mr. BRAND replied:

The Minister is personally liable for legal and other costs incurred, but he may apply for *ex gratia* reimbursement from the Government. If he does so, the application will be treated on its merits, in accordance with the usual practice.

SODIUM LIGHTING OF CROSSWALKS

Accident Statistics

5. Mr. CASH asked the Minister for Traffic:

- (1) How many pedestrian crosswalks are illuminated by sodium-vapour floodlight?
- (2) Has there been a reduction in—
 - (a) night-time; or
 - (b) day-time
 accidents at any or all of these crosswalks since sodium-vapour lights were installed?
- (3) What statistics can he provide to support his answer to (2)?

Mr. O'CONNOR (for Mr. Craig) replied:

- (1) Six.
- (2) (a) Yes, in respect of pedestrian accidents.
No, in respect of vehicular accidents.
- (3) Statistics relating to 2 (a) are as follows:—

(i) Number of Accidents Involving Pedestrians:

Before	Casualty only
1963	2
1964	Nil
1965	2
Total	4
After	
1966	Nil
1967	1
1968 (to 30/6/68)	Nil
Total	1

(ii) Number of Vehicular Accidents:

	Casualty only	Damage only	Total
Before			
1963	1	4	5
1964	Nil	3	3
1965	Nil	3	3
Total	1	10	11
After			
1966	Nil	9	9
1967	Nil	2	2
1968 (to 30/6/68)	Nil	8	8
Total	Nil	19	19

EDUCATION

Expenditure and Classrooms

6. Mr. CASH asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) What has been the expenditure on education in each of the last five years?
- (2) How many classrooms have been built in the same period and at what total cost?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Expenditure by the Education Department from Consolidated Revenue—

	\$
1963-64	25,879,704
1964-65	29,132,900
1965-66	34,015,953
1966-67	36,737,486
1967-68	46,207,369

(2)

	Class-rooms built	Expenditure from General Loan Fund
		\$
1963-64	213 for	5,767,150
1964-65	298 for	7,029,828
1965-66	290 for	7,742,657
1966-67	375 for	8,495,613
1967-68	438 for	8,583,263

MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE TRUST

Trading Results

7. Mr. BERTRAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

What were the net trading results of the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust for each of its five financial years up to and including 1968?

Mr. NALDER replied:

The trading results of the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust for each of the financial years 1963-64 to 1967-68 inclusive were as follows:—

Year	Deficit \$	Surplus \$
1963-64	475,706	
1964-65		1,075,026
1965-66	801,559	
1966-67		350,469
1967-68		8,813
	1,2-1,265	1,434,308

The excess of surpluses over deficits is, therefore, \$153,043 for the period but it should be pointed out the accounts for the period contain estimates only for claims received but unsettled—the total of this estimate being almost \$16,000,000 at the 30th June, 1968. In addition, the total accumulated deficit in the participants account at the 30th June, 1963, was \$1,135,282 which has been reduced by the figure of \$153,043 above to \$982,239 as at the 30th June, 1968.

RAILWAYS

Policy on Braking

8. Mr. McIVER asked the Minister for Railways:

As main line derailments are increasing, does the department still intend to persist with its present policy that trains shall depart from main railway centres with the vacuum brake through portion of the train only when difficulty is experienced in creating full brake before departure?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

Yes. There is no recorded instance where a main line derailment has resulted from this procedure.

EARTH MOVING EQUIPMENT

Operating Certificates

9. Mr. MAY asked the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Will he advise the type of license required in Western Australia to operate the following earthmoving equipment—
 - (a) front end loader;
 - (b) bulldozer;
 - (c) grader;
 - (d) scraper?
- (2) What States of the Commonwealth provide legislation whereby plant operators require a composite license to operate the mentioned equipment?
- (3) Does the Government intend introducing legislation in this State to cover these operators?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Certificates to operate the machines listed are not required in Western Australia except where a front end loader is fitted with a hook and used as a crane. In this instance a crane and hoist driver's certificate of competency is required.
- (2) From information available, only one State, Queensland, requires certificates to operate all the machines in question. New South Wales incorporates tractors with loading attachments

in the power crane driver certificate. This would mainly apply to front end loaders.

Tasmania has power to issue certificates for internal combustion engine drivers where the engine is above a certain size and this could be applied to all the machines mentioned.

Other States and territories do not require certificated control.

- (3) This matter is under consideration.

HOUSING AT MANIANA

Fly-wiring

10. Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister for Housing:

In view of the swampy surroundings and general breeding ground for mosquitoes in the Maniana area, would he consider the fly-wiring of homes of the pensioners and invalid pensioners in State Housing Commission homes?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

The commission's standard policy is to provide fly-wire to kitchen door and windows only. Funds are not available to extend this policy.

Power Points

11. Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister for Housing:

In view of the danger of leads being used from power points in kitchens, etc., to wash-houses in the Maniana State Housing settlement, would he direct his commission to have suitable power points installed?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

The commission already has a programme for provision of power points in laundries of all existing houses and, also, when any electrical work is carried out at a house.

A power point will be installed at the commission's expense on the request of a tenant.

POWER STATIONS

Production Costs

12. Mr. JONES asked the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) What is the cost of coal consumed in the generation of one unit of electricity at Muja?
- (2) What is the cost of coal consumed in the generation of one unit of electricity at Bunbury?
- (3) What is the present cost of oil consumed in the generation of one unit of electricity at South Fremantle?

- (4) Why is the generation of electricity at South Fremantle being done entirely on oil?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) .26c.
- (2) .29c (excluding freight).
- (3) This information is confidential.
- (4) Because oil is a more economical fuel.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Credit Betting

13. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Police:

Are records being kept at T.A.B. agencies from which information may be obtained from time to time as to the number of persons who are availing themselves of cash being provided by agents by arrangement to enable them to bet with the board by telephone?

Mr. O'CONNOR (for Mr. Craig) replied:

Betting in the manner stated is not permitted by the board. Where, however, cash bets are placed out of funds held on behalf of investors in the manner authorised in Operating Instruction 279/68, whilst the only official records available would be those kept in connection with cash betting, any agent would, on the day concerned, have knowledge of the person or persons on whose behalf cash bets were so placed.

HEALTH

Drug *Lysostroma*

14. Mr. KITNEY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Is the drug *lysostroma* a prohibited import?
- (2) If "Yes," why is it prohibited?
- (3) What drug is available locally as an adequate alternative?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) Inquiries have revealed that *lysostroma* is a combination of extracts from numerous animal organs. As such it is subject to Commonwealth quarantine regulations and it is understood that its importation is prohibited.
- (3) The Public Health Department is not aware of any similar multiple combination available in Australia.

PARKING AREA

Cloverdale

15. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Housing:

Was the parking area constructed opposite the Love Street, Cloverdale, shopping centre in-

tended to serve the whole of the area or to be included in the hotel site and subject to the purchaser of this site?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

The parking area opposite Love Street was primarily provided for the shopping centre but could, of course, be utilised by hotel patrons if the hotel parking was fully occupied. It is not part of the hotel site.

MARRON

Natural Habitat

16. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) What is the most northerly natural habitat of marron?
- (2) As marron have of recent times been reported to have been caught in the Moore River, has the department any record of marron being placed in this river; if so, when?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) The Harvey River is the most northern natural habitat of marron on record.
- (2) Marron are known to have been introduced into the Murray, Serpentine, Canning, and Swan Rivers. It is believed that they were also introduced into the Moore River in the late 1930s. No information is available concerning their success, although occasional reports of sightings have been received.

SCHOOL CROSSWALKS

Guard-controlled

17. Mr. CASH asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) How many requests have been made this year for the approval of guard-controlled school pedestrian crossings?
- (2) How many requests were refused and on what grounds?
- (3) Have the approvals for these controlled crossings yet reached the stage when the committee can work on a lower warrant figure for their establishment?

Mr. O'CONNOR (for Mr. Craig) replied:

- (1) Thirty-nine, of which five are still under consideration.
- (2) Twenty-seven. The School Crossing Reviewing Committee did not consider guards were warranted.

- (3) The committee does not operate to any predetermined formula but considers each request on its merits having regard to—
- (a) The characteristics of the area, whether wholly residential or otherwise, and natural traffic hazards.
 - (b) The density of traffic and the frequency in length of breaks in the flow.
 - (c) The number and ages of the children.

MAGISTRATES

Salaries

18. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:

- (1) What were the salaries at the 1st July, 1965, for the following:—
 - (a) Chief Stipendiary Magistrate;
 - (b) senior stipendiary magistrates;
 - (c) stipendiary magistrates?
- (2) What are the corresponding figures following the recent review of salaries?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) (a) Chief Stipendiary Magistrate—\$8,448.
- (b) Senior stipendiary magistrate—\$8,148.
- (c) Stipendiary magistrates—\$6,636, \$6,918, \$7,200, \$7,492.
- (2) (a) Chief Stipendiary Magistrate—\$10,850.
- (b) Senior stipendiary magistrates—\$10,200.
- (c) Stipendiary magistrates—\$8,000, \$8,350, \$8,750, \$9,200.

SOIL TESTING

Canning Electorate

19. Mr. BATEMAN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

In view of the continual concern by residents in the Canning Electorate with respect to unsuitable soil for building purposes, will he advise—

- (a) What types of tests were carried out in the Lynwood-Ferndale area to ensure the land was suitable for high density development?
- (b) What was the date and results ascertained from these tests?
- (c) In what way did they indicate the land was suitable?
- (d) What are the responsibilities of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority with respect to ensuring the suitability of a district for development of the type for which it is zoned?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (a) I have no knowledge of such tests having been carried out. This is, however, a matter within the jurisdiction of the shire council. I will convey the honourable member's question to the Canning Shire Council and advise him in due course of its reply.
- (b) and (c) Answered by (a).
- (d) The responsibility of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority in terms of the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act is to define in broad terms the areas within which urban development is to be permitted. It is primarily the responsibility of the shire council, in terms of the Town Planning and Development Act, to allocate within the urban areas zones for residential and other classes of urban use.

PEST CONTROL

Introduction of Legislation

20. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Relevant to the Health Department's comment in *The West Australian* of the 26th June, 1968, headed "New Body to Fight Wild Pigeons," can he inform the House whether the suggested legislation regarding pest control is to be introduced this session?
- (2) What pests other than pigeons, rats, and stray dogs are likely to be covered by the proposed legislation?
- (3) Are stray cats to be included?
- (4) With a view to a diminution in the numbers of stray cats, will he give consideration to—
 - (a) making it incumbent on the owner of a cat to have it licensed in a similar manner to a dog with the local authority; and
 - (b) making provision to ensure that all licensed male cats kept are sterilised?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) No legislation is proposed.
- (2) to (4) Answered by (1).

LOTTERIES COMMISSION AGENTS

K. E. Stewart and A. Shires

21. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Chief Secretary:

- (1) When were K. E. Stewart and A. Shires appointed agent to sell tickets in consultations conducted by the Lotteries Commission?

- (2) What sum is owing to the commission by this agent?
- (3) What amount has been paid to the commission by this agent?
- (4) From what dates are moneys owing and in what amounts respectively?
- (5) What is the policy of the commission regarding outstanding amounts owing by agents?
- (6) Why was this agent allowed to run up such a large debt?
- (7) Is not the non-payment of ticket sales proceeds to the commission an act of stealing as a servant, or misappropriation of trust moneys?
- (8) If so, why has only a writ been issued for recovery of the amount owing?

Mr. O'CONNOR (for Mr. Craig) replied:

- (1) The commission has no record of an agency in the name of K. E. Stewart and A Shires. However, Kevin Stewart Romain and Alan Shires became agents of the commission on the 22nd February, 1968. It is assumed that this is the agency referred to.
- (2) \$3,130.68.
- (3) \$7,720 of which \$1,048.53 has been received since the 16th May, 1968.
- (4) The answer depends upon the number and types of tickets sold by the agent as at any particular date, and this information is not known to the commission until the relevant "call in" date of each lottery. The commission can say with certainty that as from the 16th May, 1968, until the 17th August, when the agency was terminated, butts to the value of \$4,188.21 were recovered by the commission, for which each settlement of \$1,048.53 only was received. Prior to the 16th May, 1968, so far as the commission was aware, the agency had operated in the normal manner. After that date, transactions with this agency were placed on a cash basis.
- (5) Other than the normal day to day transactions, the commission does not allow agents to have amounts outstanding after "call in" date.
- (6) Tickets for various lotteries had been delivered to the agency in the normal way and to the normal extent, and until the agency failed to pay on the relevant "call in" date—namely the 16th May, 1968—the commission had no reason to suppose that the agency would

not meet its obligations in the same way as it had done previously.

- (7) Legal advice to the commission is that this is doubtful, but the question is at present being further considered.
- (8) This is a usual civil proceeding taken for the recovery of moneys owing.

ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

Payment in Northern Shires

22. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Transport:
 - (1) How many motor vehicles registered in the following shires pay road maintenance tax:—
 - (a) Carnarvon;
 - (b) Upper Gascoyne;
 - (c) Murchison;
 - (d) Shark Bay?
 - (2) What is the average monthly payment collected from the operation of these vehicles?
 - (3) Will the fleet of trucks to be used by the Texada Mining Co. for the carting of salt and/or potash from Lake MacLeod to Cape Couvier be exempt from the payment of road maintenance tax; if so, why?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) (a) 107.
(b) 2.
(c) 3.
(d) 1.
- (2) The average monthly payment for 1967-68 was \$17,943.31. A great deal of this was for use of roads outside the boundaries of the shires named.
- (3) No. All vehicles having a load capacity greater than 8 tons will be subject to payment of charges.

TEMPORARY RESERVES

Pincunah Hill

23. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:
 - (1) Will he table a plan showing the boundaries of the following temporary reserves in the area of Pincunah Hill:—
 - (a) 2600H;
 - (b) 2713H;
 - (c) 2714H;
 - (d) 2613H?
 - (2) Will he supply the respective dates of application for each reserve and the respective dates on which reserves were granted and also minerals concerned in each reserve?

- (3) Will he supply copies of the plans submitted by applicants for the reserves mentioned in (1)?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) Yes.
(2)

Approval

T.R. No.	Applied for	By Hon. Minister	in Ex. Co.
2600H	18/7/62	21/8/62	20/9/62
2713H	22/8/63	3/9/63	10/10/63
2714H	22/8/63	3/9/63	10/10/63
2613H	31/7/62	Not yet approved	

Minerals

Remarks

Iron Ore	Cancelled 3/9/63
Iron Ore	Under cl. 11 (6) of the Iron Ore (Mt. Goldsworthy) Agreement Act
Iron Ore	Under cl. 11 (6) of the Iron Ore (Mt. Goldsworthy) Agreement Act
Manganese	

- (3) Plans submitted by applicants are confidential but arrangements can be made for the honourable member to inspect the plans in question, at the Mines Department.

The plan was tabled.

ARTIFICIAL BREEDING SCHEME

Continuance

24. Mr. H. D. EVANS asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he aware that some farmers in the south-west have disposed of breeding sires and have been dependent on the artificial breeding scheme for herd propagation?
(2) As this is so, will he allow the scheme to continue for another month to six weeks to alleviate the cost and inconvenience of farmers so positioned even to the extent of aiding the board financially?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes.
(2) The Manjimup and Margaret River centres will close on the 1st October, but arrangements have been made for services to be provided until the 26th October for Manjimup from Kirup and for Margaret River from Busselton.

EDUCATION

Class Enrolments

25. Mr. CASH asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) In the view of his department, what is the acceptable maximum number of students for—
(a) primary school classes;
(b) secondary sub-junior, and post-junior classes?
(2) How successful has been the Government's policy of reducing class sizes, having regard to the considerable population increase since 1959?
(3) What are the latest percentage figures relating to class enrolments that exceed the acceptable

maximum numbers quoted in reply to (1)?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) There is no agreement among educationalists, nor is there any available research evidence, as to what is the optimum size for primary and secondary classes. In fact, in modern educational thinking, class size has become a flexible concept, varying according to the subject taught and the teaching methods employed.

The department has, in the past, quoted class sizes of 40 for primary, 30 for secondary sub-junior, and 25 for post-junior as desirable goals, but such thinking is largely outmoded. It is more common these days to express school staffing in terms of pupil-teacher ratios.

- (2) The effect on pupil-teacher ratios of the Government's policy of progressively liberalising school staffing can be gauged from the following figures:—

1962—Primary, 34.8; secondary, 22.5.

1967—Primary, 33; secondary, 20.3.

- (3) As indicated above, in modern educational thinking, the term "acceptable maximum" for class enrolments is tending to lose its significance.

PROFESSIONAL OFFICERS

Salaries

26. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:

- (1) Will he tabulate the salaries of the professional officers (other than magistrates) recently reviewed by the Public Service Commissioner, showing—
(a) the new salary rates; and
(b) the corresponding salary rates as at the 1st July, 1965?
(2) From what date do the new rates become operative?

Mr. BRAND replied:

(1)

SALARIES—PROFESSIONAL OFFICERS—SEPTEMBER, 1968

ENGINEERS			LEGAL OFFICERS			AGRICULTURAL SCIENTISTS			FORESTRY OFFICERS			DRAFTSMEN		
	1/7/65	New Rate		1/7/65	New Rate		1/7/65	New Rate			New Rate		1/7/65	New Rate
	\$	\$		\$	\$		\$	\$		\$	\$		\$	\$
Grade 3	3,254	3,675	Grade 2	3,760	4,000	Grade 3	3,380	3,870	Assistant Di- visional P.O.	3,128	3,870	Draftsman	2,810	3,250
	3,380	3,805		4,016	4,000		3,760	4,920		3,380	4,200		2,916	3,370
	3,760	4,196		4,274	5,225		4,016	4,570		3,632	4,570		3,022	3,490
	4,016	4,463		4,534	5,550		4,534	5,130		3,888	5,130		3,254	3,740
	4,534	4,990		4,794	5,875		4,794	5,410		4,144	5,410		3,380	3,870
	4,794	5,262		5,054	6,200	Grade 2	5,024	5,560		4,404			3,500	4,150
Grade 2	5,182	5,903	Grade 1	5,182	6,500		5,054	5,710		4,794			3,760	4,430
	5,310	5,836		5,310	6,800		5,310	6,010	D.F.O.	4,924	5,500		3,588	4,710
	5,560	6,123		5,566	7,100		5,566	6,330		5,054	5,710		4,144	
	5,822	6,400		5,822	7,400	Grade 1	5,822	6,050		5,310	6,010	Senior	4,274	4,850
	6,078	6,677	Assistant Crown Counsel Soli- citor	6,078	7,700		6,078	6,950	Utilisation Eco. Officer	5,822	6,380		4,404	4,990
	6,354	6,904		6,354	8,025	Senior	6,354	7,250					4,534	5,130
	6,636	7,261		6,636	8,350	Officers - In - Charge	6,636	7,550					4,664	5,270
	6,918	7,568		6,918	8,700	Assistant Chiefs	6,918	7,900	Inspector	6,636	7,550	Draftsman-In- Charge	4,794	5,410
Senior	7,200	8,200	Senior Assistant Crown Counsel	7,200	9,050	Chiefs	7,200	8,500	Superintendent	7,492	8,900		4,924	5,560
Principal Assistant	7,492	9,250	Assistant Parlia- mentary Draftsman	7,492	9,400	Deputy Direct- or	8,148	9,900	Chiefs	8,148	9,900	Assistant Chief (Titles)	5,054	5,710
Branch Head	8,448	10,240				Deputy Direct- or	8,348	11,200	Deputy Con- servator	8,848	11,200		5,182	5,890
Engineer H. & R., P.W.D., and Deputy Chief Engineer, M.W.S.	8,848	10,540	Conveyancer			Director	10,348	13,500	Conservator	10,348	13,500	Assistant Chief (Mines)	5,438	6,010
		10,814	Senior Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman	7,784	9,000								5,566	6,170
Chief Engineer, P.W.D.	9,248	11,205	Chief Crown Prosecutor	8,448	10,650							Chief (Forests)	5,822	6,330
Chief Engineer, M.W.S.	9,648	12,000	Crown Solicitor	9,248	11,500							Chief (Titles)	5,078	6,050
Director of En- gineering, P.W.D.	10,648	13,500	Crown Counsel	10,048	12,500							Assistant Sup- erintendent of Mapping	6,354	7,250
			Chief Parlia- mentary Draftsman									Chief (Mines)	7,200	8,500
			Solicitor General	10,648	13,500							Superintendent of Mapping		

[Tuesday, 1 October, 1968.]

- (2) Engineers from the 8th April, 1968, with exception of the Director of Engineering, Public Works Department from the 1st January, 1968.

Chief Engineer, Metropolitan Water Supply Board, from the 1st January, 1968.

Legal officers from the 22nd May, 1968, with exception of the Solicitor-General from the 1st January, 1968.

Agricultural scientists from the 28th June, 1968, with exception of director from the 1st January, 1968.

Forestry officers from the 12th August, 1968, with exception of the conservator from the 1st January, 1968.

QUESTIONS (2): WITHOUT NOTICE STATE SHIPPING SERVICE

Cessation: Additional Freight Rates Required

1. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Transport:

Will he supply an estimated gross figure of the total additional freight rates that would have to be charged over a period of 12 months to transport the present tonnage carried by the State ships to the north-west if the State ships ceased to operate?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of this question, the answer to which is as follows:—

The estimated additional freight payable in respect of Western Australian ports on 1967-68 State Shipping Service cargo figures would be \$7,837,000. There are some ports which cannot be serviced entirely by road such as Barrow, Cookatoo, Koolan Islands, and Kulumburu, and there is a requirement in a number of places for inland transportation by road after the State Shipping Service has performed its task. Marble Bar from Port Hedland and Kununurra and Halls Creek from Wyndham are examples.

If total transportation charges are considered—i.e., freight, wharfage, handling, terminal cartage, inland road transportation, and sea transportation to those places that cannot be serviced by road—the estimated additional freight payable would then be \$6,205,000.

YORK GAOL

Demolition

2. Mr. I. W. MANNING (for Mr. Gayfer) asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Have tenders been recently called for demolition of part of the York gaol?
- (2) If so, what does the tender embrace?
- (3) What reasons have been advanced for this work to be carried out?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes. The closing date is the 15th October, 1968.
- (2) The tender embraces—
 - (i) The demolition of existing stables.
 - (ii) The erection of new six-foot high link mesh fencing and gates.
 - (iii) The erection of new double car port.
 - (iv) Other such work as shown on the drawings or included in the specification.
- (3) The old stables are in a dangerous condition and on the point of collapse. The question of demolition has been referred to the National Trust of Australia (W.A.), and the Public Works Department was advised "that the portion to be demolished was not essential for preservation as an historic building."

BILLS (3): THIRD READING

1. Medical Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Works), and passed.

2. Trustees Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development), and passed.

3. Police Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. O'Connor (Minister for Transport), and transmitted to the Council.

APPROPRIATION BILL (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND)

1968-69

Standing Orders Suspension

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [5 p.m.]: I move, without notice—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as to enable the introduction and second reading of a Bill for "An Act to appropriate and apply out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and from the Public Account certain sums to make good the supplies granted for the service of the year ending the 30th day of June,

1969, and to supplement grants made by the last Parliament during its third session in adjustment of the Vote 'Advance to Treasurer 1967-68,' for charges during the year ended the 30th day of June, 1968; and to approve of certain expenditure under section forty-one of the Forests Act, 1918-1964," to be taken at this sitting.

Mr. Speaker, I would like your permission to offer a few remarks in explanation. Firstly, I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his ready co-operation in respect of this matter. Through an omission of mine, the necessary notice was not given before we adjourned for Show Week. Consequently I cannot proceed unless I am able to get this motion through. I need to introduce the Budget today, because tomorrow is private members' day, and on Thursday I have to attend the Premiers' Conference in Sydney. Therefore the Government has no option but for me to attempt to move in this direction. I offer this explanation to the House and I hope that members will be willing to co-operate and will understand the situation.

The SPEAKER: Before I put this motion, I would like to explain that it requires an absolute majority. If there is no dissentient voice I will count the House; otherwise I will have to call for a division.

Question put.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and I declare that the resolution has been carried by an absolute majority.

Question thus passed.

Message: Appropriations

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the Bill.

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Brand (Treasurer), and read a first time.

Procedure: Statement by Speaker

The SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I think I should make a short announcement for the benefit of members. Members will appreciate that this is the first occasion since the new Standing Orders were adopted last year that this procedure will be followed in regard to the Budget. To that end, I have asked the Clerks to prepare notes for the guidance of members as to the procedure to be adopted, and the notes have been distributed.

I would also mention that we are copying Commonwealth procedure. Members will recollect that under the old procedure the Chairman of Committees presided over the Budget debate. The procedure has been evolved in the Parliament at Canberra of the Deputy Speaker taking the Chair under the new procedure, and

we propose to adopt that same procedure here. I therefore propose to vacate the Chair in favour of the Deputy Speaker.

Second Reading: Budget Speech

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [5.7 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This year, for the first time, the Budget speech takes the form of the second reading speech on the Bill for the Appropriation Act (Consolidated Revenue Fund), 1968-69. The Estimates are in the same form as before and will be made available to members at the conclusion of this speech.

Tonight we have reached another milestone in the history of the State in that this is the first Budget presented to the House for the services of Western Australia as a non-claimant State. It is a moment of pride for me and, indeed, for all Western Australians.

The effect of the change on our financial activities will not be readily apparent, but I am sure that as time goes on we will see real benefits flowing from the greater flexibility we can bring to bear on our problems; but I will have more to say on this later.

For the second year in succession I am able to present to members a Budget that will provide for the growing needs of the State without having to increase taxation. In fact, as I promised, I have studied the existing land taxation legislation and I will be submitting later a number of proposals which will give substantial reductions to most taxpayers.

The Economy

When I reviewed the economy at this time last year I concluded my remarks by saying, "All told, the present situation looks extremely favourable for maintaining a high rate of growth during 1967-68 and beyond." The high rate of growth which I predicted then was most certainly achieved for 1967-68 and I am still confident that it will be maintained in the year ahead of us.

Population and Employment

During 1967-68 the population of the State increased by nearly 33,000 people—an increase of 3.8 per cent. for the year. This followed an increase of 3.3 per cent. in the previous year and represents a sustained period of very high population growth by any standards.

I know that percentages of this magnitude do not sound very impressive, but if members consider that the rate at which our population increased last year was one-and-a-half times the rate at which the population of India is growing and nearly two-and-a-half times the rate at which the population of mainland China is growing, they can appreciate that the State is experiencing a very spectacular period of population growth.

Our ability to continue to attract and provide employment for growing numbers of families, both from overseas and from other parts of Australia, has been a feature of this growth. Although our rate of natural increase is the highest in Australia, almost two-thirds of our population gain last year was due to arrivals from outside the State, principally from abroad.

The ability to provide employment opportunities is of course the key to success in maintaining a high rate of population growth. It is significant that month after month for several years the level of unemployment in the State has been one of the lowest in the Commonwealth and, at the same time, the rate of growth of our work force has been the highest in the Commonwealth. Last year the rate of increase in civilian employment in Western Australia was almost two-and-a-half times the rate recorded for the whole of Australia.

Concurrent with the population increase, average weekly earnings and personal income have also continued to rise, so it is clear that we have been able to achieve the very desirable goals of a growing population with a rising standard of living.

Building

It is natural that faced with such high rates of economic growth as this State has been experiencing in recent years, there should be a certain number of growing pains. Perhaps the most remarkable thing is that there have been so few of them during this period.

One area in which the strains of development have been felt is in the low-cost housing sector of the building industry. However, with the stepped-up programme of the State Housing Commission for this and future years, and with the co-operation the Government is receiving from the private sector of the industry, I am confident that we can overcome our problems.

The building industry set new records last year when 12,300 new houses and flats were completed compared with 10,014 in 1966-67. This is a remarkable increase of almost 23 per cent. for the year. The number of dwellings under construction at the 30th June, 1968, was 35 per cent. higher than the number at the same time last year and this, together with other indications, augurs well for another record year for the home-building industry.

This high level of activity is not confined to dwelling construction alone and, during 1967-68, the value of other buildings completed represented an investment of some \$85,000,000 in the State compared with \$75,000,000 in the previous year. Overall, the estimated value of all work completed by the building industry last year increased by 20 per cent. to \$194,000,000.

Production

The prosperity of any community depends on its capacity to produce and sell goods and services, and therefore trends in production are of fundamental importance in reviewing economic performance. It has been my pleasure for some years now to report annual record levels of production in Western Australia, and 1967-68 has been no exception in this regard.

Although the spectacular developments in mining in recent years have tended to draw the spotlight from the other sectors of primary industry, there is no doubt that farming is still the cornerstone of the Western Australian economy.

In 1967-68 farm production reached a net value of \$307,500,000, an increase of more than \$10,000,000 over the previous year. A record wheat production of 106,500,000 bushels was mainly responsible for the increase.

Although wool production reached 284,500,000 lb. compared with 264,000,000 lb. the previous year, farmers received nearly \$7,000,000 less for their 1967-68 wool clip because of lower wool prices.

This drift of prices for primary produce in the face of rising costs of production is a matter of real concern to all Australians and the Government continues to watch the price trends closely.

The growing importance of the fishing industry to the State is reflected in the fact that for the first time its value of production exceeded that of the dairying, poultry, or beekeeping sector of primary production. Good prices for crayfish and the rapid expansion of the prawning industry were the principal reasons for the record \$21,614,000 catch for the year.

It is perhaps not widely realised that our fishing industry is the most important in the Commonwealth, both in terms of its total catch and in terms of the contribution which it makes to Australia's balance of payments by way of its exports.

Once again, mineral production almost doubled in value for the year, reaching nearly \$121,000,000. Most of the rise was due to increased production of iron ore, but important increases also occurred in the production of bauxite and oil. In addition, the figure also includes the first returns from nickel mining.

The mineral industry in Western Australia is certain to play an ever-increasingly important role in the fortunes of the State, and although its production has risen from \$37,000,000 to \$121,000,000 in just three years, even this is but a forerunner of things yet to come. Already contracts and plans have been announced which will result in even more spectacular achievements in the years ahead.

Manufacturing Industry

On this occasion two years ago, I spoke of the development policy which my Government has consistently promoted since it

has been in office. I said then that it was our intention to press on with development on all fronts, and I stress the importance of encouraging the expansion of secondary industry as the basis for providing employment for the population that was so clearly necessary for the long-term stability of the economy and its continued growth.

I have referred already to the rates of population growth that the State has been able to absorb, and now I would like to draw members' attention to the truly remarkable revolution which has occurred in our manufacturing industries.

In 1962-63, the value of factory production was \$216,000,000. Present indications are that in 1967-68 our factories produced something in the vicinity of \$385,000,000 worth of goods, which represents a fantastic increase of 78 per cent. in five years. The remarkable thing about this performance is that it has taken place in our midst and seems to have gone almost unnoticed, and yet it is one of the most important pieces in our pattern of economic development.

During the last five years the factory work force has increased by more than 25 per cent., and today it is evident that women are playing a more important role in factory operations than they did in past years. This greater employment of women in manufacturing industry is in part due to the normal additions to be expected from expansion but, in addition, it is also the result of the greater opportunities that there are for women today in industry due to technological advances.

A pleasing feature of this growth is that it has added great variety and depth to local manufacturing. Many existing industries have expanded and strengthened their positions while many new firms have introduced new products and skills to the local scene. Overall, manufacturing industry today in Western Australia is much more diverse, much more efficient, and much more resilient to changing moods in the national economy.

This latter feature was well illustrated by the performance of our manufacturers, who were able to increase their production by well over 30 per cent. during the last two years while many parts of Australia were suffering from the dampening effects of a severe drought.

I am not being parochial when I enthuse about the achievements of Western Australian manufacturers, nor am I unrealistic enough to think that the day will come when all our needs could be supplied from local factories. Western Australia will always be an important market for outside manufacturers; and, in fact, during the last five years our purchases from other Australian States have risen from \$314,000,000 to \$506,000,000. I pause here to say that this is occasionally overlooked when Premiers in some States,

particularly the larger-populated States, refer to the road moneys which we receive under a certain formula. Nevertheless, I do emphasise the importance of the growth occurring in secondary industry.

At a time when the wealth being generated by the primary industries is being achieved largely by capital intensive operations that are not directly employing large numbers of people, the expansion of secondary industry to meet the growing needs of that development is ensuring that substantial benefits are flowing to the Western Australian economy, not the least of which are the growing job opportunities that it is creating.

Community Benefits

A most satisfying aspect of the Western Australian economy has been the general rise in income levels and the clear evidence that the average Western Australian is able to purchase more and to save more. In 1966-67, personal income in Western Australia averaged \$1,361 for every man, woman, and child. Comparable figures will not be available for 1967-68 for some time, but it is apparent from other economic indicators that there has been a further substantial lift in the figure.

Wage and salary earners have continued to benefit markedly and their average weekly earnings rose by a further 7.2 per cent. in 1967-68 after a gain of 7.8 per cent. in the previous year. The capacity of the community to satisfy their wants is reflected in retail sales which are estimated to have risen by about 9 per cent. during 1967-68 to a total of \$815,000,000.

Some of the increase was due, of course, to additional population, and some to the 2.9 per cent. average rise in prices; but, after allowing for this, it is apparent that people were able to increase measurably the volume of their purchases during the year.

At the same time, savings bank deposits in the State increased by a further 13 per cent., while investments in real estate and in stocks and shares also rose markedly, illustrating the capacity that the people have to save.

The Current Situation

In summary, therefore, it is evident that 1967-68 was another year of satisfactory progress for the State. Production attained new record levels and the benefits of development flowed to all sections of the community.

Economic activity is still at a very high pitch and there is every indication that we will maintain the high rate of economic growth of the last few years.

Western Australia is in a unique situation to forecast its economic future because a substantial amount of future investment is already known and committed.

ted in the programmes of many of the major development undertakings of the State.

It has been estimated that private investment in the State during the last three years exceeded \$1,250,000,000. From what is known of the major developments that are already under way or planned it seems certain that this rate of investment will be at least maintained, and indeed over the next three years private investment in the State is likely to reach \$1,500,000,000. This magnitude of investment by the private sector is a virtual assurance that the present rate of economic growth will continue.

We have already entered 1968-69 with a firm employment situation and every sign that migrants are still being attracted by the job opportunities available in the State. Under the present impetus it seems certain that our population will reach the 1,000,000 mark in 1971—it could be that this number will be attained in 1970.

Good rains throughout the State give promise of another excellent agricultural season and recent estimates place this year's wheat harvest at 117,000,000 bushels—some 10 per cent. higher than last year's record.

The mineral industry is set for another year of increased production and with the expanding manufacturing industry it is clear that 1968-69 is already away to a good start.

Financial Results for 1966-67

We ended the 1966-67 year with a published deficit of \$27,000. Although we have ceased to be a claimant State we will receive, during this year, the second and final instalment of the special grant for 1966-67, which amounts to \$582,000. This amount, paid on the recommendation of the Commonwealth Grants Commission, will leave us with a final surplus of \$555,000 for 1966-67.

The Year 1967-68

When I introduced the Supply Bill earlier this session, I informed the House that the published Budget result for 1967-68 was a surplus of \$829,000. Usually at this time I am required to guess what the final result may be after the accounts for the year have been examined by the Grants Commission. However, as a result of our recent agreement with the Commonwealth we will no longer have to wait to find out how our efforts have been rewarded. Consequently, the published surplus of \$829,000 is the final result for 1967-68, and is the fifth successive year in which a deficit on the Revenue Fund has been avoided.

Preservation of Capital

Members know the great importance we have always attached to this result because of the need to avoid any drain on our capital resources to support the

Revenue Fund. With capital the primary need in a State faced with such pressures of development, deficit funding from choice would be a thoroughly irresponsible financial policy. I think it is fair to say we have emphasised this whenever we have had the opportunity to do so, especially on occasions such as this; and I might point out that our loan programme has benefited in a very real way from the results of the financial effort and the advice we have received from the Under-Treasurer and his officers in this respect.

It is interesting to look at the trend of results over the last five years compared with the previous five years. In each of the last five years the State has ended the year with a surplus giving a total surplus result for the period of \$1,646,000. By comparison, the total of deficits incurred over the preceding five years was \$6,600,000 beginning with more than \$2,000,000 in 1958-59.

The reasons for this transformation of our financial position in a decade are to be found in three factors. The first is that in the interests of the development of the State we have not shirked from asking the people to make the same efforts to finance Government activity as is made in other States. The second is in the income to the Government generated by the large-scale development of our mineral wealth. The third is the rise in business activity and the wealth of the whole community which has greatly increased the base on which State taxes are levied.

So dramatic has been the effect of the latter factor in the last two or three years that we have been able to step out from under the Grants Commission umbrella and also to consider giving some tax relief, which I will come to shortly.

Cessation of Claimancy

Earlier this session I reported briefly to the House on the arrangements made with the Commonwealth Government in June for Western Australia to move from claimant status as from the beginning of this financial year. This decision was made after a great deal of thought and careful investigation; it was certainly not entered into lightly.

For 35 years the Commonwealth Grants Commission has played a significant part in the growth and development of Western Australia, and the special grant has been of immense value to the State in achieving this result.

In past years the special grant reflected the fact that Western Australia had a lower taxable capacity than the wealthier States. Average incomes of Western Australians were lower than in the more industrialised States, mainly because we had fewer of the more highly paid occupations; business turnovers also were lower on average and there were few really big firms. Consequently, even when we called on our citizens to pay taxes at the same

rates as in the other States we raised much less per head of population.

Similarly, our business undertakings, notably the railways, burdened with lower traffic densities, long mileages, and high unit costs, could not match the revenues achieved by their counterparts in the East, even with substantially the same rates.

We suffered also from the extra costs of providing services such as education, health, and law and order to a comparatively small population spread over a huge area. But, provided we made a comparable effort in raising revenue and containing expenditure, the special grant filled the gap and enabled the Government to provide Western Australians with a social infrastructure equal to the best in Australia.

This broad uniformity of social and economic standards throughout the nation is one of the great achievements of the special grant system; and, as Australians, we should be prepared to acknowledge the assistance given to us by our countrymen in other States and to recognise what it has meant to Western Australians over the years.

The other achievement of the special grant system is that it maintained Western Australia in a condition of readiness for expansion. With a change in economic fortune the base was there for a rapid lift in financial capacity.

Members who have followed my annual reviews of the local economy on these occasions will be conscious of the fundamental changes which have taken place in the economic capacity of the State in recent years. We can, I believe, be confident that the financial capacity of the State will now continue to grow at a rate fully comparable with the national average.

It would, of course, be the ambition of any Treasurer of a claimant State to achieve non-claimant status, and I take pride in the fact that it has been realised during my term of office. It is an historic event and a clear indication of the great strides Western Australia has made in recent years. I might also add that it is a clear vindication of our financial policy, which has always been to face facts and not to shrink from doing what had to be done.

When South Australia withdrew from claimancy in 1959, its move coincided with the negotiation of a new arrangement for the payment of financial assistance grants to the States. When the financial assistance grants formula was again revised in June, 1965, there was little evidence to suggest that Western Australia was then in a position to follow the South Australian example.

However, such was the speed of events during the next three years, that by early this year it had become apparent that Western Australia's dependency on the

special grant had stabilised and that, if our forecasts proved to be right, it could well decrease.

It was clearly right for Western Australia that we should seek to have the special grant incorporated with our financial assistance grant while it was at its present level, even though it meant that we had to take some chance on the future trend of economic events and on the continuation of good seasons. There were other important reasons for deciding we should not wait until 1970 when a new financial assistance grants arrangement was due to be negotiated.

The Commonwealth Grants Commission's announced decision to move from a two to a four-State standard would have meant a substantial change to our disadvantage in the standards by which the special grant was determined. I opposed this move strenuously at the time, and the later decision by the commission to defer the change until 1970 did not alter our resolve, which by then had firmed.

More important were the increasingly irksome restrictions imposed on our activities by the comparative methods used by the commission. We could never be sure when considering a profitable contract for large volume rail traffic, or in negotiating arrangements with private companies to provide works for the State that were to our great advantage, that a subsequent decision by the Grants Commission would not turn it to our disadvantage because it was out of line with other States.

I do not blame the members of the commission for this. They have been good friends of this State over many years, but their methods were shaped in a different era and for a different purpose, and were not readily adaptable to the needs of a fast developing State trying to take advantage of good business opportunities in the modern world of large-scale projects. We just had to be in a position to make our own decisions and be sure of the consequences.

Consequently, I sought the Prime Minister's agreement to our move from claimancy being made this year. He was in full agreement with our aims, but was not prepared to amend the current financial assistance grants arrangements at this time so as to incorporate the special grant into the State's financial grant immediately.

For my part, the immediate incorporation of the special grant was not the vital issue. What did matter was that it should be incorporated as part of our base grant when the new arrangements were under consideration in 1970. We had to have that assurance before we could agree to become non-claimant.

The amount of \$15,500,000 which was the special grant received for 1967-68 was, I considered, adequate for the remaining

two years of the current period if it could be retained.

The arrangement finally agreed upon was—

In lieu of the special grant, the Commonwealth will pay Western Australia the sum of \$15,500,000 in each of the years 1968-69 and 1969-70 in addition to the financial assistance grant payable under the formula.

The amount of \$15,500,000 added to the formula grant for 1969-70 will be regarded as the State's financial assistance grant for 1969-70 for the purpose of the review of the financial assistance arrangements in 1970.

The completion grant recommended by the Grants Commission in respect of 1966-67 will be paid in the normal way in 1968-69, and the advance payment of \$15,500,000 for 1967-68 will be regarded as the final grant for that year.

This is a most satisfactory outcome, and I am pleased to say that the Prime Minister was very fair in his attitude to the change.

We are now, to a much greater extent than before, masters of our own financial affairs. We can tackle our own problems in our own way, with less need to follow closely the financial pattern of other States.

However, it would be a mistake to assume that we will be enabled to make less efforts on our own behalf than before. Our basic position is unchanged in that what we spend we must raise. If anything, that simple fact will be brought home more sharply than before, in that our budgetary position will not be clouded by the complexities of the Grants Commission system.

Budget 1968-69

The continued economic growth of the State is reflected in Government revenue which remains buoyant. Collections from land tax in particular have increased markedly as higher land values have raised the base on which the present rates are applied. This is having a particularly severe effect on persons whose only land holding is the block on which their house stands. At the same time we believe that people holding vacant land for future profit should be put under greater pressure to improve their land or to sell it to someone else who will.

We also accept that there should be adequate protection for owners who have purchased a lot, but are unable for the time being to build on it. Consequently, legislation will be introduced shortly—

To reduce land tax payable on improved land. The greatest reduction will be at the low value end of the scale where the rate will be almost halved.

To provide that persons who own and reside in a dwelling in an area that is subsequently rezoned for other purposes will not pay tax on that portion of the unimproved value of the land that is attributable to the rezoning.

To increase the rate of tax on unimproved land on all values above \$6,000. This move will be coupled with a system of rebates whereby the difference between the improved and the unimproved scale for up to four years back, will be refunded to the taxpayer when the land is improved by the erection of a dwelling.

The net cost to the Budget this year of the land tax proposals is expected to be \$1,500,000.

Other changes in rates of taxation are not proposed and there is to be no new taxation for 1968-69. Total revenue is estimated at \$272,216,000, which is the sum required to cover expenditure allowed for in the Estimates.

I am therefore presenting a balanced Budget.

Estimated Revenue

Total revenue is expected to be \$21,478,000 greater than last year, of which increased receipts from the Commonwealth of \$10,648,000 account for almost one-half. Increased collections are expected from State Taxation (\$1,952,000), Territorial Revenue (\$5,247,000), and Public Utilities (\$4,964,000).

Revenue under the heading of Law Courts, Departmental, and Royal Mint is expected to decline by \$1,333,000 mainly because of—

A reduction in earnings of the Harbour and Light Department as a result of a smaller volume of general cargo through Port Hedland with the tapering off of the Mt. Newman construction stage.

A fall in the revenue of the Mines Department which is brought about by a change in the accounting treatment of survey fees.

A smaller recoup to the Treasury of debt charges following a change in the treatment of sinking fund contributions.

A decline in earnings of the Royal Mint due to the tapering off of coin production.

State Taxation

The main increase under this heading is from stamp duties which are expected to yield an additional \$1,745,000 this year. The greater part of this increase is from duty on conveyances and on receipts, both reflecting the expected continued rise in general business transactions.

Probate duty is expected to yield an additional \$402,000 as a result of rising values of estates, but land tax collections should

be lower by \$537,000, as rising collections are more than offset by the concessions I outlined earlier.

Territorial Revenue

A very substantial increase of \$4,391,000 should be recorded against iron ore royalties this year principally resulting from the greatly increased activity of Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd. However, the increase is not restricted to iron ore. Royalties from other minerals should increase by \$533,000, of which nickel should contribute \$308,000 and petroleum \$157,000.

Receipts from the Commonwealth

Total receipts from the Commonwealth payable to the Revenue Fund are expected to increase this year to \$123,265,000. Of this amount, \$582,000 is the completion grant for 1966-67 and is applicable to the services of that year. Provision has therefore been made in the Miscellaneous Services division of the Estimates for this sum to be appropriated for that purpose.

The amount available for the services of 1968-69 is therefore \$122,683,000, of which \$106,200,000 will be received under the financial assistance grant formula and \$15,500,000 as an additional assistance grant in lieu of the special grant.

Public Utilities

Revenue of the Country Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department is expected to increase by \$126,000 this year with the continued expansion of country water, sewerage, and irrigation schemes.

Railway revenue was less than expected last year principally because of a reduction in wheat and coarse grain haulage as a result of a shortage of shipping. Storage in country bins is about 140,000 tons more than at the same time last year, and, with the expectation of a good harvest, a considerable increase in revenue from this source is expected this year.

Ores and minerals also yielded less than was expected last year, with decreased earnings from manganese, pyrites, and coal. Substantially increased earnings are expected this year with heavier traffic in iron ore from Koolyanobbing and in bauxite, nickel, and manganese.

General traffic under the heading "all other paying goods" continues to be buoyant and a substantial increase in earnings from this source is expected this year. The year 1968-69 will provide the first experience of through goods traffic on the standard gauge railway and, although the main benefit will not be felt until the following year, some increased earnings are expected this year. Overall railway revenue is expected to increase by no less a sum than \$4,476,000 this year.

Estimated Expenditure

The estimates of expenditure for 1968-69 provide for a total outlay of \$272,216,000,

which exceeds last year's expenditure by \$22,307,000. The components of this increase are—

	\$
Interest and sinking fund	3,056,000
Other Statutes	1,025,000
Departmental	16,776,000
Public Utilities	1,449,000

Servicing the Public Debt

Debt charges are estimated at \$46,920,000 for 1968-69 and represent over 17 per cent. of the total outlay from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. This gives some indication of the cost of meeting the interest and sinking fund of our State debt. This year's increase of \$3,056,000 reflects charges payable on new loans and the conversion of maturing loans to higher interest rates.

Other Statutes

The greater part of the increase under the heading of "Other Statutes" is accounted for by a provision of \$650,000 to enable payment of increased superannuation benefits to retired Government employees. A good deal of work has been done on developing a new scheme for updating pensions and I expect to be in the position shortly to introduce the legislation required to implement a new approach to a rather vexed question.

Departmental

After allowing for transfers to the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Commonwealth grants which relate to past years' transactions, the real increase in departmental expenditure for this year is \$16,212,000. Of this increase, \$2,233,000 occurs under the heading of—

Treasury Miscellaneous Services

Important items of increased expenditure in this section of the Estimates include—

A grant of \$50,000 to the Paraplegic Association to assist in financing the construction of a hostel and rehabilitation centre at Shenton Park.

A rise of \$25,000 in the grant to the Spastic Welfare Association in accordance with a revised scale of assistance commenced last year.

An amount of \$50,000 for the Artificial Breeding Board to assist in meeting its establishment costs. It is hoped that once established, the board's activities will be self supporting.

An increase of \$87,000 in the grant to the Cancer Council. Of this amount, \$77,000 represents a Government contribution towards meeting the cost of purchase and installation of a deep X-ray plant.

Provision for an increase of \$106,000 in the grant to the Country High School Hostels Authority, the greater part of which is to meet debt charges on loans raised by the authority.

An amount of \$150,000 for the Home of Peace as a contribution towards financing the construction of two new hospital wards at Inglewood. A similar amount is to be provided next year.

A first instalment of \$500,000 of the Government's promised contribution to the Perth City Council for the construction of a concert hall.

A rise of \$250,000 in the allocation to the Tourist Development Authority to meet increased operating costs and to provide grants to local authorities for the development of facilities for tourists.

An increase of \$488,000 in the grant to the Western Australian Institute of Technology for the further expansion of that institution.

A substantial lift of \$75,000 in the grant to the King's Park Board, bringing it up to \$265,000 to allow continued development of this reserve.

A amount of \$200,000 for the purchase of land for the proposed cultural centre north of the railway line. The land concerned is between William Street and Museum Street, which must be acquired before the new library can be commenced.

These are but a few of the highlights of the Miscellaneous Services division of the Estimates, but they serve to illustrate the emphasis given in the Budget to activities of a charitable or community nature.

Education

Provision has been made for the Education Department to spend \$45,478,000 this year which exceeds last year's outlay by \$4,254,000. Expenditure on education at all levels is estimated at \$54,000,000 or nearly 20 per cent. of the total Budget. Included in the Education vote is a sum of \$661,000 to finance increased benefits to independent and Government schools as follows:—

The grant of \$10 per child to independent primary schools introduced in February this year will be doubled from the beginning of the next school year.

Parents of secondary-school children at all schools will be assisted to meet the rising cost of textbooks in two ways: Firstly, by a textbook subsidy scheme; and, secondly, by the payment of grants to all schools to enable the purchase of stocks of books to be used for matriculation studies.

Libraries in all schools will be strengthened by increased grants to Government schools for book purchases and by increased subsidies for library books purchased by parent organisations of both Government and private schools.

Increased assistance will be given to all schools for the purchase of teaching aids and equipment and to P. and C.

groups in Government schools towards ground improvements and building projects.

Hospitals

Medical and health services continue to make very heavy demands on the State's resources. This year, the allocation for hospitals amounts to \$24,455,000, an increase of \$3,507,000 or 16.7 per cent. over the previous year. It gives some indication of the cost of medical and health services in a State such as ours. Percentage increases of this magnitude are serious and far outstrip the rate of increase in State revenue and Commonwealth grants.

Two years ago, I drew the attention of members to the fact that expenditure on hospitals had increased by almost 50 per cent. in only four years. Estimated expenditure this year of \$24,500,000 will mean that the cost of maintaining hospitals will almost double in only six years. Without any doubt, this is an area where the Commonwealth Government must give urgent consideration to means of assisting the States with what is looming as a crushing financial burden. As in the previous year, the largest increase occurs in the wages bill which this year will add \$820,000 to the expense of servicing our hospitals.

Public Health

Public Health services are expected to cost \$3,292,000 in this financial year. This is an increase of \$297,000 over the cost of the preceding year. Here again the increase is of a very substantial order and arises in the main from the need to service an expanding population. This applies particularly to the north where the growth of new towns has required the increased provision of health services in that part of the State.

An interesting sidelight is that the Division of Epidemiology has completed the first phase of immunising children against polio with Sabin oral vaccine. The service is now being offered to adults.

Mental Health

Provision this year of \$5,490,000 for mental health is higher by \$690,000 than last year's outlay. The upgrading of accommodation and facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of patients at Claremont Mental Hospital and other centres is continuing.

Additional facilities have been provided in the form of a rehabilitation workshop at Claremont, a centre for autistic children at Subiaco, an outpatients' clinic at Bentley, a new 64-bed ward for children at Pyrron Training Centre, and a new hostel at Subiaco. This hostel is the forerunner of a number of proposed small hostels designed to provide a homely atmosphere for patients who are well enough to leave hospital and undertake some form of employment. The cost of providing staff for these new facilities is expected to be \$246,000, whilst wage rises will add \$341,000 to the cost of existing staff.

Police

The sum provided for police services will increase this year by \$916,000 to \$7,795,000. The Government has approved of an increase of 50 police officers to the force to bring the authorised total strength to 1,460. This follows increases of 50 officers in each of the two preceding years. Funds also provide for the expansion of the motor vehicle fleet by the purchase of 26 vehicles and 20 motor cycles at an estimated cost of \$64,000, and the replacement of the Police launch at an estimated cost of \$24,000.

In the current financial year, provision has been made for the introduction of reflectorised vehicle license plates, with a view to providing an additional safety feature.

Last year, the department completed the conversion of motor drivers' licenses to automatic processing by computer. The conversion of motor vehicle licenses is well under way.

Prisons

Allowance has been made to spend considerably more on penal establishments this year than in 1967-68. The increase is \$388,000 on last year's outlay of \$1,677,000, or a rise of 23 per cent. A substantial part of the increase is to provide for the appointment this year of additional staff and to meet the full year cost of new staff recruited in 1967-68.

The engagement last year of a supervisor of industries, a works manager, trade instructors, and welfare officers has indicated what can be done in the field of rehabilitation. With added staff and improved equipment for workshops, funds for which are also provided in this year's Estimates, the department will be able to further develop in this direction. In addition, members will recall that I recently announced a programme for training prisoners in selected trades, which we hope will greatly assist in the rehabilitation of prisoners on their return to civil life.

Other Departments

I do not propose to comment on the votes of other departments as members will be supplied with the Estimates and will no doubt take the opportunity to obtain whatever additional information they require from the Ministers concerned when the Bill is in the Committee stage.

Public Utilities

Expenditure on railways is expected to be lower this year by \$1,273,000, which is due in the main to a change in accounting for the charging of accrued annual and long service leave of railway employees. In addition, a non-recurring adjustment took place last year in railway accounts to extinguish the book value of gravel ballast which had been replaced in the past by metal without appropriate ac-

counting entries. This results in a saving in the charge for depreciation in 1968-69.

An increase of \$2,691,000 is provided in the vote for country water supplies, sewerage, drainage, and irrigation. This increase is due to higher operating costs resulting from continued expansion of services and an allowance for depreciation of wasting assets not previously provided.

Conclusion

The main purpose of the Bill is to appropriate the sums required for the services of the current financial year as detailed in the Estimates and it also makes provision for the grant of supply to complete requirements for this year.

Supply of \$110,000,000 has already been granted under the Supply Act, 1968, and further supply of \$105,219,000 is provided for in the Bill now under consideration. This total sum of \$215,219,000 is to be appropriated in the manner shown in a schedule to the Bill.

The Bill also makes provision for the grant of further supply of \$12,000,000 from the Public Account for Advance to Treasurer which is to supplement the sum of \$5,000,000 already granted under the Supply Act.

As well as authorising the provision of funds for the current year, the Bill ratifies the amounts spent during 1967-68 in excess of the Estimates for that year. Details of these excesses are given in the relevant schedule to the Bill.

Under section 41 of the Forests Act, 1918-1964, it is necessary for a scheme of expenditure from the Forests Improvement and Reforestation Fund to be submitted annually for the approval of Parliament.

The Bill makes provision for the appropriation of the moneys for the current financial year in accordance with the scheme of expenditure already laid on the Table of the House.

Before closing, I would like to thank members for their attention to what has been a long speech and to say that I believe this to be a constructive, as well as an historic, Budget and one that heralds a period of growing financial strength for this State.

Before I close I would once again like to thank the Under-Treasurer, the Deputy and Assistant Under-Treasurer, and his officers, for their hard work during the year, and for their very sound advice. As I said previously, I believe that advice has led to the position of which we can well be proud. Irrespective of our politics and financial policies, that advice has meant that we have been able to derive the maximum benefit from the great natural resources we enjoy in this State. On that note, I commend the Bill to the House.

The Consolidated Revenue Fund Estimates, 1968-69, were tabled.

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

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

ESTIMATE FOR 1968/69

	\$	\$	\$	\$
Surplus for year 1967-68				828,636
Financial Improvement.				
Add Increases in Estimated Revenue.				
Taxation—				
Stamp Duty	1,744,971			
Probate Duty	402,101			
Licenses	133,192			
Betting Taxes	103,430			
Third Party Insurance Surcharge	44,900			
			2,488,612	
Territorial—				
Land	75,580			
Mining	5,163,168			
Timber	3,194			
			5,246,951	
Law Courts				188,907
Departmental—				
Agriculture	171,761			
Automatic Data Processing Centre	68,000			
Child Welfare	41,770			
Explosives	50,647			
Forests	123,324			
Lands and Surveys	124,496			
Land Titles	126,159			
Native Welfare	39,170			
Police	134,534			
Printing	61,148			
Public Works	41,220			
Minor Variations	230,569			
Treasury Miscellaneous Revenue—				
Interest—Bunbury Port Authority	149,930			
Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry	105,941			
Fremantle Port Authority	97,035			
Hospital Fund	277,011			
State Housing Commission	78,333			
Metropolitan Water Supply	303,539			
State Electricity Commission	220,598			
Minor Variations	41,420			
Sinking Fund—Minor Variations	47,424			
Business Undertakings—Profits and Surpluses	60,657			
Miscellaneous—Minor Variations	52,057			
		1,433,045		2,646,752
Commonwealth—				
Additional Assistance Grant	15,500,000			
Financial Assistance Grant	10,084,245			
Interest Contributions	136			
			25,584,381	
Public Utilities—				
Country Water Supplies, Sewerage and Drainage	125,818			
Railways	4,745,908			
Minor Variations	81,890			
			4,963,625	
Add Decreases in Estimated Expenditure—				
Special Acts—Minor Variations				11,570
Departmental—				
Industrial Development	97,362			
Mines	133,141			
Electoral	124,637			
Minor Variations	156,585			
Treasury Miscellaneous Services—				
University of W.A.—Additional Grant	124,997			
Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry	277,820			
Computer Installation	388,000			
Minor Variations	340,673			
		1,137,460		1,649,415
Public Utilities—				
Railways			1,272,673	
				44,053,391
Carried forward				44,582,027

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND—continued

			\$	\$	\$	\$
	Brought forward	44,882,027
Financial Deterioration.						
Less Decreases in Estimated Revenue—						
Taxation—						
Land Tax	536,527		
Licences—Other	36		
					536,563	
Departmental—						
Harbour and Light	477,901		
Mines	372,110		
Minor Variations	37,155		
Treasury Miscellaneous Revenue—						
Interest—Minor Variations	30,055		
Sinking Fund—Fremantle Port Authority	224,581		
Hospital Fund	212,798		
Metropolitan Water Supply	845,845		
Railways	1,261,336		
State Electricity Commission	382,916		
Minor Variations	100,862		
Business Undertakings—Profits and Surpluses	115,639		
Miscellaneous—Minor Variations	20,727		
				3,194,759		
					4,081,925	
Royal Mint			88,579
Commonwealth—Grant under Section 96			14,930,000
Less Increases in Estimated Expenditure—						
Special Acts—						
Interest and Sinking Fund	3,056,022		
Parliamentary Allowances	111,514		
Superannuation and Family Benefits	659,126		
Minor Variations	266,183		
					4,092,845	
Departmental—						
Agriculture	406,775		
North-West	1,757,371		
Education	4,117,131		
Native Welfare	296,380		
Crown Law	258,087		
Land and Surveys	314,486		
Forests	110,224		
Public Works	910,657		
Child Welfare	312,804		
Prisons	372,696		
Police	853,104		
Medical	3,324,745		
Public Health	242,638		
Mental Health	639,864		
Minor Variations	519,423		
Treasury Miscellaneous Services—						
Country High School Hostels Authority	106,490		
Home of Peace	150,000		
Perth City Council—Contribution towards Concert Hall	500,000		
Tourist Development Authority	249,882		
University of W.A.—Engineering School, etc.	151,217		
W.A. Institute of Technology	448,070		
M.T.T.—Recoup of Losses	238,540		
Acquisition of Land for Cultural Purposes	200,000		
Pay Roll Tax	178,839		
Completion Grant, 1966-67	582,000		
Minor Variations	1,129,293		
				3,934,331		
					18,425,736	
Public Utilities—						
Country Water Supplies, Sewerage and Drainage	2,690,828		
Minor Variations	31,401		
					2,722,229	
						44,882,027
Estimated Surplus for the Year						<i>Nil</i>

FINANCIAL STATEMENT, 1968-69

INDEX TO RETURNS

	Return No
I. Balance Sheet	1
II. Consolidated Revenue Fund—	
Revenue and Expenditure, 1967-68, compared with Estimate	2
Revenue—Statement of Receipts, 1967-68, and previous years	3
Expenditure Statement, 1967-68, and previous years	4
Revenue and Expenditure—Source and Functional Application Per Capita	5
Dissection of Expenditure	6
III. General Loan Fund—	
Loan Repayments	7
Loan Expenditure for 1967-68, and previous years	8
IV. Public Debt—	
Loan Indebtedness	9a
Sinking Fund—Transactions for the Year	9b
Net Public Debt per head of Population	9c
Contingent Liabilities	9d
Loan assets, 1967-68—Summarised classification	10
Loan assets, 1967-68—Detailed classification	11
V. Business Undertakings—	
a. Public Utilities—Summary	12
Country Areas Water Supply	13
Railways Commission	14
State Batteries	15
b. State Trading Concerns—Summary	16
State Engineering Works	17
West Australian Meat Export Works	18
Wyndham Freezing, Canning and Meat Export Works	19
c. Other business undertakings—Summary	20
State Electricity Commission	21
Rural & Industries Bank—Rural Department	22
State Government Insurance Office	23
Charcoal Iron & Steel Industry	24
Albany Port Authority	25
Bunbury Port Authority	26
Fremantle Port Authority	27
Midland Junction Abattoir Board	28
Metropolitan Markets Trust	29
Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust	30
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board	31
Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission	32
Government Employees Housing Authority	33
VI. Trust Funds—	
Road Funds	34
Forests Improvement and Reforestation Fund	35
Hospital Fund	36
The State Housing Commission Funds	37
VII. Statistical Section—	
Receipts from Commonwealth taken to the Consolidated Revenue Fund 1901-02 to 1967-68	38
Adjusted Budget Results after Receipt of Commonwealth Special Grants, 1947-48 to 1968-69	39
Other Receipts from Commonwealth, 1967-68	40
Commonwealth Grants for Science Laboratories and Technical Training	41
State Taxation and Taxation per head	42
Social Service Expenditure, 1967-68	43
Western Australian Government Railways—Statement of Operations	44
Tonnage and Earnings on goods carried	45
Indicators of Western Australian Economic Conditions	46

[Return No. 1]

GOVERNMENT OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA
BALANCE SHEET AS AT 30th JUNE, 1968

30th June, 1967		30th June, 1968	
\$	Funds Employed	\$	\$
889,555,703	Loan Flotations	942,959,504	
140,954,383	Less Redemptions from Sinking Fund	149,990,232	
748,601,320			792,969,272
26,663,508	Trust Funds, Governmental	33,443,710	
3,798,522	Less Investment	4,669,370	
22,864,986			28,774,340
34,637,229	Trust Funds, Private	38,976,190	
33,396,158	Less Investments	36,700,319	
1,291,071			2,185,871
6,348,574	Suspense Accounts		9,934,198
7,371,851	Commonwealth Grants and Advances		8,831,246
2,293,754	Trading Concerns and Public Utilities' Banking Accounts		5,075,424
788,771,556			847,810,351
Dr. 4,461,520	Consolidated Revenue Fund:		
Dr. 27,494	Balance at commencement of year	210,986	
	Surplus for Year	828,636	
4,489,014		1,045,622	
4,706,000	Special Grant from Commonwealth received in year	18,000	
216,086			1,063,622
788,988,542			848,873,973

Employment of Funds

Works and Services—			
841,274,712	Railways, Tramways, Electricity, Harbours, Water Supplies, Housing, and other State Undertakings	804,282,591	
8,849,931	Flotation Expenses and Discounts and Exchange	9,259,946	
39,413,162	Consolidated Revenue Fund Deficits (Funded)	39,413,162	
889,537,605		942,959,699	
140,954,383	Less Redemptions of Debt applied to depreciation of assets, etc.	149,990,232	
748,583,422			792,969,467
Other Assets—			
29,950,000	Short Term Investment		49,110,470
309,425	Cash at Bank	50,927	
134,638	Cash in London	145,133	
331,604	Cash in Hand	354,911	
775,587			531,023
3,200,149	Stores Accounts		2,705,643
Advances—			
5,577,847	Treasurer's Advances to Departments, etc.	3,376,320	
53,260	Trust Funds, Governmental (Overdrawn Accounts)	153,799	
261,292	Trust Funds, Private (Overdrawn Accounts)		
503,916	Trading Concerns and Public Utilities (Overdrawn Banking Accounts)		
83,089	Commonwealth Grants and Advances (Overdrawn Accounts)	2,231	
6,479,404			3,532,370
788,988,542	Total Assets		848,873,973

II.—CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

[Return No. 2]

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE, 1967-68, COMPARED WITH ESTIMATE

Summary

	Estimate	Actual	Comparison with Estimate	
			Increase	Decrease
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Revenue	244,176,000	250,737,839	6,561,839	
Expenditure	244,900,000	249,909,203	5,009,203	
Surplus		828,636	1,552,636	
Deficit	724,000			
Net Improvement			\$1,552,636	

DETAILS

Revenue	Estimate	Actual	Comparison with Estimate	
			Increase	Decrease
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Taxation	30,974,000	34,915,951	3,941,951	
Territorial	10,411,000	11,845,049	1,434,049	
Law Courts	1,320,000	1,441,093	121,093	
Departmental	32,514,000	33,135,173	621,173	
Royal Mint	548,000	557,579	9,579	
Commonwealth	111,365,000	112,616,619	1,251,619	
Public Utilities	57,044,000	56,226,375		817,625
Total Revenue	244,176,000	250,737,839	6,561,839	
Net Increase			\$6,561,839	

Expenditure	Estimate	Actual	Comparison with Estimate	
			Increase	Decrease
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Special Acts—				
Constitution Act	16,200	16,200		
Interest—Overseas	3,514,300	3,215,606		298,694
Interest—Australia	33,102,700	32,816,640		286,060
Sinking Fund	7,863,000	7,831,732		31,268
Other Special Acts	8,746,640	9,035,747	289,107	
Governmental—				
Departmental	135,959,860	137,885,630	1,925,770	
Public Utilities	55,697,300	59,107,048	3,410,348	
Total Expenditure	244,900,000	249,909,203	5,009,203	
Net Increase			\$5,009,203	

II.—CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

[Return No. 3]

REVENUE

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS FROM 1964-65 TO 1967-68, AND ESTIMATE FOR 1968-69

Heads	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	Estimate 1968-69
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Taxation—					
Land Tax	2,891,902	3,397,551	3,588,672	4,811,527	4,275,000
Stamp Duty	8,368,432	9,687,559	13,004,320	18,255,029	20,000,000
Probate Duty	3,030,404	3,947,043	4,777,227	5,197,899	5,600,000
Licenses	1,952,272	2,037,582	2,350,570	2,592,844	2,726,000
Third Party Insurance Sur- charge	572,394	608,771	660,907	700,091	745,000
Betting Taxes—					
Totalisator Duty and Licenses	311,798	360,978	400,897	454,962	500,000
Bookmakers Betting Tax and Licenses	131,836	134,112	151,950	164,841	168,000
Investment Tax	514,306	548,758	574,424	579,156	592,000
Totalisator Agency Board Betting Tax	1,679,888	1,793,677	1,970,583	2,098,651	2,200,000
Stamp Duty on Betting	59,150	57,848	56,408	60,951	62,000
Total	19,512,382	22,573,879	27,535,958	34,915,951	36,868,000
Territorial and Departmental—					
Land	1,004,182	1,118,340	1,357,057	1,435,411	1,511,000
Mining	513,450	769,414	2,970,550	6,992,832	12,161,000
Timber	2,589,194	2,720,322	3,327,502	3,416,806	3,420,000
Royal Mint	562,136	590,073	747,149	557,579	471,000
Departmental Fees, etc.	26,711,758	28,752,503	31,460,548	33,135,173	31,700,000
Law Courts	906,350	998,684	1,212,324	1,441,093	1,630,000
Total	32,287,070	34,939,336	41,075,130	46,978,894	50,893,000
Commonwealth—					
Financial Assistance Grant	70,498,358	78,474,063	86,395,579	96,151,755	106,236,000
Special Grant	17,120,000	24,038,000	19,406,000	15,518,000	582,000
Additional Assistance Grant	15,500,000
Interest Contribution....	946,864	946,864	946,864	946,864	947,000
Total	88,565,222	103,458,927	106,748,443	112,616,619	123,265,000
Public Utilities—					
Country Areas Water Supplies, Sewerage and Drainage	2,905,688	3,308,373	4,072,788	4,500,182	4,626,000
State Abattoirs and Saleyards	408,064	438,139	449,344	468,894	551,000
Railways	36,381,420	41,863,946	48,194,002	51,183,092	55,929,000
State Batteries	83,172	72,747	70,533	74,207	84,000
Total	39,778,344	45,683,205	52,786,667	56,226,375	61,190,000
GRAND TOTAL	180,143,018	206,655,347	228,146,198	250,737,839	272,216,000

[Return No. 4]

II.—CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND EXPENDITURE

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURE FROM 1964-65 TO 1967-68, AND ESTIMATE FOR 1968-69

Head	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	Estimate 1968-69
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Special Acts	41,478,150	45,263,932	49,939,270	52,915,925	56,907,000
Departmental—					
Parliament	251,588	263,491	303,238	317,151	326,000
Premier	203,172	225,261	245,512	297,945	295,000
Treasury	338,730	352,593	431,490	487,806	544,000
A.D.P. Centre	47,922	142,965	124,000
Governor's Establishment	55,748	60,927	62,491	67,763	96,060
London Agency	154,370	200,943	233,791	213,587	189,000
Tokyo Agency	31,889	15,700
Public Service Commissioner (a)	122,150	151,107	177,610	213,347	247,000
Government Motor Cars	23,950	33,888	113,812	134,890	127,000
Audit	221,838	239,547	268,403	289,277	302,000
Government Stores	386,064	425,250	495,531	552,238	590,000
Taxation	409,004	480,066	525,459	599,773	650,000
Superannuation Board	43,596	50,371	60,342	65,501	61,000
Printing	1,448,684	1,631,209	977,916	949,550	960,000
Miscellaneous Services	12,406,198	16,408,924	18,457,954	16,475,159	19,272,000
Agriculture (b)	2,789,228	3,056,257	3,459,464	3,801,480	4,220,000
College of Agriculture	193,204	189,927	224,411	249,742	285,000
Agriculture Protection Board	100,748	110,194	(e)	(e)	(e)
Industrial Development	647,484	760,842	865,648	970,362	873,000
North-West	8,733,142	9,024,530	9,885,105	10,786,629	12,544,000
Education	28,620,700	33,420,730	35,988,249	40,207,869	44,325,000
Native Welfare	1,135,478	1,307,950	1,436,930	1,820,620	2,117,000
Mines	1,485,418	1,646,920	1,898,539	2,375,141	2,242,000
Crown Law	1,879,734	2,083,260	2,472,260	2,691,933	2,950,000
Electoral	155,296	75,404	87,514	279,837	155,000
Licensing	32,348	33,411	45,376	47,444	52,000
Land and Surveys	2,223,824	2,407,691	2,829,400	3,234,514	3,549,000
Forests	1,247,640	1,296,881	1,401,679	1,576,776	1,687,000
Bush Fires Board	85,362	107,140	134,481	128,301	156,000
Public Works	4,237,326	4,911,672	5,704,194	6,689,343	7,600,000
Harbour and Light	1,299,354	1,539,724	1,513,576	1,895,965	1,822,000
Local Government	123,436	129,672	148,310	179,738	195,000
Town Planning	162,860	204,337	240,256	296,248	333,000
Child Welfare	1,720,398	1,870,001	2,130,322	2,272,196	2,585,000
Chief Secretary (including Reg- istry and Observatory)	461,072	524,847	593,765	644,217	647,000
Prisons	849,666	918,822	1,232,286	1,619,304	1,992,000
Police	4,940,106	5,269,949	5,819,598	6,585,806	7,444,000
Weights and Measures	(c)	47,000	50,534	50,473	58,000
Labour (including Scaffolding)	111,912	136,201	154,278	162,899	196,980
Factories	82,600	86,785	88,057	99,630	109,000
Industrial Commission	93,272	115,652	131,332	139,140	158,000
Medical	15,081,792	16,446,028	18,541,295	20,395,255	23,720,000
Homes	1,203,310	1,365,691	(d)	(d)	(d)
Public Health	1,779,266	1,955,426	2,333,817	2,544,362	2,787,000
Mental Health Services	3,151,622	3,481,228	4,215,074	4,800,136	5,490,000
Fisheries	278,830	342,752	421,942	500,803	570,000
Sundries	626	625	625	625	660
Total, Departmental	100,977,086	115,400,126	126,449,788	137,885,629	154,662,000
Public Utilities—					
Country Areas Water Supplies,					
Sewerage and Drainage	4,503,366	4,778,819	5,418,997	6,002,172	8,693,000
State Abattoirs	486,396	510,756	531,973	525,200	548,000
Railways	36,965,310	40,209,723	45,397,156	52,172,878	50,900,000
State Batteries	420,760	412,101	436,508	407,399	416,000
Total Public Utilities	42,384,832	46,001,399	51,784,634	59,107,649	60,557,000
GRAND TOTALS	184,840,068	206,665,457	228,173,692	249,909,203	272,210,000
SURPLUS FOR YEAR				828,636
DEFICIT FOR YEAR	4,697,050	10,110	27,494

(a) Since 1966-67 includes expenditure for Public Service Arbitration. (b) Since 1966-67 includes expenditure for Co-ordinator of Agricultural Industries. (c) Prior to 1964-65 included with Police Department. (d) Taken over by Medical Department from 1st July, 1966. (e) Total contribution now provided under Special Acts.

II. CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

[Return No. 5]

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE
SOURCE AND FUNCTIONAL APPLICATION PER CAPITA

Details	Year and Per Capita				
	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
REVENUE					
Commonwealth (including Financial Assistance Grant)	78,987,514 98.88	88,565,222 108.38	103,458,927 123.56	106,748,443 123.82	112,616,619 126.19
State Taxation	17,604,304 22.04	19,512,382 23.88	22,573,879 26.96	27,535,958 31.94	34,915,951 39.13
Departmental and Territorial	25,920,458 32.45	32,287,070 39.51	34,939,336 41.73	41,075,130 47.64	46,978,894 52.64
Public Utilities and Trading Concerns	45,376,194 56.80	39,778,344 48.68	45,683,205 54.56	52,786,687 61.23	56,226,375 63.00
Total—Revenue	167,888,470 210.17	180,143,018 220.45	206,655,347 246.81	228,146,198 264.63	250,737,839 280.96
EXPENDITURE					
Social Services					
Education	31,248,636 39.12	35,448,308 43.38	40,795,375 48.72	44,362,199 51.45	50,598,223 56.70
Health, Hospitals and Charities	24,170,990 30.26	27,006,690 33.05	29,657,842 35.42	32,383,039 37.56	36,316,661 40.69
Law, Order and Public Safety	7,674,496 9.60	8,585,554 10.48	9,381,076 11.21	10,721,817 12.44	12,062,409 13.52
Total, Social Services	63,094,122 78.98	71,020,552 86.91	79,834,293 95.35	87,487,055 101.45	98,977,293 110.91
Development of State Resources	23,308,348 29.18	22,200,550 27.17	25,325,482 30.25	28,952,835 33.58	32,359,988 36.26
Transport	40,844,370 51.13	43,136,658 52.79	46,817,348 55.92	51,237,866 59.43	58,601,030 65.66
Legislative and General	10,281,692 12.87	12,299,922 15.05	15,209,297 18.16	18,303,434 21.23	15,279,784 17.12
Public Debt Charges	33,152,298 41.50	36,182,386 44.28	39,479,037 47.15	42,212,502 48.96	44,691,108 50.08
Total—Expenditure	170,680,830 213.66	184,840,068 226.20	206,665,457 246.83	228,173,692 264.66	249,909,203 280.03

Based on estimated mean population, viz. 1967-68 892,442

[Return No. 6]

DISSECTION OF CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND EXPENDITURE
1963-64 TO 1967-68

Item	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Interest	25,924,574	28,222,792	31,022,813	34,217,135	36,032,246
Sinking Fund	5,846,724	6,445,784	6,902,961	7,444,980	7,831,732
Exchange	1,064,216	1,081,688	1,041,152
Salaries and Wages	72,469,984	76,548,016	85,279,312	92,400,755	103,608,015
Grants	6,348,534	7,443,632	8,143,980	9,566,213	12,258,755
Pensions	2,528,942	2,712,178	2,841,556	2,982,203	3,400,902
All other	56,497,856	62,385,978	71,433,683	81,562,406	86,777,553
Total	170,680,830	184,840,068	206,665,457	228,173,692	249,909,203

III.—GENERAL LOAN FUND

[Return No. 7]

LOAN REPAYMENTS
RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE

Year ended 30th June					Receipts	Expenditure	Balance
					\$	\$	\$
1928	308,216	308,216
1929	470,808	66,594	712,430
1930	307,166	433,294	586,302
1931	168,496	754,799
1932	224,722	343,600	635,920
1933	183,502	498,550	320,872
1934	201,870	431,480	91,262
1935	301,014	194,128	198,148
1936	215,812	149,582	264,378
1937	245,950	156,752	353,576
1938	268,924	309,650	312,850
1939	294,080	306,210	300,720
1940	254,940	202,172	353,488
1941	255,778	280,404	328,862
1942	342,464	179,734	491,592
1943	562,710	369,414	684,888
1944	512,306	397,792	799,402
1945	414,150	444,986	768,566
1946	574,086	421,190	921,462
1947	381,008	385,636	916,832
1948	996,174	564,310	1,348,696
1949	485,840	1,076,408	757,928
1950	504,366	597,278	665,016
1951	2,171,604	517,982	2,318,638
1952	2,012,620	2,177,342	2,153,916
1953	2,824,668	2,149,086	2,829,498
1954	3,280,686	2,586,280	3,523,904
1955	3,427,212	3,523,904	3,427,212
1956	3,366,960	3,427,212	3,366,960
1957	3,361,928	3,366,960	3,361,928
1958	3,667,446	3,361,928	3,667,446
1959	3,213,650	3,522,846	3,358,250
1960	3,659,398	3,358,250	3,659,398
1961	3,424,122	3,659,396	3,424,124
1962	3,900,476	3,424,124	3,900,476
1963	5,523,588	3,900,476	5,523,588
1964	4,273,400	5,523,588	4,273,400
1965	4,071,150	4,273,400	4,071,150
1966	4,983,483	4,071,150	4,983,483
1967	4,391,647	4,983,480	4,391,650
1968	7,348,516	4,391,000	7,348,566

III.—GENERAL LOAN FUND

[Return No. 8]

LOAN EXPENDITURE FROM 1963-64 TO 1967-68

Undertakings	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Railways.....	9,755,610	9,198,814	10,205,248	11,469,283	12,962,620
State Electricity Commission	500,000	1,300,000	2,150,000	4,250,000
Electricity for Government Establishments	27,438	294,444	134,387	277,193	293,450
Harbours and Rivers—					
South	1,866,958	1,905,194	1,790,662	701,165	349,913
North-West	222,952	524,380	558,766	619,470	643,622
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage	4,899,996	5,600,000	6,000,000	6,114,000	7,000,000
Water Supplies, Irrigation and Drainage—					
South	3,538,902	3,974,640	5,260,373	5,675,591	5,817,853
North-West	1,719,992	1,244,080	1,079,141	1,465,872	1,321,903
Sewerage for Country Towns	356,874	385,526	474,252	506,036	346,070
Public Buildings—					
South	14,156,098	18,247,992	18,117,944	15,998,426	17,532,260
North-West	1,276,610	1,243,920	1,502,564	1,829,654	1,229,182
Exmouth Township Development	164,008	104,226	182,438	408,206	2,589
Agriculture	656,622	491,272	500,793	455,234	796,459
Fisheries Research	602	14,000	18,894	86,642	62,823
Forests	350,000	300,000	380,000	400,000	400,000
Government Printing Office	71,250
Housing	3,382,000	1,540,000	1,151,924	2,975,000	2,640,000
Industrial Development	496,446	855,306	431,590	284,161	326,873
Land and Surveys	45,534
Mines	300,312	220,074	265,719	88,973	69,517
Charcoal-Iron and Steel Industry	390,000	96,798	329,000
Country High School Hostels Authority	43,714	51,906	56,879	64,746	71,962
Præmante Port Authority	940,000	400,000	550,000	450,000	1,450,000
Metropolitan Passenger Transport Trust	120,000	180,000	300,000	200,000	300,000
Midland Junction Abattoir Board	190,000	135,000
Rural and Industries Bank—Delegated Agencies	330,000	555,834	494,524	279,454	268,739
Royal Perth Hospital—Minor Works	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
State Hotels	4,580
University of Western Australia	834,560	374,998	54,261	1,029,803	225,892
Western Australian Institute of Technology	750,688
West Australian Meat Export Works	60,000	195,000
W.A. Coastal Shipping Commission	989,406	413,188	100,000	364,247
W.A. Tourist Development Authority	150,000	150,000	218,200	200,000	200,000
Wyndham Meat Works	200,000
Loans and Grants to Local Authorities and Other Public Bodies	452,870	578,716	840,244	605,509	40,257
Local Authority Loan Repayments	83,362	105,226	112,131	117,971	123,574
Roads and Bridges	872,666
Provision for Funding Revenue Deficits	564,026	5,750
	47,833,938	50,742,152	52,646,468	55,253,434	60,356,396
Add Discounts, Expenses, etc. (a)	437,424	223,500	279,857	227,915	236,213
Total Expenditure	48,271,362	50,965,652	52,926,325	55,481,349	60,592,609

(a) Charged to General Loan Fund.

IV.—PUBLIC DEBT

[Return No. 9]

(a) LOAN INDEBTEDNESS

(i) Transactions for the Year

	\$	\$	\$
Total amount raised to 30th June, 1967	889,555,703	
Flotations during the year—			
Commonwealth Loans—			
Loan 173	13,278,000		
174	14,940,000		
176	5,286,190		
178	3,964,300		
180	14,300,397		
Special Bonds—			
Series "N"	50,715		
Series "O"	983,841		
Series "P"	600,358		
		53,403,801	942,959,504
Redemptions—			
Total to 30th June, 1967	140,954,383	
During the year—			
National Debt Commission :			
Securities repurchased and redeemed :			
London	1,138,552		
New York	425,357		
Canadian	33,289		
Netherlands	35,844		
Commonwealth Government Debenture	296,684		
Instalment Stock	255,203		
Other Australian Securities	6,850,920		
		9,035,849	149,990,232
Gross Public Debt at 30th June, 1968		792,969,272
Sinking Fund		407,504
Net Public Debt at 30th June, 1968		792,562,768

(ii) Mint Par (Face) Values at Current Rates of Exchange

		At Mint Par of Exchange	At Current Rate of Exchange
		SA	SA
Australia	SAust.	723,807,997	723,807,997
London	£Stg.	31,299,359	67,069,576
New York	U.S. \$	12,547,000	11,202,679
Canada	Canadian \$	1,259,000	1,039,808
Switzerland	Swiss Francs	4,863,000	992,895
Netherlands	Guilders	3,047,000	751,529
Gross Public Debt		792,969,272	804,864,484

[Return No. 9—continued]

(b) SINKING FUND
Transactions for the Year

Receipts :	\$	\$
Balances brought forward, 1st July, 1967—		
National Debt Commission		215,787
Contributions :		
State—		
$\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on loan liability	2,098,306	
$\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on Special Deficit Loan	80,850	
$\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on Deficit Loans	547,057	
$\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on cancelled securities	4,982,420	
Midland Railway Acquisition	133,577	
Special contribution under clause 12 (20) of Financial Agreement	6,018	
Commonwealth—		
$\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on loan liability	1,986,135	
Net earnings on investments	16,732	
		9,851,095
Disbursements :		10,066,882
Redemptions and Repurchases, etc., at net Cost (including Exchange)		9,659,378
Balance, Sinking Fund, 30th June, 1968		407,504

(c) PUBLIC DEBT PER HEAD OF POPULATION AS AT 30th JUNE†

Year	Debt per Head \$	Year	Debt per Head \$
1927	315.43	1961	710.08
1930	326.98	1962	735.78
1935	395.19	1963	760.29
1940	407.58	1964	792.54
1945	390.90	1965	827.41
1950	392.46	1966	844.35
1955	540.23	1967	†853.97
1960	675.36	1968	*871.91

* Preliminary figure, liable to revision.

† Adjusted on corrected figures of population.

‡ Prior to 1967 excludes Aborigines.

(d) CONTINGENT LIABILITIES AT 30th JUNE, 1968

	Securities Issued	Re- deemed	In Circula- tion	Funds Invested
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Abattoirs Act (Midland Junction)	800,000	800,000	4,856
Albany Port Authority Act	470,000	470,000	2,834
Bunbury Port Authority Act	1,100,000	1,100,000	12,114
Fremantle Port Authority Act	1,950,000	1,950,000	88,752
Government Employees Housing Act	700,000	4,079	695,921
Metropolitan Market Act	436,000	168,479	267,521
Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust Act	5,236,160	45,302	5,190,858	1,249,729
Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act	4,490,000	17,010	4,472,990	123,840
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act	2,900,000	100,000	2,800,000	19,807
Milk Board Act	80,000	4,557	75,443
State Electricity Commission Act	67,297,160	305,444	66,991,716	2,814,558
State Housing Act	10,496,000	531,861	9,964,139	233,636
W.A. Coastal Shipping Commission Act	700,000	700,000	4,312
	96,655,320	1,178,732	95,478,588	4,554,238
Bank Guarantees and Indemnities in force	36,770,688
Total, Contingent Liabilities	132,249,276

IV.—PUBLIC DEBT

[Return No. 10]

SUMMARISED CLASSIFICATION OF LOAN ASSETS, 1967-68 (a)

Undertaking*	Loan Liability (b)	Capital Charges		Net Earnings	Surplus	Deficiency
		Interest	Sinking Fund			
	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$
Fully Productive						
Electricity Supply	42,189,896	1,951,671	382,916	2,334,587
Govt. Employees Housing Authority	3,432,133	190,124	18,112	178,236
Kwinana Housing	3,234,402	132,465	31,559	164,024
Metropolitan Markets	204,344	10,618	8,030	18,648
Metropolitan Water Supply	87,840,259	4,076,400	845,845	4,922,305
Midland Junction Abattoirs	3,190,187	159,308	29,271	185,039
Roads and Bridges	4,626,853	232,626	25,066	256,282
Rural and Industries Bank	22,229,554	791,036	2	791,038
State Engineering Works	339,308	16,954	5,904	59,080	35,762
State Housing Commission	35,732,870	1,164,347	271,542	1,435,889
North West Electricity	1,192,753	56,809	9,000	114,087	47,588
West Australian Meat Export Works	1,168,195	53,831	11,313	65,144
	205,175,757	8,806,399	1,838,820	10,526,569	83,350
Partially Productive						
Assistance to Industries	3,634,688	173,388	33,542	136,894	75,036
Bulk Handling at Ports	277,548	13,240	2,959	1,841	14,358
Harbours and Rivers	47,672,352	2,129,385	490,358	2,125,358	494,385
Kwinana Development	536,220	25,590	5,680	823	30,437
Loans and Grants to Local Authorities and Other Public Bodies	5,354,690	255,439	56,333	1,320	310,452
Mining Generally	4,572,789	218,139	48,704	22,081	244,762
Miscellaneous	7,095,178	344,145	81,002	108,700	316,441
Pine Planting and Reforestation	7,115,045	339,319	71,108	259,980	150,447
Plant Suspense	2,051,840	97,861	21,734	69,013	30,662
Railways	147,239,561	6,077,203	1,261,336	2,502,892	5,435,647
Rural and Industries Bank—Delegated Agency	4,661,808	222,389	47,148	76,263	193,274
Tourist Resorts	1,839,857	87,788	17,370	4,552	100,586
	232,049,645	10,583,876	2,142,274	5,329,723	7,896,427
Totally Unproductive						
Abattoirs, Sale Yards, Grain Sheds and Cold Storage	240,964	11,495	3,685	† 56,306	71,466
Agriculture Generally	11,872,394	566,359	118,462	† 555,404	1,240,225
Assessed Expired Capital (c)—						
Electricity	2,545,332	121,422	26,961	148,353
Railways	30,666,312	1,434,279	318,478	1,752,757
Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry	1,329,000	50,000	5,000	277,820	332,820
Country Water Supplies	98,437,703	4,695,857	962,456	†1,962,916	7,621,229
Metropolitan Transport Trust	4,640,708	229,792	30,145	† 292,523	552,460
Public Buildings including Schools, Police Stations, Gaols, Court Houses, etc.	181,771,232	8,326,868	1,440,674	† 324,152	10,091,604
Rabbit Proof Fence	931,778	30,138	6,692	36,830
State Batteries	1,361,708	64,959	14,099	† 368,161	447,219
W.A. Coastal Shipping Commission	8,353,967	419,440	69,909	†2,140,350	2,628,699
	341,251,098	15,950,609	2,977,682	†5,977,632	24,924,302
Summary						
Fully Productive	205,175,757	8,806,399	1,838,820	10,526,569	83,350
Partially Productive	232,049,645	10,583,876	2,142,274	5,329,723	7,896,427
Totally Unproductive	341,251,098	15,950,609	2,990,561	†5,977,632	24,924,302
Special Deficit Loans	6,285,908	299,862	296,684	596,546
Deficit Funded	8,203,050	391,318	759,204	1,150,522
Balance of General Loan Fund	3,805	182	189	371
	792,969,272	36,082,246	7,881,732	9,878,600	83,350	34,008,668

Public Debt—30th June, 1968

Net Deficiency \$33,985,318

* For details see Return No. 8.

† Debit.

(a) This statement distributes the net cost of loan charges for the year over the various assets. (b) Total expenditure from loan funds (including the proportionate cost of raising), after allowing for sinking fund redemptions and other adjustments. (c) Capital Charges met by Treasury.

IV.—PUBLIC DEBT

[Return No. 11]

DETAILED CLASSIFICATION OF LOAN ASSETS, 1967-68 (a)

Undertaking	Loan Liability	Capital Charges		Net Earnings	Surplus	Deficiency
		Interest	Sinking Fund			
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Railways	147,239,561	6,677,203	1,261,336	2,502,892	5,435,647
Railways—Assessed Expired Capital (b)	30,066,312	1,434,279	318,478	1,752,757
Metropolitan Transport Trust	4,640,708	229,792	30,145	†202,523	562,460
Electricity Supply	42,189,896	1,951,671	382,916	2,334,587
Electricity Supply—Assessed Expired Capital (b)	2,545,332	121,422	26,991	148,333
	226,681,809	10,414,387	2,019,836	4,544,956	7,839,247
<i>Harbours and Rivers</i>						
Fremantle Port Authority	18,529,393	719,235	224,581	943,866
Fremantle—Other	3,146,581	159,104	32,867	50,868	132,103
Bunbury Port Authority	5,053,350	231,522	31,195	304,265	8,452
Bunbury—Other	239,324	11,416	2,495	†17,201	31,112
Geraldton	4,635,919	221,151	48,103	528,592	259,278
Albany Port Authority	3,517,255	176,085	32,187	238,272	80,000
Albany—Other	417,266	19,905	4,420	17,546	6,779
Esperance	3,033,393	144,704	31,885	196,671	20,082
Busselton	240,444	11,470	2,547	†36,352	60,369
North-West Ports	4,343,556	207,204	39,419	164,370	141,753
Swan River	1,508,919	71,981	15,983	†12,862	100,826
Dredges, Steamers and Plant	1,357,061	64,737	14,375	†161,705	240,317
Other Jetties and Works	1,044,336	49,321	10,241	†31,472	91,534
	47,672,352	2,129,385	490,358	2,125,358	309,360	803,745
<i>Water Supplies</i>						
Metropolitan	37,646,259	4,070,460	845,845	4,922,305
Comprehensive Water Supply	69,738,694	3,326,805	675,688	†1,043,711	5,646,204
Other Water Supplies	606,109	28,913	6,420	†107,109	142,442
Irrigation and Drainage	23,271,837	1,110,158	235,413	†416,893	1,762,464
Sewerage for Country Towns	4,821,013	226,981	44,935	204,797	70,119
	136,083,962	8,772,317	1,808,301	2,959,389	7,621,229
<i>Trading Concerns and Business Undertakings</i>						
Engineering Works	333,308	16,954	5,964	58,680	35,762
W.A. Coastal Shipping Commission	8,353,907	419,440	69,909	†2,140,350	2,629,699
West Australian Meat Export Works	1,193,198	53,831	11,313	65,144
North-West Electricity	1,192,753	56,899	9,600	114,087	47,588
Metropolitan Markets	204,344	10,613	8,030	18,648
Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry	1,329,000	50,000	5,000	277,320	392,820
	12,576,570	607,742	109,816	†2,161,011	83,350	2,962,519
<i>Development of Agriculture</i>						
Rural and Industries Bank	22,229,554	791,036	2	791,038
Rural and Industries Bank—Delegated Agency	4,661,868	222,389	47,148	76,263	193,274
Rabbit-proof Fence	631,778	30,138	6,692	36,830
Generally	11,872,394	586,359	118,462	†555,404	1,240,225
	39,395,594	1,609,922	172,304	311,807	1,470,329

IV.—PUBLIC DEBT

[Return No. 11—continued]

DETAILED CLASSIFICATION OF LOAN ASSETS, 1967-68 (a)—continued

Undertaking	Loan Liability	Capital Charges		Net Earnings	Surplus	Deficiency
		Interest	Sinking Fund			
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<i>Abattoirs, Slaughterhouses, etc.</i>						
Midland Junction	3,180,187	159,368	26,271	185,689
Kalgoorlie Abattoirs	168,304	8,029	1,783	† 9,890	19,702
Generally	72,660	3,466	1,902	† 46,416	51,784
	3,431,151	170,863	29,956	129,333	71,466
<i>Development of Mining</i>						
State Batteries	1,361,708	64,959	14,099	† 368,181	447,219
Generally	4,572,789	218,139	48,704	22,081	244,762
	5,934,497	283,098	62,803	† 346,080	691,981
<i>Public Buildings</i>						
Education (including Narrogin School of Agriculture and Muresk College of Agriculture)	89,221,787	4,256,223	841,916	† 1,582,204	6,680,343
Police Stations, Quarters, etc.	5,044,758	283,587	54,416	† 167,809	505,812
Court Houses, Quarters, etc.	1,919,724	91,578	18,004	† 85,644	195,316
Gaols	2,395,823	114,289	22,172	† 43,377	179,838
Hospitals	51,826,153	2,127,959	212,799	2,340,788
Institutions	9,190,024	438,399	87,123	† 112,524	638,046
Buildings Generally	21,272,963	1,014,803	204,154	† 673,382	1,892,339
	181,771,232	8,326,868	1,440,674	† 324,152	10,091,684
<i>All Other</i>						
Assistance to Industries	3,634,688	173,388	38,542	136,894	75,036
Bulk Handling at Ports	277,548	13,240	2,959	1,841	14,358
Loans to Public Bodies	5,354,690	255,439	56,333	1,320	310,452
Miscellaneous	7,095,178	344,145	81,002	108,706	316,441
Pine Planting and Reforestation	7,113,045	339,319	71,108	259,980	150,447
Plant Suspense	2,051,849	97,881	21,734	89,018	30,602
Roads and Bridges	4,626,853	232,626	25,666	258,292
Tourist Resorts	1,839,857	87,768	17,370	4,552	100,586
State Housing Commission	35,732,870	1,164,347	271,542	1,435,889
Government Employees Housing Authority	3,432,133	160,124	18,112	178,236
Kwinana Area Development	536,220	25,580	5,680	823	30,437
Kwinana Area Housing	3,234,402	132,465	31,559	184,024
Special Deficit Loans	6,285,908	299,802	296,684	596,546
Deficits Funded	8,203,059	391,318	759,204	1,150,522
Balance of General Loan Fund	3,805	182	189	371
	89,422,105	3,717,684	1,697,684	2,639,570	2,775,798
Total	792,969,272	36,032,246	7,831,732	9,878,660	33,985,318
Public Debt, 30th June, 1968	792,969,272

(a) This statement distributes the net cost of loan charges for the year over the various assets.

(b) Capital Charges met by Treasury.

† Debit.

V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS

[Return No. 12]

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

A. Public Utilities

Public Utility	Return No.	Trading Results 1967-68	
		Profit	Loss
		\$	\$
Country Areas Water Supply	13	7,053,062
Railways Commission	14	4,800,023
State Batteries	15	486,784
Total—Net Loss	12,339,869

[Return No. 13]

COUNTRY AREAS WATER SUPPLY

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Loan Capital	49,760,182	53,779,610	58,315,628	63,789,410	69,765,513
Total Annual Revenue	2,398,138	2,790,876	2,652,592	3,112,962	3,297,530
Working Expenses	3,466,422	3,666,798	3,996,155	4,612,222	4,978,380
Interest	2,086,120	2,263,872	2,527,882	2,963,464	3,322,063
Depreciation including Sinking Fund	1,390,338	1,424,886	1,667,751	1,855,505	2,048,142
Provisions and Other Charges	1,026	698	2,694	2,716	4,007
Total Annual Cost	6,943,956	7,356,254	8,194,482	9,433,907	10,350,592
Loss	4,545,818	4,565,378	5,541,890	6,320,945	7,053,062

[Return No. 14]

RAILWAYS COMMISSION

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Loan Capital	119,106,178	124,569,110	131,136,721	136,631,940	142,843,589
Loan Capital—non-interest bearing	29,054,882	26,992,150	26,852,577	26,872,577	26,847,994
Total	148,161,060	151,561,260	157,989,298	163,504,517	169,691,583
Total Annual Revenue	35,189,660	36,686,332	43,668,937	49,119,986	52,772,880
Working Expenses	32,250,488	32,920,100	35,984,523	40,169,817	42,623,424
Interest	5,577,070	6,231,836	7,006,097	8,068,504	8,809,562
Depreciation including Sinking Fund	4,049,454	4,354,444	4,669,370	5,340,476	6,139,917
Total Annual Cost	41,877,012	43,506,380	47,659,990	53,578,797	57,572,903
Loss	6,687,352	6,820,048	3,991,053	4,458,811	4,800,023

V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS

[Return No. 15]

STATE BATTERIES

Details	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967
Loan Capital	\$ 1,171,634	\$ 1,219,384	\$ 1,242,105	\$ 1,282,037	\$ 1,306,051
Total Annual Revenue	71,420	79,986	85,030	76,921	81,231
Working Expenses	429,548	441,128	463,778	444,309	474,249
Interest	52,724	54,872	55,886	57,692	58,772
Depreciation including Sinking Fund	25,562	30,310	27,524	26,719	28,283
Provisions and Other Charges	5,462	5,462	5,836	5,774	6,711
Total Annual Cost	513,296	531,772	553,024	534,494	568,015
Loss	441,876	451,786	467,994	457,573	486,784

[Return No. 16]

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

B. State Trading Concerns

Trading Concern	Return No.	Trading Results, 1967-68	
		Profit	Loss
State Engineering Works	17	\$ 161,816	\$
W.A. Meat Export Works	18	58,468
Wyndham Freezing, Canning and Meat Export Works	19	143,398
Total—Net Profit	76,886

[Return No. 17]

STATE ENGINEERING WORKS

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
Loan Capital	\$ 368,384	\$ 350,442	\$ 344,979	\$ 339,272	\$ 333,308
Earnings	1,462,554	1,584,526	1,667,466	1,658,773	1,734,337
Increase in Stocks	83,118	56,046
Decrease in Stocks	59,720	4,960	23,850
Total Annual Revenue	1,402,834	1,667,644	1,662,506	1,634,923	1,790,383
Working Expenses	1,162,042	1,346,896	1,365,989	1,360,182	1,490,218
Interest	17,730	17,494	17,055	17,242	16,954
Depreciation including Sinking Fund	36,616	35,446	34,914	39,292	44,590
Provisions and Other Charges	47,924	73,730	62,818	74,736	76,805
Total Annual Cost	1,264,312	1,473,566	1,480,776	1,491,452	1,628,567
Profit	138,522	194,078	181,730	143,471	161,816

(a) Includes Sinking Fund charged, in the accounts of the Concern as follows:—

\$5,060	\$5,286	\$5,462	\$5,707	\$5,964
---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS

Return No. 18]

WEST AUSTRALIAN MEAT EXPORT WORKS

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Loan Capital	950,324	1,000,696	990,337	979,511	1,163,198
Total Annual Revenue	1,954,092	2,252,118	2,520,674	2,624,693	3,089,844
Working Expenses	1,800,358	1,971,830	2,203,687	2,451,868	2,851,740
Interest	43,216	42,814	45,382	46,903	50,428
Depreciation including Sinking Fund	56,944	62,674	67,582	77,892	85,022
Provisions and Other Charges	50,438	44,512	39,355	39,545	44,186
Total Annual Cost	1,950,956	2,121,830	2,356,006	2,616,208	3,031,376
Profit	3,136	130,288	164,668	8,485	58,468

[Return No. 19]

WYNDHAM FREEZING, CANNING AND MEAT EXPORT WORKS (b)

Details	1-2-63 to 31-1-64	1-2-64 to 31-12-64	1965	1966	1-1-67 to 19-3-67
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Loan Capital	2,540,008	2,468,942	2,662,114	2,662,114	2,662,114
Revenue Capital	22,546	22,546	22,546	22,546	22,546
Total	2,562,554	2,491,488	2,684,660	2,684,660	2,684,660
Earnings	3,437,428	3,163,164	2,859,910	3,332,249	8,320
Increase in Stocks	63,690
Decrease in Stocks	5,686	21,482	64,090
Total Annual Revenue	3,431,742	3,141,682	2,923,600	3,268,159	8,320
Working Expenses	3,219,698	2,936,076	2,729,488	3,053,728	125,273
Interest	120,650	110,596	115,256	129,778	28,445
Depreciation including Sinking Fund (a)	12,700	12,700	12,700	12,700
Provisions and Other Charges	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Total Annual Cost	3,373,048	3,079,372	2,877,444	3,216,206	153,718
Profit	58,694	62,310	46,156	51,953
Loss	143,398

(a) Sinking Fund not charged in the accounts of the Concern, but included for comparison as follows :—

\$12,700 \$12,700 \$12,700 \$12,700

(b) Undertaking sold from 20th March, 1967.

V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS

[Return No. 20]

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF OPERATIONS

C. Other Business Undertakings

Undertaking	Return No.	Trading Results 1967-68	
		Profit	Loss
		\$	\$
State Electricity Commission	21	3,819,760
Rural and Industries Bank—Rural Department	22	597,485
State Government Insurance Office	23	41,899
Charcoal-Iron and Steel Industry	24	126,888
Albany Port Authority	25	105,510
Bunbury Port Authority	26	95,830
Fremantle Port Authority	27	117,630
Midland Junction Abattoir Board	28	146,453
Metropolitan Market Trust	29	4,432
Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust	30	553,504
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board	31	172,004
Western Australian Coastal Shipping Commission	32	2,372,565
Government Employees Housing Authority	33
Total—Net Profit	1,925,118

[Return No. 21]

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Loan Capital	35,362,256	35,558,916	36,527,874	38,322,812	42,189,896
Loan Capital—Non-interest bearing	2,545,332	2,545,332	2,545,332	2,545,332	2,545,332
Subscribed Loans	42,736,146	47,728,052	53,553,830	59,537,715	66,991,716
Total	80,643,734	85,832,300	92,627,036	100,405,859	111,726,944
Total Annual Revenue	22,934,184	24,962,996	27,403,171	30,488,926	34,043,357
Working Expenses	17,861,238	19,083,966	20,755,186	22,583,079	24,451,350
Interest	4,051,732	4,345,194	4,677,696	5,184,121	5,772,247
Total Annual Cost	21,912,970	23,429,160	25,432,882	27,767,200	30,223,597
Profit	1,021,214	1,533,836	1,970,289	2,721,726	3,819,760

V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS

[Return No. 22]

RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK OF W.A. (RURAL DEPARTMENT)

Details	†1964	†1965	†1966	†1967	†1968
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Loan Capital	22,165,386	22,165,384	22,229,558	22,229,556	22,229,554
Total Annual Revenue	4,633,572	5,163,218	5,888,202	6,860,325	8,713,354
Total Annual Cost	4,421,454	4,937,610	5,565,787	6,419,608	8,115,869
Profit	212,118	225,608	322,415	440,717	597,485
General Reserve	1,592,372	1,817,980	2,140,395	2,581,112	3,178,597

† Financial Years ending 31st March.

[Return No. 23]

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Total Assets	9,048,176	9,883,024	11,116,117	11,969,026	12,662,523
Earned Premiums	3,536,906	3,958,036	4,767,512	5,687,022	6,408,449
Other Revenue (including Interest, Rents, etc.)	534,456	594,686	670,652	738,167	956,084
Total Annual Revenue	4,071,362	4,552,722	5,438,164	6,425,189	7,364,533
Claims Paid and Outstanding	3,311,272	3,523,360	3,950,473	5,395,642	6,516,616
Working Expenses (including Taxes, Rebates, etc.)	624,882	755,980	973,599	847,587	889,816
Total Annual Cost	3,836,154	4,279,340	4,924,072	6,243,229	7,406,432
Taken to Reserves—					
Surplus	235,208	273,382	514,092	181,960
Deficit	41,899
Total Reserves	5,646,268	5,919,650	6,433,743	6,615,703	6,573,804

[Return No. 24]

CHARCOAL-IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Loan Capital	3,533,250	3,502,286	3,860,338	3,957,136	1,329,000
Earnings	2,441,016	3,267,392	2,931,093	3,298,614	3,663,194
Increase in Stocks	451,454	9,153	38,721
Decrease in Stocks	651,298	65,803
Total Annual Revenue	2,892,470	2,616,094	2,940,246	3,232,811	3,701,915
Working Expenses	2,431,760	2,466,896	2,783,941	3,305,466	3,306,313
Interest	174,038	175,258	172,656	211,625	60,766
Depreciation including Sinking Fund	187,008	188,112	193,312	213,891	48,385
Provisions and Other Charges	127,282	141,706	148,067	173,859	159,563
Total Annual Cost	2,920,088	2,971,972	3,297,976	3,904,831	3,575,027
Profit	126,888
Loss	27,618	355,878	357,730	672,020

V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS

[Return No. 25]

ALBANY PORT AUTHORITY

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Loan Capital	3,619,024	3,598,434	3,568,945	3,538,144	3,517,255
Inscribed Stock	40,000	170,000	170,000	470,000
Total	3,619,024	3,638,434	3,738,945	3,708,144	3,987,255
Total Annual Revenue	272,834	350,174	402,635	432,206	520,498
Working Expenses	137,514	165,278	145,555	184,555	188,216
Interest	172,336	171,496	179,906	187,646	194,585
Depreciation including Sinking Fund	26,916	28,170	29,475	30,800	32,187
Total Annual Cost	336,766	354,944	354,936	403,001	414,988
Profit	47,699	29,205	105,510
Loss	63,932	4,770

[Return No. 26]

BUNBURY PORT AUTHORITY

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Loan Capital	5,704,804	5,757,300	6,125,951	5,634,267	5,684,108
Inscribed Stock	200,000	400,000	600,000	800,000	1,100,000
Non Interest Bearing Capital	38,000	38,000	38,000	38,000	38,000
Total	5,942,804	6,195,300	6,763,951	6,472,267	6,822,108
Total Annual Revenue	441,812	532,826	624,465	708,306	786,455
Working Expenses	202,314	327,814	233,528	274,116	293,675
Interest	249,320	288,128	294,857	291,693	332,376
Depreciation	8,278	3,558	52,346	58,778	64,574
Total Annual Cost	459,912	619,500	580,731	624,587	690,625
Profit	43,734	83,719	95,830
Loss	18,100	86,674

[Return No. 27]

FREMANTLE PORT AUTHORITY

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Loan Capital	16,638,690	17,048,194	17,247,231	17,434,474	18,659,893
Revenue Capital	147,352	124,528	105,753	88,806	75,363
Inscribed Stock	1,050,000	1,250,000	1,450,000	1,650,000	1,950,000
Total	17,835,942	18,422,722	18,802,984	19,173,280	20,685,256
Total Annual Revenue	6,641,572	7,334,376	7,870,126	8,045,470	9,638,118
Working Expenses	5,162,950	5,673,740	6,040,556	6,348,683	7,270,130
Interest	658,662	703,828	742,502	788,834	915,601
Depreciation including Sinking Fund	724,342	876,262	962,673	864,888	1,330,757
Provisions and Other Charges	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Total Annual Cost	6,549,954	7,257,830	7,749,731	8,006,405	9,520,488
Profit	91,618	76,546	120,395	39,065	117,630

V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS

[Return No. 28]

MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR BOARD

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Loan Capital	2,961,804	2,939,532	2,916,257	3,081,459	3,190,198
Subscribed Loans	200,000	292,000	483,500	673,979	963,143
Total	3,161,804	3,231,532	3,399,757	3,755,438	4,153,331
Earnings	1,818,412	1,654,372	1,948,768	2,011,758	2,577,611
Increase in Stocks	9,354	2,969	37,231
Decrease in Stocks	204	9,590
Total Annual Revenue	1,827,766	1,654,168	1,951,737	2,048,989	2,568,021
Working Expenses	1,556,190	1,465,018	1,775,166	1,858,490	2,315,663
Interest	141,674	154,744	162,711	181,123	200,005
Depreciation including Sinking Fund	135,468	146,940	153,576	161,085	198,806
Provisions and Other Charges	11,992	3,522	259
Total Annual Cost	1,845,324	1,770,224	2,091,702	2,200,698	2,714,474
Loss	17,558	116,056	139,965	151,709	146,453

[Return No. 29]

METROPOLITAN MARKET TRUST

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Loan Capital	234,451	227,414	220,061	212,377	204,344
Subscribed Loans	359,525	338,256	315,873	292,515	267,521
Total	593,976	565,670	535,934	504,892	471,865
Total Annual Revenue	176,370	177,560	180,694	186,975	196,070
Working Expenses	87,506	86,590	88,282	91,497	94,386
Interest	32,010	30,870	29,469	28,212	26,591
Depreciation including Sinking Fund	26,944	28,306	29,737	31,241	32,827
Provisions and Other Charges	29,334	31,072	31,446	33,675	37,834
Total Annual Cost	175,794	176,838	178,934	184,625	191,638
Profit	576	722	1,760	2,350	4,432

[Return No. 30]

METROPOLITAN (PERTH) PASSENGER TRANSPORT TRUST

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Loan Capital	3,774,378	3,922,708	4,198,146	4,370,854	4,640,708
Inscribed Stock Issued	4,321,876	4,514,653	4,707,089	4,899,164	5,190,858
Total	8,096,254	8,437,361	8,905,235	9,270,018	9,831,566
Total Annual Revenue	5,198,716	5,397,021	5,883,056	6,956,943	7,311,529
Working Expenses	5,174,452	5,416,303	6,134,424	6,568,459	6,781,615
Interest	365,704	386,205	408,674	427,109	452,669
Depreciation including Sinking Fund	487,016	585,423	601,458	581,130	630,749
Provisions and Other Charges	15,400	2,983	20,615
Total Annual Cost	6,042,572	6,390,914	7,165,171	7,576,698	7,865,033
Loss	843,856	993,893	1,282,115	619,755	553,504

[Return No. 31]

V.—BUSINESS UNDERTAKINGS

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE AND DRAINAGE BOARD

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Loan Capital	66,191,164	71,081,918	76,276,661	81,607,398	87,646,259
Subscribed Loans	480,000	860,000	1,340,000	1,920,000	2,800,000
Total	66,671,164	71,941,918	77,616,661	83,427,398	90,446,259
Total Annual Revenue	6,808,146	7,137,970	8,101,595	9,179,268	9,700,445
Working Expenses	2,950,132	3,116,158	3,396,202	4,226,688	4,296,330
Interest	3,121,608	3,266,536	3,744,440	3,929,470	4,210,268
Depreciation including Sinking Fund	611,620	665,012	725,023	790,005	855,270
Provisions and Other Charges	200,000	166,573
Total Annual Cost	6,683,360	7,047,706	7,865,665	9,146,163	9,528,441
Profit	124,786	90,264	235,930	33,105	172,004

[Return No. 32]

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN COASTAL SHIPPING COMMISSION

Details	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Loan Capital	8,815,484	8,756,178	8,551,980	8,242,900	8,353,967
Subscribed Loans	400,000	700,000
Total	8,815,484	8,756,178	8,551,980	8,642,900	9,053,967
Total Annual Revenue	2,667,544	3,460,686	4,145,538	4,878,505	5,420,100
Working Expenses	4,094,284	5,079,588	5,831,758	6,112,004	6,559,907
Interest	412,502	433,734	426,450	427,554	441,321
Depreciation including Sinking Fund	522,834	536,522	552,552	601,424	693,219
Provisions and Other Charges	73,852	71,398	65,510	131,490	98,218
Total Annual Cost	5,103,472	6,121,242	6,876,270	7,272,472	7,792,665
Loss	2,435,928	2,660,566	2,730,732	2,393,967	2,372,565

[Return No. 33]

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' HOUSING AUTHORITY

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Loan Capital	2,723,864	3,110,247	3,432,136
Subscribed Loans	200,000	398,652	695,921
Total	2,923,864	3,508,899	4,128,057
Total Annual Revenue	143,400	316,379	360,247
Administration	27,592	31,303	38,602
Maintenance	11,829	38,102	39,700
Rates on Rental Properties	10,830	23,916	27,922
Interest	102,867	142,028	179,247
Depreciation	13,360	23,519	38,931
Provisions	50,000	35,845
Total Annual Cost	166,478	308,868	360,247
Loss	23,078
Profit	7,511

VI.—TRUST FUNDS
ROAD FUNDS—TRANSACTIONS DURING THE YEAR 1967-68

	Main Roads Trust	Common- wealth Aid Roads, 1959 and 1964 (a)	Metro- politan Traffic Trust Account	Road Main- tenance Fund	Central Roads Trust Fund	Railway Crossing Protec- tion Fund	Beef Roads	Mitchell Freeway Reserve and New Building Account	Total
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Balances from year 1966-67—	8,292,855	1,814,491	60,253	313,604	106,265	10,587,468
Receipts during year—									
License Fees and Permits	9,970	6,196,230	2,873,414	587,953	9,667,507
Recoups by Local Authorities	1,469,223	1,469,223
Payments by Local Authorities	2,468,535	43,705	2,512,240
Commonwealth Government Recoups	5,949	5,949
Commonwealth Government Grants	24,307,400	4,289,541	1,400,000	29,996,941
Overload Permits—Traffic Act, Section 14B	173,020	173,020
	9,951,017	26,121,891	6,256,483	3,187,018	7,346,029	149,970	1,400,000	54,412,408
Transfers to Other Funds	6,362,973	3,498,479	4,889,264	3,100,398	4,132,853	11,266	21,995,233
Transfers from Other Funds	10,390,697	1,201,584	3,996,274	156,678	6,250,000	21,995,233
	13,978,741	23,824,996	1,367,219	86,620	7,209,450	295,382	1,400,000	6,250,000	54,412,408
Payments during year—									
Administration, Office Equipment, etc.	3,636,956	474,228	4,111,184
Interest and Sinking Fund	258,292	258,292
Road Construction, Maintenance Surveys, etc.	6,816,151	23,297,587	192,124	1,400,000	31,705,862
Distribution to Local and Statutory Authorities	892,991	7,209,450	8,102,441
Traffic Control Lights, etc.	293,025	293,025
Recoup to P.W.D. for Sundry Marine Works under section 5 (3) of C.A.R. Act, 1964	256,816	256,816
Architectural Fees	158,240	158,240
	11,004,424	23,554,403	1,367,219	7,209,450	192,124	1,400,000	158,240	44,886,860
Balances on hand—30th June, 1968	2,974,317	270,593	86,620	103,258	6,091,760 (b)	9,526,548

	\$	\$
(a) Includes Commonwealth Aid Roads, 1959—Opening Balance	1,591,083
Transfers to Other Funds	138,320
Road Construction etc.	1,452,763	1,591,083

(b) Includes Mitchell Freeway Reserve \$3,000,000

Nil

[Tuesday, 1 October, 1968.]

VI.—TRUST FUNDS

[Return No. 35]

FOREST IMPROVEMENT AND RE-FORESTATION FUND

Transactions during the Years, 1963-64 to 1967-68

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<i>Receipts</i>					
Balance from previous year	408,002	370,842	613,904	471,303	659,339
Appropriation from Revenue Fund	1,945,798	2,142,088	2,352,665	2,861,634	2,935,327
Sundry Receipts	273,846	194,656	217,928	229,473	252,064
Total Receipts	2,627,646	2,707,586	3,184,497	3,562,410	3,846,730
<i>Payments</i>					
Expenditure on Forest Improvements and Re-forestation during year	2,256,804	2,093,682	2,713,194	2,903,071	3,376,023
Balance on hand, 30th June	370,842	613,904	471,303	659,339	470,707

[Return No. 36]

HOSPITAL FUND

Transactions during the Years, 1963-64 to 1967-68

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<i>Receipts</i>					
Treasury Grants	13,724,010	15,710,074	17,046,812	19,158,916	20,947,195
Miscellaneous Receipts	103,140	101,162	52,271	280,713	465,701
	13,827,150	15,811,236	17,099,083	19,439,629	21,412,896
<i>Payments</i>					
Administration Expenditure	354,660	416,700	507,362	609,438	651,404
Hospitals Expenditure—					
Departmental	2,828,514	3,040,134	3,227,782	4,255,131	4,066,028
Non-Departmental Subsidies, etc.	8,334,826	9,454,662	9,877,348	10,580,301	11,912,621
Miscellaneous	2,309,150	2,899,740	3,486,591	3,994,759	4,782,843
	13,827,150	15,811,236	17,099,083	19,439,629	21,412,896

VI.—TRUST FUNDS

[Return No. 37]

THE STATE HOUSING COMMISSION FUNDS

Transactions during the Years, 1963-64 to 1967-68

Details	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Balance—Brought forward	3,626,510	6,217,646	6,026,473(a)	2,716,832	3,911,443
Receipts during year—					
General Loan Fund	3,382,000	1,540,000	700,000	2,690,000	2,300,000
Treasury Grants	844,000	2,100,000
Other Borrowings	1,800,000	1,860,000	1,350,060	1,555,000	1,935,000
Sale of Land and Leases	1,158,050	840,744	818,484	761,229	1,947,548
Rents	109,582	156,224	135,211	232,044	264,965
Principal Interest and Repayments from Borrowers	2,535,162	2,943,884	3,370,132	4,153,231	4,723,137
Construction	2,029,360	2,207,178	2,019,219	4,099,344	3,099,157
Fees and Agency Commissions	357,326	95,216	361,922	378,919	400,643
Other Revenue	494,898	963,092	1,290,934	1,157,913	1,307,390
Total Receipts	16,336,888	18,923,984	16,072,435	17,745,412	19,889,283
Payments during year—					
Repayment of Borrowed Funds	249,478	291,956	314,299	368,890	417,527
Construction	5,666,846	7,692,018	7,410,590	7,599,649	5,550,238
Purchase of Land and Leases	973,338	1,007,796	1,803,036	1,190,922	1,610,102
Revenue Vote—Administration	1,305,550	1,348,798	1,698,528	1,645,619	1,743,218
Interest	1,115,938	1,267,500	1,351,329	1,585,885	1,667,756
Other	808,092	758,762	777,821	1,443,004	973,701
Total Payments	10,119,242	12,366,830	13,355,603	13,833,969	11,962,542
Balance on hand 30th June	6,217,646	6,557,154	2,716,832	3,911,443	7,926,741

(a) Excluding Transfer of \$530,681, held for Government Employees Housing Authority, on creation of a Separate Authority.

VII.—STATISTICAL SECTION

[Return No. 38]

STATEMENT SHOWING RECEIPTS FROM COMMONWEALTH TAKEN TO THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND, 1901-02 TO 1967-68

Year	Contribution towards Interest	Surplus Revenue Returned	Payment per Head, \$2.50	Special Payment to W.A.	Grant Under Sec. 98	Income Tax Reimbursement	Tuberculosis Financial Aid	Mental Institutions Benefits	Immigration Subsidies	Other Receipts	Total
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Period Covered by Braddon Clause											
(a) 1901-02 to 1910-11	(b) 17,745,444	17,745,444
Period Covered by Per Capita Payments and Special Payment to W.A.											
1911-12 to 1926-27	13,264,528	5,112,496	1,131,810	(c) 924,020	20,432,854
Period Covered by Financial Agreement Act											
(i) Prior to Uniform Tax Reimbursement											
1927-28 to 1941-42	14,202,960	(d) 402,000	16,040,000	147,250	29,792,240
(ii) Under Uniform Tax Reimbursement											
1942-43 to 1959-60	16,096,696	182,280,000	(e) 272,719,804	7,421,966	177,466	70,824	(f) 2,315,122	481,081,878
(iii) State Grants Act, 1959											
1959-60	946,856	7,000,000	50,924,000	1,042,092	(g) 36,610	50,949,553
1960-61	946,884	8,618,000	55,953,950	1,034,518	(g) 53,034	66,006,360
1961-62	946,894	12,312,000	80,170,848	(g) 58,254	73,487,964
1962-63	946,894	12,420,000	82,480,808	(g) 84,424	75,911,890
1963-64	946,884	12,144,000	85,598,050	34,000	(h) 358,360	79,070,864
1964-65	946,884	17,120,000	70,498,358	88,565,222
1965-66	946,884	24,038,000	78,474,063	103,468,927
1966-67	946,884	19,406,000	86,385,670	106,748,449
1967-68	946,884	15,518,000	96,151,755	(i) 35,405	112,662,024
Total, 9 years	8,521,768	128,570,000	626,645,809	2,076,610	34,000	606,077	760,460,254
Total, 67 years	38,821,424	18,147,444	13,264,528	5,112,496	327,027,810	899,385,613	9,498,678	177,466	104,824	3,992,505	1,315,512,636

(a) First complete year of Federation. (b) Including \$1,737,926 from Special Tariff provided under the Constitution of the Commonwealth for 5 years after the imposition of uniform customs duties. (c) Interest on transferred properties. (d) Proportion of Commonwealth Surplus distributed to States. (e) Includes Special Payment under the States Grants (Income Tax Reimbursement) Act, 1942, of \$1,826,118 and Special Payment on account of coal strike of \$1,323,354. (f) Entertainment Tax Reimbursement, \$730,896; Price Control Reimbursement, \$703,212; States Grants (Additional Assistance) Act, \$630,124; Kimberley Research Station, \$245,390. (g) Kimberley Research Station. (h) Includes Kimberley Research Station \$58,360 and Additional Assistance Grant for Employment Giving Activities \$300,000. (i) States Grants (Deserted Wives) Act.

VII.—STATISTICAL SECTION

[Return No. 39]

STATEMENT SHOWING BUDGET RESULTS AFTER TAKING INTO ACCOUNT COMMON-WEALTH SPECIAL GRANTS RECOMMENDED FOR PAYMENT BY THE COMMONWEALTH GRANTS COMMISSION

Year	Special Grants included as Revenue for year of receipt	Published Budget Results after bringing to account Special Grants as per column 2 (See Return No. 5)		Special Grants not included as Revenue for year of receipt but applied towards extinguishment of previous years' deficits		Negative adjustments in respect of previous years' Special Grants		Adjusted Budget Results after bringing to account amounts listed in columns 5 and 7	
		Surplus	Deficit	Amount	Year of receipt	Amount	Year of deduction	Surplus	Deficit
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$		\$	\$
1947-48	5,954,000	704,164	878,000	1949-50	171,836
1948-49	7,200,000	1,634,522	1,634,522	1950-51
1949-50	10,360,000	47,516	47,516
1950-51	10,043,478	318,694	318,000	1952-53	694
1951-52	10,178,000	1,183,222	900,000	1953-54	233,222
1952-53	(a) 18,400,000	1,015,786	700,000	1954-55	315,786
1953-54	14,700,000	205,358	50,000	1955-56	155,358
1954-55	14,200,000	983,088	106,000	1956-57	772,088
1955-56	(b) 17,700,000	3,661,662	644,000	1957-58	3,017,662
1956-57	(b) 18,204,000	3,824,736	2,634,000	1958-59	1,140,736
1957-58	(b) 19,656,000	2,246,660	702,000	1959-60	1,544,660
1958-59	(b) 19,516,000	3,360,466	1,218,000	1960-61	2,151,466
1959-60	(b) 6,298,000	2,811,628	1,912,000	1961-62	899,628
1960-61	(b) 7,400,000	2,409,152	620,000	1962-63	1,780,152
1961-62	(b) 10,400,000	1,923,024	344,000	1963-64	1,584,024
1962-63	(b) 11,800,000	1,505,750	1,320,000	1964-65	185,750
1963-64	(b) 11,800,000	2,792,360	3,038,000	1965-66	245,640
1964-65	(b) 15,800,000	4,697,050	4,706,000	1966-67	8,950
1965-66	(b) 21,000,000	10,110	18,000	1967-68	7,800
1966-67	(b) 14,700,000	27,494	582,000	1968-69	554,506
1967-68	15,500,000	828,636	828,636
1968-69	(c)

(a) Includes \$318,000 transferred from the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

(b) Excludes final adjustment of results of previous years shown in column 5.

(c) In 1968-69 no Special Grant is payable under Section 96 of the Constitution.

VII.—STATISTICAL SECTION

[Return No. 40]

Receipts from Commonwealth taken to various funds other than Consolidated
Revenue Fund, 1967-68

Details	Amount
Trust Funds and Commonwealth Grants and Advances—	\$
Agriculture Extension Services	294,404
Australian Meat Research Committee	70,082
Australian Dairy Produce Board Research	27,231
Australian Wool Board	61,314
Barley Research Advisory Committee	10,000
Beef Cattle Roads	1,400,000
Coal Mining Industry—Long Service Leave	36,326
Colleges of Advanced Education	2,079,428
Commonwealth Aid Roads Act, 1964	28,596,941
Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement	11,240,625
Commonwealth Educational Training Schemes	236,258
Emergency Housekeeping Service	2,000
Hospital Benefits	1,607,086
National Fitness	44,158
National Pleuro Pneumonia Fund	31,210
National Safety Council	19,140
Petroleum Products Subsidy	2,854,999
Pharmaceutical Benefits	1,290,002
Research Laboratory, Kalgoorlie School of Mines	6,450
Science Laboratories and Equipment—Government Schools	530,000
Science Laboratories and Equipment—Independent Schools	381,200
Sinking Fund (Financial Agreement)	1,986,135
State Wheat Research	107,990
Technical Training—Buildings and Equipment	1,323,200
War Service Homes	3,520,000
Water Resources	259,850
Wheat Research	70,429
Total—Trust Funds	58,086,458
Other Funds—	
Australian Research Grants Committee	257,326
Bull Creek Migrant Centre	356,885
Exmouth Township Development	417,000
Free Milk for School Children	856,000
Kimberley Research Station	109,000
Mental Institutions	146,719
Ord River Irrigation Project—Stage II	100,000
Railway Standardisation Agreement	19,458,207
Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service	79,580
Softwood Forestry Agreement	450,000
South West Region Water Supplies	1,500,000
Strategic Roads and Roads of Access to Commonwealth Property	88,714
Teachers Training College	1,817,000
Tuberculosis Financial Aid	853,745
University of Western Australia	3,205,966
War Service Land Settlement—Advances Rural and Industries Bank	2,185,020
Total—Other Funds	31,881,162
Grand Total	89,967,620

[Return No. 41]

Commonwealth Grants for the Provision of Science Laboratories and Technical Training Facilities

Details	Amount
Government Schools—	\$
Technical Training :	
Balance on Hand, 1st July, 1967	Dr. 81,631
Commonwealth Advances, 1967/68	1,323,200
	1,241,569
Expenditure, 1967/68	1,241,569
Balance on Hand, 30th June, 1968	Nil
Details of Expenditure—	
Buildings and Equipment :	
Carlisle Technical School	425
Fremantle Technical School	1,229,682
Geraldton Technical School	13
Leederville Technical School	943
Equipment—Various Technical Schools	10,506
	1,241,569
Science Laboratories—	
Balance on Hand, 1st July, 1967	185,693
Commonwealth Advances, 1967/68	530,000
	715,693
Expenditure, 1967/68	620,621
Balance on Hand, 30th June, 1968	95,072
Details of Expenditure—	
Buildings and Equipment :	
Albany High School	84,333
Applecross Senior High School	18,858
Belmont High School	95,266
Bentley High School	93,954
Busselton High School	Cr. 40
Churchlands High School	97,996
Cyril Jackson High School	75,454
Governor Stirling High School	4
Hollywood High School	54,538
Kent Street High School	7,083
Margaret River High School	25,471
Melville High School	3,599
Pinjarra High School	15,685
Scarborough High School	8,825
Swanbourne High School	Cr. 745
York High School	4,173
Equipment—Various Secondary Schools	36,167
	620,621
Non-Government Schools—	
Science Laboratories :	
Balance on Hand, 1st July, 1967	44,206
Commonwealth Advances, 1967/68	381,200
	425,406
Payments to Non-Government Schools, 1967/68 for Buildings and Equipment	411,200
Balance on Hand, 30th June, 1968	14,206

VII.—STATISTICAL SECTION

[Return No. 42]

Total Net Collections of State Taxation taken to the Consolidated Revenue Fund, Trust Accounts, and Special Accounts, for the Year ended 30th June, 1983

Details	Paid to Consolidated Revenue Fund	Paid to Trust or Special Accounts	Total	Taxation per Head (a)
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Probate and Succession Duties	5,161,755	5,161,755	5.78
Other Stamp Duties	18,224,347	18,224,347	20.43
Land Tax	4,702,012	4,702,012	5.27
Third Party Insurance Surcharge	700,091	700,091	.78
Liquor Licenses	2,566,246	2,566,246	2.87
Racing—				
Stamp Duty on Betting	60,922	60,922	.07
Totalisator Duty and Licenses	454,962	454,962	.51
Bookmakers' Betting Tax and Licenses	164,841	164,841	.18
Betting Tax—Totalisator Agency Board	2,098,640	2,098,640	2.35
Investment Tax	579,153	579,153	.65
Motor Taxation (b)	778,682	15,074,349	15,853,031	17.76
Other Vehicle Taxation (b)	35,633	35,633	.04
Vermin Tax	533,524	533,524	.60
Noxious Weed Tax	204,543	204,543	.23
Fruit Fly Eradication Registration Fees	35,809	35,809	.04
Metropolitan Region Improvement Tax	1,101,276	1,101,276	1.24
Licenses not elsewhere included	798,122	798,122	.89
Total	36,289,773	16,985,134	53,274,907	59.89

(a) Based on estimated mean population for year 1967-68. 892,442

(b) Preliminary figures.

VII.—STATISTICAL SECTION
COST OF SOCIAL SERVICES—YEAR 1967-68

Service	Loan Lia- bility	Expenditure				Receipts	Net Ex- penditure	Cost per Head	
		Indirect		Direct	Total				
		Interest	Sinking Fund	Con- solidated Revenue Fund					
									(*)
1.—Education—		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
(a) Education Department and Schools	74,767,875	3,566,715	710,671	39,308,354	43,585,740	461,811	43,123,929	48.32	
(b) University	4,234,134	201,984	42,457	3,745,707	3,990,148	3,990,148	4.47	
(c) Tertiary other than University	3,636,827	173,491	29,859	1,561,691	1,765,041	1,765,041	1.98	
(d) Technical Education	4,106,245	195,884	35,959	4,404,834	4,636,677	437,448	4,199,229	4.71	
(e) Agricultural Education	2,320,684	110,706	21,320	405,561	537,587	77,849	459,738	.51	
(f) Library, Museum, etc.	154,394	7,365	1,633	1,157,776	1,166,774	1,166,774	1.30	
(g) Deaf, Dumb and Blind	1,628	78	17	14,300	14,395	14,395	.02	
Total 1	89,221,787	4,256,223	841,916	50,598,223	55,696,362	977,108	54,719,254	61.31	
2.—Health, Hospitals and Charities—									
(a) Public Health	27,121	1,204	288	2,951,416	2,952,998	808,872	2,144,126	2.40	
(b) Care of Sick and Mentally Afflicted, Health of Mothers and Children	57,701,595	2,408,270	267,845	26,946,330	29,622,445	575,115	29,047,330	32.55	
(c) Recreation Facilities	645,356	645,356	645,356	.72	
(d) Relief of Aged, Indigent and Infirm and Child Welfare	3,287,461	156,824	31,789	2,982,212	3,170,825	191,755	2,979,070	3.34	
(e) Miners' Phthisis	62,108	62,108	62,108	.07	
(f) Natives n.e.i.	1,604,553	76,544	13,857	2,692,298	2,782,699	114,830	2,667,869	2.99	
(g) Unemployment Relief	36,941	36,941	36,941	.04	
Total 2	62,620,730	2,642,932	313,779	36,316,661	39,273,372	1,690,572	37,582,800	42.11	
3.—Law, Order and Public Safety—									
(a) Administration of Justice	1,919,724	91,578	54,416	1,920,253	2,006,247	1,629,337	436,910	.49	
(b) Police	5,944,758	283,587	18,094	6,865,603	7,167,284	1,236,430	5,930,848	6.64	
(c) Gaols and Reformatories	2,395,823	114,289	22,172	2,685,857	2,822,318	56,257	2,766,061	3.10	
(d) Public Safety	590,696	590,696	14,153	576,543	.65	
Total 3	10,260,305	489,454	94,682	12,062,409	12,646,545	2,936,183	9,710,362	10.88	
GRAND TOTAL	162,102,822	7,388,609	1,250,377	98,977,293	107,616,279	5,603,863	102,012,416	114.30	

(*) Based on estimated mean population for year 1967-68, viz. 892,442

[Return No. 44]

VII.—STATISTICAL SECTION

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS

Statistical Statement of Operations

Details	Year Ended 30th June				
	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
Average number of miles open Results of Operations (per train mile)	3,677	3,733	3,747	3,769	3,815
Earnings	454·88c	466·23c	523·00c	570·72c	609·94c
Operating Expenses	417·26c	420·43c	431·11c	466·14c	491·80c
Depreciation	53·95c	57·58c	58·05c	64·22c	73·34c
Interest	74·30c	82·41c	87·10c	97·02c	105·22c
Operating Expenses plus Depreciation and Interest	545·51c	560·42c	576·26c	627·38c	670·36c
Deficit	90·63c	94·19c	53·26c	56·66c	60·42c
Operating Expenses per cent of Earnings	91·65	89·73	82·40	81·78	80·77
Passenger Traffic					
Rail					
Earnings from Passengers Carried	\$2,297,452	\$2,445,594	\$2,472,000	\$2,674,816	\$2,818,426
Road Services					
Number of Passenger Miles	19,469,776	23,368,907	24,584,018	23,699,361	23,095,660
Earnings from Passengers Carried	\$386,540	\$491,346	\$528,782	\$541,920	\$548,936
Average Earnings per Passenger Mile	1·99c	2·10c	2·15c	2·29c	2·38c
Parcels Earnings	\$1,192,064	\$1,259,272	\$1,378,585	\$1,482,574	\$1,529,750
Goods and Livestock Traffic Paying					
Number of Ton Miles (millions)	813	842	1,021	1,244	1,572
Average haul per ton of Goods (miles)	156·78	161·03	159·91	158·02	176·39
Average tonnage per loaded wagon	7·4	7·2	7·7	8·6	10·0
Average locomotive load (tons)	159·60	157·4	170·5	195·9	242·3
Average Earnings per ton mile	3·62c	3·61c	3·63c	3·38c	2·89c
Earnings from Goods and Livestock	\$29,872,766	\$31,035,934	\$37,708,034	\$42,771,550	\$46,097,840
Goods and Livestock Traffic Gross					
Average Tonnage per Loaded wagon	17·3	17·2	18·0	19·5	21·7
Average locomotive load (tons)	370	370	393	440	517
Average number of vehicles per locomotive—Loaded	21·1	21·3	21·5	22·2	23·4
Average number of vehicles per locomotive—Empty	9·1	9·0	10·1	11·3	12·4
Rolling Stock on 30th June					
Locomotives Steam—No.	†245	†240	†239	†238	†216
Locomotives Diesel Electric and Hydraulic—No.	83	106	112	123	147
Passenger Vehicles—No.	300	266	263	239	238
Brake Vans—No.	261	270	268	269	263
Goods Vehicles—No.	12,365	12,896	12,878	13,061	12,925
Omnibuses—No.	50	67	66	59	62
Staff—Average per Year					
Salaried—No.	2,017	2,051	2,055	2,061	2,098
Wages—No.	9,878	9,770	9,528	9,595	9,312
Total Staff—No.	11,895	11,821	11,583	11,666	11,410

† Includes 1 Diesel Mechanical Locomotive.

VII.—STATISTICAL SECTION
WESTERN AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS
(a) TONNAGE OF GOODS CARRIED

Class of Goods	1963-64		1964-65		1965-66		1966-67		1967-68	
	Tonnage	Percentage of Total	Tonnage	Percentage of Total	Tonnage	Percentage of Total	Tonnage	Percentage of Total	Tonnage	Percentage of Total
Coal, Coke, and Charcoal	704,244	13.58	757,836	14.40	678,385	10.63	590,994	7.51	359,394	4.03
Ores and Minerals	626,560	12.08	868,019	16.60	1,101,842	17.27	2,264,298	28.76	3,477,873	39.03
Wool	89,871	1.73	86,018	1.65	100,182	1.57	109,258	1.39	116,824	1.31
Chaff	6,271	.12	5,977	.11	5,657	.09	6,208	.08	6,842	.08
Wheat	1,473,981	28.42	1,137,758	22.71	1,906,892	30.82	2,338,140	29.70	2,276,520	25.55
Grain and Grain Products	275,495	5.31	227,254	4.35	330,309	5.17	297,669	3.78	258,703	2.90
Firewood	1,821	.03	1,914	.04	729	.01	284	276
Local Timber	363,069	7.00	359,387	6.87	367,536	5.76	303,545	4.62	302,076	4.41
Imported Timber										
Fruit and Vegetables	96,838	1.87	112,154	2.14	102,994	1.61	98,790	1.25	95,672	1.07
Fertilisers	521,910	10.00	539,718	10.32	587,488	9.20	664,357	8.44	703,806	7.90
All other goods	1,027,608	19.80	1,083,105	20.72	1,141,497	17.87	1,139,535	14.47	1,221,818	13.72
Total	5,187,468	100.00	5,229,230	100.00	6,383,509	100.00	7,872,978	100.00	8,910,464	100.00

(b) EARNINGS ON GOODS CARRIED

Class of Goods	1963-64		1964-65		1965-66		1966-67		1967-68	
	Earnings	Percentage of Total	Earnings	Percentage of Total	Earnings	Percentage of Total	Earnings	Percentage of Total	Earnings	Percentage of Total
Coal, Coke, and Charcoal	\$ 2,138,648	7.16	\$ 2,472,666	7.98	\$ 2,289,131	6.07	\$ 1,969,568	4.60	\$ 1,128,848	2.45
Ores and Minerals	1,853,720	5.63	1,921,494	6.20	2,398,460	6.36	4,114,328	9.82	7,247,355	15.72
Wool	1,170,590	3.92	1,255,625	4.05	1,465,400	3.89	1,580,148	3.69	1,087,014	3.60
Chaff	43,580	.15	42,670	.14	42,380	.10	44,930	.11	49,197	.11
Wheat	7,093,576	23.75	5,952,118	19.21	10,131,638	26.87	12,481,029	29.13	12,044,556	26.13
Grain and Grain Products	1,316,478	4.41	1,140,458	3.68	1,854,774	4.39	1,506,580	3.52	1,370,840	2.99
Firewood	6,164	.02	7,002	.02	3,300	.01	1,212	1,138
Local Timber	2,443,914	8.13	2,403,642	7.76	2,459,044	6.52	2,470,111	5.73	2,833,946	6.15
Imported Timber										
Fruit and Vegetables	737,902	2.47	893,406	2.88	844,981	2.24	820,472	1.92	794,132	1.72
Fertilisers	2,308,604	7.71	2,401,140	7.75	2,857,832	7.68	3,204,807	7.46	3,434,775	7.45
All other goods	10,064,650	36.70	12,493,512	40.33	13,503,094	35.97	14,598,365	34.14	15,500,039	33.62
Total	29,872,768	100.00	30,983,694	100.00	37,708,034	100.00	42,771,550	100.00	46,097,840	100.00

VII.—STATISTICAL SECTION

[Return No. 46]

Selected Statistics on Western Australian Economic Conditions

Item	Unit	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67 (a)	1967-68
A. VITAL STATISTICS						
Population at 30th June (a)	No.	808,443	825,525	848,100	878,362	†900,414
Annual Rate of Increase	%	2.55	2.11	2.73	3.33	†3.77
Births	No.	10,948	16,299	16,131	18,019	†18,563
Marriages	No.	5,881	6,235	6,728	7,185	†7,375
Immigration (net Overseas Arrivals and Departures)	No.	8,366	7,702	10,768	15,137	14,789
B. EMPLOYMENT						
Wage and Salary Earners in Civilian Employment at 30th June	'000's	222.9	234.2	248.7	256.3	†276.8
Registered Unemployed at 30th June	No.	5,141	3,576	3,370	3,757	4,151
Registered Vacancies at 30th June	No.	1,143	2,422	2,965	2,411	2,630
Basic Wages (Perth Rates at 30th June)						
Adult Male Weekly Rates—						
State	\$	30.42	31.47	32.65	33.50	33.50
Commonwealth	\$	30.80	30.80	30.80	32.80	32.80
Average Weekly Earnings (Males)	\$	47.20	49.50	54.10	58.30	62.50
D. LAND SETTLEMENT						
Area of Land Selected during the Year	acres	1,090,838	1,052,171	790,621	1,196,977	1,122,259
Area of Land Leased during the year	acres	1,464,114	2,238,237	3,565,850	4,806,354	1,389,843
Area of Land under Cultivation (b)	acres	28,262,509	29,545,477	30,898,048	*31,868,762	(o)
Area of Land under Crop	acres	6,705,632	7,280,406	8,448,751	*8,557,718	(o)
E. PRODUCTION						
(1) Rural and Primary						
Wool (Shorn, Dead and Fellmongered)—						
Quantity	lb.	209,555,000	200,995,000	238,356,000	*283,852,000	†284,500,000
Value	\$	116,330,970	93,274,914	115,182,949	*121,509,161	†114,707,000
Wheat	bus.	52,340,000	63,071,000	102,156,000	*103,195,000	†106,500,000
Quantity	bus.	74,383,786	88,556,922	153,049,650	*153,157,379	†171,183,000
Value	\$	17,849,740	14,011,063	23,278,721	*22,117,918	†24,408,000
Oats	bus.	4,076,809	3,701,015	6,480,934	*6,707,484	†8,280,000
Barley	bus.	20,164,868	22,391,834	24,426,808	27,370,386	†30,700,000
Livestock at 31st March (f)—	No.	1,298,874	1,258,427	1,271,226	1,357,042	†1,440,000
Sheep	No.	378,422	326,560	314,557	300,754	326,721
Cattle and Calves	No.	1,278,731	1,268,900	1,677,399	1,675,999	2,152,665
Sheep	No.	858,390	786,664	867,560	904,355	1,060,750
Lambs	No.	164,831	162,002	194,586	213,744	240,615
Pigs	No.					
Meat Produced—						
Beef and Veal	tons	66,025	56,983	58,089	54,811	58,086
Mutton	tons	24,516	24,411	32,153	32,831	41,776
Lamb	tons	12,174	11,428	12,542	13,580	15,990
Pigment	tons	9,852	9,861	10,444	11,584	13,015
Timber (Sawn) (d)	sup. ft.	195,723,990	207,303,974	*211,637,766	*204,505,446	†209,445,620
(2) Mining						
Gold—						
Quantity	fine oz.	743,549	696,216	636,768	*600,106	566,864
Value	\$	23,266,752	21,831,270	20,006,102	18,843,682	17,801,457
Coal—						
Quantity	tons	922,682	965,715	1,042,110	1,082,630	1,057,387
Value	\$	4,250,138	4,499,220	4,493,337	4,746,264	4,736,634
Iron Ore (Mine Production)—	tons					
Quantity	'000's	1,417	1,616	3,093	11,258	†18,710
Bauxite—	tons					
Quantity	'000's	195	400	583	1,153	†1,367
Oil—						
Quantity	brlts.				†1,044,713	†8,808,370
(3) Manufacturing						
Bricks (Clay) (e)	No.	155,792,000	146,057,000	140,611,000	*163,160,000	†210,021,000
Electricity (Distributed)	KWH	1,111,948,000	1,240,725,000	1,371,730,000	*1,595,904,000	†1,823,174,000
Building and Construction—						
Houses and Flats—						
Completed	No.	8,571	9,286	8,859	10,014	(o)
Value	\$	57,370,000	66,284,000	67,185,000	87,400,000	(o)
Total All Buildings—						
Value	\$	92,868,000	107,100,000	130,178,000	162,135,000	(o)
(4) Net Value of Production						
Agricultural	\$	79,619,230	92,800,208	*154,493,705	*154,821,481	†171,000,000
Pastoral and Trapping	\$	123,978,764	101,747,286	130,435,014	*128,807,307	†119,650,000
Dairying, Poultry, and Beekeeping	\$	12,713,652	14,709,116	16,926,221	*15,302,460	†16,808,000
Fisheries	\$	8,926,410	15,972,838	14,477,932	*14,974,798	†21,614,000
Forestry exclusive of Milling	\$	10,734,698	11,334,232	11,965,259	*12,472,761	†12,830,000
Mines and Quarries	\$	30,697,226	32,162,434	*35,191,851	*63,810,921	†120,595,000
Factories	\$	230,511,312	260,637,078	288,802,710	335,787,600	(o)

VII.—STATISTICAL SECTION

[Return No. 46]

Selected Statistics on Western Australian Economic Conditions

Item	Unit	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67 (a)	1967-68
D. TRADE						
Imports—						
Interstate	\$'m	323.2	343.9	403.1	473.0	†506.3
Overseas	\$'m	121.7	153.5	175.7	159.4	†200.8
Total	\$'m	444.9	497.4	*578.8	*632.4	†713.1
Exports—						
Interstate	\$'m	101.2	120.0	119.6	116.0	†120.6
Overseas	\$'m	286.7	243.1	314.4	421.3	†473.9
Total (h)	\$'m	387.9	363.1	434.0	*537.3	†594.5
Principal Exports—						
Wheat	\$	77,830,032	56,955,076	96,515,344	*126,918,349	†121,764,482
Wool (Greasy and Degreased)	\$	114,238,728	98,294,072	115,128,052	*126,094,062	†120,258,373
Timber (i)	\$	7,373,564	7,091,136	*4,384,823	*3,620,695	†0,519,507
Gold Bullion (j)	\$	15,044,638	10,127,202	26,146,680	15,106,782	†11,815,970
Flour	\$	4,395,872	5,926,154	*3,378,091	*2,500,971	†2,944,227
Iron Ore and Concentrates	\$	2,516,554	3,114,386	6,967,352	50,889,586	†101,037,004
Meat, Fresh, Chilled or Frozen	\$	15,539,430	16,101,818	18,680,403	*17,601,664	†19,947,091
Crayfish Tails	\$	9,210,784	10,591,532	13,820,594	13,873,257	†17,988,801
Petroleum and Petroleum Products	\$					
Retail Sales—						
(1) Excluding Motor Vehicles, etc.	\$	404,000,000	*440,900,000	*486,400,000	*530,400,000	(o)
(2) Motor Vehicles (k)	\$	168,900,000	*169,100,000	*181,200,000	*217,000,000	(o)
(3) Total	\$	572,900,000	610,000,000	667,600,000	747,400,000	(o)
E. FINANCE						
Depositors Balances—						
Trading Banks—Weekly Averages						
for June	\$	245,950,000	*274,256,000	324,760,000	353,164,000	411,710,000
Savings Banks—end of June	\$	239,766,280	261,654,000	292,871,000	330,807,000	373,602,000
Insurance—Life—						
Sum Assured (existing Policies) (l)	\$	727,144,000	825,138,000	935,217,000	1,063,035,000	1,238,308,000
Insurance—General—						
Gross Premiums (m)	\$	26,284,710	28,224,272	*32,384,879	*36,566,268	(o)
Installment Credit—Balances Outstand-						
ing at 30th June—						
(1) Non Retail Finance Business	\$	73,400,000	82,500,000	*89,800,000	101,400,000	(o)
(2) For All Business (n)	\$	108,900,000	*110,000,000	†115,700,000	†126,900,000	(o)
F. MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS						
AT 30th JUNE						
(1) Cars and Station Wagons	No.	189,251	202,914	219,816	240,519	(o)
(2) Utilities, Vans, Trucks and Omnibuses	No.	73,239	79,316	84,423	87,661	(o)

(a) New Series Figures now include Aborigines.

(b) Area of cleared land under crop or pasture, fallowed, newly cleared for next season, used for natural grazing or resting.

(c) Comprises gold refined at the Perth Branch of the Royal Mint and gold contained in gold bearing materials exported. Includes payments by the Gold Producers Association Ltd., but excludes Commonwealth Subsidy.

(d) From local logs includes railway sleepers and plywood veneers in terms of super feet.

(e) For 1963-64 includes all types of standard size bricks. For subsequent years figures represent clay bricks only (all sizes).

(f) 31st March of year last mentioned.

(h) Excluding ships stores.

(i) For years prior to 1965-66 figures include Plywood and Veneers; from 1965-66 figures include Plywood Veneers and Reconstituted Wood.

(j) Recorded in the year of shipment which is not necessarily the year of sale.

(k) Including Parts and Petrol, etc.

(l) As at 31st December of year first mentioned.

(m) Excluding particulars of the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust.

(n) Operations of Retail Businesses and Non Retail Businesses.

(o) Not yet available.

‡ Subject to revision.

† Preliminary.

* Revised.

RAILWAYS DISCONTINUANCE AND LAND REVESTMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 17th September.

MR. MAY (Clontarf) [6.3 p.m.]: I have been caught unawares, because I did not anticipate the debate on this measure would be resumed at this early stage. The Bill refers to the discontinuance of certain railways and the revestment of land, and it is before the House because the standard gauge railway between Kalgoorlie and Perth is now nearing completion, and several branch lines will be discontinued.

I have endeavoured, by various means, to ascertain whether the discontinuance of the railways will have any effect on the areas concerned, but so far I have been unable to learn whether there will be any detrimental effect. However, I feel that several matters could possibly be brought to the notice of the Minister.

The Bill states that the material from the discontinued lines will be used for the maintenance of other railways, and also for the construction of new lines should they be required. On looking at the definition of "maintenance" in the parent Act, I find there is no ruling in connection with the upgrading of a line. I refer particularly to the line between Widgiemooltha and Esperance. It is the intention of the Railways Department to upgrade this line and such upgrading does not come under "construction" or "maintenance," in the true sense of the words as applied to the parent Act.

I feel that some consideration could be given to the incorporation of this provision in the Act. With the escalation of the standard gauge in Western Australia, there could be a considerable quantity of existing railway material which could be used for upgrading certain lines at some later stage.

Mr. O'Connor: You are referring to the sections of line being withdrawn?

Mr. MAY: Yes; I believe that some of the railway lines around Kalgoorlie could possibly be used for upgrading.

Mr. O'Connor: That is the Leonora line?

Mr. MAY: Yes; I believe a move is afoot for the upgrading of the Widgiemooltha-Esperance line, because of the increased traffic. I was looking at the interpretations of "maintenance" and "construction," but "upgrading" is not covered.

There is no reason why the discontinuance of these particular lines should not be agreed to by Parliament. In 1965, when the Bolgart-Clackline line was discontinued, the then Minister for Railways mentioned upgrading. The Leader of the Opposition, at that time, stated that he saw no justification for keeping the 3 ft. 6 in. gauge in conjunction with the standard gauge line. In any case,

under the proposals contained in the agreement concerning the standard gauge line, opposition could not be raised to the discontinuance of the 3 ft. 6 in. gauge. That was all part and parcel of the standard gauge agreement.

I have endeavoured to find out what effect the Bill will have in connection with the Geraldton portion of line which is to be closed. I refer to the portion between Bluff Point and the Chapman River, and I believe this line has been out of commission for many years. In this case, the discontinuance is simply being ratified by Parliament.

As far as the Merredin portion is concerned, everybody in that area is of the opinion that there is nothing in the Bill to cause any concern. It is just a normal discontinuance.

I ask the Minister if it is necessary to have these railway discontinuance Bills coming to the House so frequently. Is it necessary to introduce a Bill of this nature, or could the closure be included in the first schedule of this Bill, where the railway lines are specified? Each time we bring a Bill of this type before the House, it is a separate Bill. The first schedule of the Bill sets out each railway which will be discontinued. In this instance, we have the line in and around Dowerin and Merredin; the line from Northam to Southern Cross; the section of the Wickepin-Merredin line; and the Northampton-Geraldton section, all referred to in the first schedule.

I ask the Minister if it is envisaged that at some future date there will be further amendments in the form of separate pieces of legislation? That is a point he might clarify for me.

There is nothing else of consequence in the Bill; it is a normal piece of legislation brought about because of the standard gauge railway. We on this side of the House support the measure.

MR. STEWART (Merredin - Yilgarn) [6.11 p.m.]: I would like to support this Bill and to speak briefly to it. The discontinuance of the railway lines is necessary because the marshalling yards are nearing completion, and the feeder lines are now going to the marshalling yards instead of to the old stations. As a consequence, the Merredin Shire will be helped in its town planning. Merredin, in the eastern wheatbelt, is expanding rapidly and is suffering from growing pains. The branch line from Nungarin runs through the centre of the town, where the shire plans to have open space. The closure of this line will allow access from the east and west to the northern part of the town and will assist the town planning in the district.

A redevelopment project on the south-west corner of the town will tidy up a section of farming land and allow greater

scope for town planning. Great difficulty is experienced in obtaining sufficient space, particularly north of the marshalling yards, to construct an industrial complex. The oil companies are being moved to that area, and the superphosphate bulk storage has an area and intends to store a considerable amount of superphosphate. Quite a number of other projects are also involved.

So this discontinuance will tidy matters, and the shire will be able to go ahead with town planning. It is a forward move and is very welcome, and it is significant that the broad gauge programme has progressed considerably. I support the motion.

MR. O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Railways) [6.13 p.m.]: I thank members for their support of this Bill, and I will answer the queries which were raised. The member for Clontarf asked if the lines could be used for upgrading as well as for maintenance. The lines concerned are comparatively short in length and amount to only a couple of miles altogether. In the areas where the lines will be discontinued it is intended that they will be used for upgrading or maintaining other lines.

Members will recall the discussion on the closure of the Leonora line. At that time it was proposed that portion of the 60 lb. line could be used to upgrade the Esperance line. This particular line is only 45 lb. and cannot take very heavy wagons. Therefore, the loading would be considerably restricted and would affect the payload which could be carried on the line. Bearing in mind that there have been—and still are—negotiations progressing regarding the salt industry in that particular area which would require a great deal of upgrading of the line to Esperance, any line which we can obtain from a discontinuance, and which could be used for upgrading, will be so used.

The member for Merredin-Yilgarn referred to town planning in the Merredin area. From discussions I have had I believe that both the Shire of Geraldton and the Shire of Merredin are quite happy about the closures. I cannot see that they will have any detrimental effect on the areas concerned.

The member for Clontarf referred to the need for future legislation of this nature. It is necessary to introduce a separate Bill for closures to protect the interests of the people in the area, and allow them to go into the matter thoroughly. When a Bill is brought before Parliament, it provides protection for the shires concerned.

I do not think any other points were raised, and I commend the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Sitting suspended from 6.16 to 7.30 p.m.

In Committee, etc.

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

MOTOR VEHICLE (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE SURCHARGE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 17th September.

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [7.33 p.m.]: In 1962 this Parliament passed a Bill which imposed a surcharge of £1 or, in today's currency, \$2 per annum on each motor vehicle insured. I suppose one could call it a flat rate tax which, in its implications, would be a little unfair. Nevertheless, this has been the law of the land for some half-dozen years. At the time of the passing of the legislation there was a provision which allowed for exemptions in certain limited cases, and this Bill seeks to extend the exemptions from the payment of the surcharge, and I have no objection to that whatsoever; that is, it is proposed no surcharge shall be payable on vehicles that come to this State from overseas and from other States.

This is fair and equitable, because the various States have their own arrangements and, if anything, we should encourage visits to our State, not only from people within Australia but from also those from other countries, without imposing a special charge upon them.

If the Bill went no further, that would be the extent of my comment. However, I am rather horrified to find that, in a few words, the Government informs us that, by this Bill, it is proposed to exempt owners of vehicles in certain categories from payment of the surcharge. I am informed by the Minister that this step is being taken on the suggestion of the Commissioner of Police for the purpose of legalising the existing practice.

From time to time there have been complaints from various members on this side of the House against the action of the Government in defying the law of the land, and yet, for the past six years, in defiance of the law and in contempt of Parliament, this Government has permitted non-payment of a surcharge which is laid down in this legislation. This is inexcusable. If no surcharge has been raised over a period of years against those who are the subject of this complaint, obviously it was known to the Government and its departmental officers several years ago. Yet, such is the contempt of this Government for Parliament that it took no remedial action whatsoever.

In two short lines the Government now tells us that this measure is designed to exempt two classes of vehicles and to

legalise the existing practice. There is nothing unusual in introducing retrospective legislation to remedy an oversight, but here we have an acknowledgment of the fact that this situation has been known to the Government, and yet it has gone blithely on its way.

With my leader, I wonder where we are heading if the Government accepts the situation that it is entitled to ignore the law of the land. I make it perfectly plain that I am not opposed to the provisions to exempt from the payment of the surcharge the Governor, diplomatic representatives, or vehicles that belong to the Crown or to the local authorities, but I take the strongest exception to the Government allowing this situation to continue without so much as extending a courtesy, or expressing an apology, to Parliament by informing us that, notwithstanding the law, the Government year after year has defied the law and now seeks merely to legalise a practice which has been in existence for some half-dozen years.

You will appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that my comments and criticism are not directed against the terms of the Bill. I have already said that they are fair; indeed, they should have been part of the original legislation; but the Government has been guilty of an affront to the Parliament and, in regard to that, I see no reason why I should excuse it or be generous in my attitude. The Government deserves the criticism of this Parliament, and indeed the censure of this Parliament, because of the illegal action which it has taken and which it has allowed to continue over a period of years. Although I say that, I indicate again my intentions to support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [7.40 p.m.]: I note the comments of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, but I think he was tilting at a situation which has occurred on a number of occasions in this Parliament when it has been considered necessary, in view of a situation that has developed, to correct it; and this is exactly what is happening with this Bill.

Mr. Tonkin: Was the Government so aware that this was the situation?

Mr. NALDER: Whether the Government was aware of it or not, at this stage it is correcting the existing situation. The Leader of the Opposition knows very well that there are times when it is not convenient to bring a measure of this type into the Parliament, because of certain reasons. Such circumstances have arisen time and time again, and on this occasion the Government has acknowledged that a situation has arisen and it is now trying to correct it.

Mr. Tonkin: The Government has no authority to permit a breach of the law if it is aware of it.

Mr. NALDER: Similiar situations have occurred time and time again. For instance, in my own case, as Minister for Agriculture, there was a situation with reference to the position of the grain pool. In that case the situation had deteriorated without the Government's being aware of it, and so action was taken to remedy the position. As I have said, similar situations have occurred on many occasions, and I see no reason whatsoever to level this type of criticism at the Government.

Mr. Graham: You were aware of this situation and yet, notwithstanding it, you ignored the law?

Mr. NALDER: We are making an attempt to correct it. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was so keen to criticise the existing situation, he should have pointed it out to the Government before.

Mr. Graham: I did not know you were defying the law.

Mr. NALDER: We are correcting a situation which has existed, and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has accepted the principle contained in the Bill.

Mr. Jamieson: You are another illegal eagle.

Mr. NALDER: It is very interesting to note such comments when the Government is endeavouring to correct an existing situation which it acknowledges. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition accepts the situation as outlined in the amending Bill, I see no reason why we should get excited over the existing situation, which is being corrected now.

I see no reason to extend the debate. The Bill has been accepted by the Opposition. The amendment contained in it has been considered necessary by the Government and, in the circumstances, I see no reason for the debate to continue.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. W. A. Manning) in the Chair; Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Section 3 amended—

Mr. GRAHAM: Because the Opposition agrees that the exemption should be extended to people other than those already provided for, I trust the Minister does not misconstrue that as being our approval of the Government's illegal acts which, as the Minister informed us when introducing the Bill, are the existing practice.

It is that to which I take the strongest exception. It has been the practice of the Government to exempt these categories of people from the payment of the surcharge, and the final portion of the clause tells us that the relevant paragraph shall be

deemed to have come into operation on the same day as this Act came into operation, which was the 30th November, 1962.

If the Government felt, as all of us appear to feel, that certain categories of people should not be called upon to pay this tax, there should have been an immediate approach to Parliament. Meanwhile, and in accordance with the law, the people concerned should have been called upon to pay. Because the Government in its wisdom—and I would agree with the Government in this—is of the opinion that other classes of people should be exempt is no justification for the Government taking the law into its own hands and deciding to do this thing.

The Government should apologise to the people concerned if it feels an injustice was done; they should be informed that the Government is sorry but that they will have to wait until the next session of Parliament before corrective action can be taken. But the Government is so contemptuous of Parliament that it takes action contrary to the law and then comes to us with the proposition that we agree with its thinking and seeks to backdate the matter. I do not think that is good enough.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 19th September.

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [7.48 p.m.]: This Bill seeks to effect eight distinct amendments to the principal Act. As you are well aware, Sir, the Justices Act is the Act which governs the proceedings in courts of petty sessions and other tribunals which are presided over by magistrates or justices of the peace—hence the name of the Act: the Justices Act.

In the first place the opportunity has been taken to remove outmoded references to types of magistrates which no longer exist, but which are, in fact, found throughout the Act itself. As the Minister has outlined, since 1957 all appointments to the magistracy have been made pursuant to the Stipendiary Magistrates Act of that year. The first amendment, and those consequential to it in this Bill, will correctly refer to magistrates as being stipendiary magistrates or simply magistrates, and we will find that such terms as resident magistrate and police magistrate will disappear from the Act itself.

Another amendment to section 4 of the Act will correct the hiatus in the section which deals with the duties of clerks of petty sessions. At present the Act is quite

clear in outlining the duties of these officers, but there is no mention of their appointment to the courts. The opportunity is now taken to rectify this omission.

The next amendment is one which must appeal to every reasonable and fair-minded citizen as being right and just. It seeks to correct the policy governing the issue of warrants of execution and commitment. The proposed amendment will provide that such edicts will no longer issue, except by leave of a magistrate, where a period of 12 months has expired from the final date of the court hearing right up to the issue of the warrant.

I think you will agree, Sir, that the law should not condone unwarranted delay in such matters where the liberty of the subject may be at stake. As a well-known lawyer in this State once said to me, "Justice is sweetest when it is freshest."

A further desirable and sensible amendment relates to persons on bail who are required to attend before a criminal court or courts of petty sessions, and to surrender themselves to trial. Members can see the effect of this amendment by the addition of a proposed new section 121A which is to be found in clause 21 of the Bill. It is most desirable and extremely sensible.

The marginal note in the Bill of a further amendment reads, "Hearings in absence of defendant." The amendment, however, does not offend one's sense of justice, as reading the marginal note would make one feel; it simply provides that in matters of complaints in respect of simple offences arising under the Traffic Act, or any other Act which may be prescribed, or any regulation under the Traffic Act or such prescribed Act, where the defendant does not attend, and where he pleads guilty by endorsement, the court in such cases may proceed in his absence, and evidence may be given supporting the complainant's case by way of affidavit.

If however the defendant attends the court and pleads not guilty, the court will adjourn the matter to enable the defendant to call his witnesses to give verbal evidence. There is a safeguard in the Bill which provides that where the court does proceed in the defendant's absence, and he is convicted, the defendant must be brought to court before the court has jurisdiction to impose a sentence of imprisonment.

A proposed new section—section 136B—relates to validating hearings before justices in a court of petty sessions when the justices proceed in the belief that the defendant was at the material time a juvenile. It may be found that at the material time the defendant was a juvenile and accordingly his case should have been determined by the Children's Court.

Where this happens at the moment it is necessary for the law to completely ignore the proceedings in the court of petty sessions, and for new proceedings to be commenced against the defendant in the Children's Court. This is undesirable and the amendment will put an end to this practice.

A further amendment in the Bill will overcome a difficulty which arises where a defendant has been convicted, but due to lack of information in the hands of the court a sentence not authorised by law is sometimes imposed.

Where this happens the only way to rectify the matter is by appeal by way of order to review to a judge of the Supreme Court. Where the matter relates only to the sentence that has been imposed this would seem a cumbersome method of trying to rectify an anomaly.

Section 32 of the Traffic Act, I believe, has given rise to some of these decisions which have been given and which, strictly speaking, are not in accordance with the law. An example is where a person has been charged with, and convicted of, driving under the influence of alcohol, and the court believes that it is the person's first offence, and naturally he is fined between \$200 and \$300, and his driver's license is suspended for three months.

Subsequently it may be found that such a person had previously been convicted, and that the fine should have been a greater one in accordance with the section and, furthermore, that the driver's license should have been suspended for a period of two years.

These are examples which could arise where, possibly through lack of information, the court would impose a sentence not authorised by law. I hope however—and I trust the Minister will take note of this—that by the granting of this concession by the Legislature to enable the court of petty sessions to rectify the matter, it will not be taken as our condoning any lack of care on the part of the police, who first of all compile a person's criminal record, and who send the details of that record to the various police stations throughout the State.

The fact that the court of petty sessions will be able to rectify these errors through its own action should not be taken as a sign for the police to no longer exercise the care they have done in the past.

The final amendment, which is a very humane one, concerns the scale of imprisonment to be awarded in default of payment of moneys. First of all the amendment would permit the court to order that sentences in default of payment may be served cumulatively with any other penalty which the defendant may be serving, or at the time of conviction he is liable so to serve.

The opportunity is taken to remove an anomaly which exists; that is, a term of three days' imprisonment must be imposed, where the warrant of commitment is for an amount under \$4. In all other cases, where, for example, the warrant is for an amount of exactly \$4, the default term is only two days and not three days. The amendment deletes the provision of three days where the amount is under \$4. I support the Bill.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [7.58 p.m.]: I thank the member for Kalgoorlie for his support of the Bill, and for the obvious care with which he has studied the practical effects of the amendment. I think it also makes the point that the people who put forward the amendments must have done so as a result of their own practical experience over the years because, as a practitioner, the honourable member will know that the very nature of the amendments is such that they would have been put forward by people with a lot of experience.

The point the honourable member made concerning the young person under 18 years misrepresenting his age is well made; and I assure him that this also has been the subject of previous discussion. But it was explained to me at the time that these cases of misrepresentation of age are those where some of the chaps under 18 are as cunning as a cartload of monkeys; they have learnt these tricks from an early age, and they do these things with malice aforethought. But I do not think this will bring about any laxity on the part of the police.

There are good reasons why the records in respect of some of these young offenders cannot be kept as up to date as we would like them to be; because sometimes these persons commit offences in another State or in another location where it is not possible for the police to go through the normal procedure of checking the age and other particulars in time.

The point raised by the member for Kalgoorlie is well taken. I want to assure him that the amendment in the Bill will not bring about any laxity so far as the police is concerned. The provision was inserted to prevent an anomalous position arising just because someone, though young in years, wanted to be smart and put the police and the court to some trouble. The amendment in the Bill provides the machinery to correct the position.

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.

MOTOR VEHICLE (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 17th September.

MR. T. D. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [8.4 p.m.]: This Bill, though very small in content, because there are only five lines, is rather significant in consequence. It relates to the effects of certain amendments made to the principal Act in 1966. Those amendments sought to destroy, and achieved in destroying, for the purposes of proceedings under this Act, what has been called the immunity of suit between spouse and spouse. Apart from this Act, it is still the law in Western Australia under section 12 of the Married Women's Property Act that no husband or wife can sue the other for a tort or a civil wrong.

The amendments effected by this Parliament in 1966 to the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act did qualify this doctrine known as the immunity of suit doctrine. Applied to proceedings under this Act the law provided originally that where one spouse was injured as a result of the negligence of the other—where no third party was involved—the injured spouse should receive no compensation whatsoever. This was the law which applied in Western Australia until the amendments to which I have made reference were passed in 1966.

However, where a third party was involved, the injured spouse, by application of a case decided by the Court of King's Bench in England in 1939—the case quoted being *Chant versus Read*—could sue the third party; and provided that the injured spouse could prove some negligence against the third party then that injured spouse could recover in full against the third party irrespective of his degree of negligence. Even in that circumstance the injured spouse could not recover against the other spouse, but could recover against the third party irrespective of his degree of negligence.

Normally, a person such as a third party could call upon, under the Law Reform (Contributory Negligence and Tortfeasor's Contribution) Act of 1947—the Western Australian version of the Statute law—the other negligent person to make a contribution to meet the judgment; but in the case where a negligent spouse was involved and the other spouse was injured, and there was a third party involved, when judgment was given against the third party at the suit of the injured spouse, the third party was unable to call upon the negligent spouse to make any contribution whatsoever, because the third party would have to show that the injured spouse—if he had been sued—would have been held liable in respect of some damage; but

because of the immunity of suit doctrine the negligent spouse could not be sued at all. The law said that one spouse could not sue another.

We found, and indeed we still find, that where a husband and wife and a third party were involved, and one spouse was injured and the other spouse was negligent, the injured spouse could recover in full against the third party, but the third party was unable to call upon the negligent spouse to make any contribution.

It may well appear that since 1966, when the amendments to which I have referred became operative, all this has changed; but that is not the case. I would like to refer to section 8A of the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act. This section was one of the provisions included in the amendments of 1966. The marginal note is "Liability of Trust where spouse injured." It states—

8A. (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of section eight of this Act, where bodily injury to a person is caused partly by negligence in the use of a motor vehicle by the spouse of that person and partly by negligence in the use of a motor vehicle by some other person, and at the time of that injury that spouse was not in respect of the motor vehicle in the use of which he was negligent an insured person, the Trust shall not be liable in respect of that injury to any greater amount than such proportion of the total claim of that injured person as is equivalent to the degree of negligence attributable to that other person who partly caused the injury.

All that those words mean is that where one spouse is injured as a result of the part negligence of the other spouse and there is a third party involved and he is also negligent, and it is found that the negligent spouse is uninsured, then the trust liability is limited under section 8A of the Act. However, under that section the injured spouse is still able to receive full compensation against the third party, and because of the principle enunciated in the case of *Chant versus Read* that third party is unable to call upon the negligent spouse to make recovery.

This does not mean the negligent spouse gets off scot-free, because under section 8 of the Act—the Minister did not refer to it in his introductory speech—where the trust does pay in accordance with the principle that an injured person is to be compensated, and it is found that the negligent person is uninsured, the trust has full rights of recourse for recovery against the uninsured person. This principle has not been changed by the 1966 amendments to the Act; and it is still the law. So we find now that the trust does have the right of recourse against the uninsured negligent spouse.

What we are called upon to do is to provide that in the circumstances I have outlined not only will the trust have its liability limited, but the third party will also have his liability limited, so that the rights of compensation for the injured person will be restricted to that degree of liability or negligence of the negligent and uninsured spouse.

I well recall speaking in favour of the amendments to the Act in 1966 which seemed to break new ground, and which suggested that at last the law was catching up with reality. As a member of this Legislature at that time I am bound to say I was not as vigilant as I could, and should, have been; because I feel that section 8A should not have been allowed to creep into the Act, as it abrogates the very principle for which the Act stands.

This Act was passed in 1943 to provide that where a person was injured as a result of the use of a motor vehicle, and judgment was given in favour of that person, there would be a fund to which the injured person could have recourse to ensure that he would, in fact, receive compensation.

If no such statutory fund as this existed, and it was found that the negligent person against whom a judgment was given, was a man of clay, he could ignore his responsibility at law and leave the injured person uncompensated, uncared for, and lamenting. It was for this reason the Act was amended, and a fund was created to ensure the injured person did have the opportunity of receiving a right and just award for compensation.

The principle was that a person injured was to be placed, as near as money could do so, in the position which would have obtained had the accident not occurred. That principle is the golden thread which runs right through the Statute; and yet we find the Statute includes section 8A—a section I am not proud of. I am sorry I was not vigilant enough to speak loudly against it in 1966. This section abrogates the very principle to which I have just referred. It provides that the injured person can recover an amount dependent upon the degree of negligence by the spouse. It gets away from the principle that the person is to be compensated because an injury has been suffered.

The principle which should create the policy for the law is that a person, if injured as a result of the use of a motor vehicle, should receive compensation irrespective of whether the driver concerned was insured, bearing in mind that the trust has the right of recourse against the uninjured person.

I am not in favour of section 8A, so how could I be in favour of amending it, thus further limiting its provisions and further abrogating the principle? Again, I mentioned that an injured person, having

proved negligence, is to be assured he or she will be placed in the position in which he or she would have been—as near as money can do this—had the accident not occurred. Therefore, I cannot support the amendment and I will speak effectively against it at every opportunity which presents itself in the Committee stage.

MR. BERTRAM (Mt. Hawthorn) [8.18 p.m.]: This is a brief Bill, so far as its size is concerned, and is designed to amend section 8A of the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act of 1943. The Bill is really of a punitive nature because it seeks to impose a penalty. This penalty is harsh, unjustifiable, and inequitable, because it hits different people with varying degrees of force, without any justification for so doing. It is a Bill, the effect of which may well hit very hard each member of this House and his wife or dear ones at some future time if it becomes law. If it does become law, it will certainly hit citizens—not a great number of them—very hard; and before we start penalising people and hitting them hard, we need to have a very good case to justify our action.

I propose in a few moments to strive to demonstrate that this is a Bill which just should not become law. It is a Bill, the withdrawal of which, in view of some of the facts, would be justified. It is not worthy of having a place on our Statute book. I ask members to listen to the arguments and determine whether they will support or reject it on the facts, and not by some rule of thumb process or because of loyalty or some other reason. I submit with respect that the case against the Bill is so heavy it should not be made law.

We are all fairly well aware, I think, that there is a fiction of the common law that people who are married—legal spouses—generally speaking cannot sue one another. This old fiction is, at law, that spouses are a unity and for this reason one spouse cannot sue another. For many years endeavours were made, particularly by those on this side of the House, to do something about this fiction at common law, more particularly as it made, and makes, its impact upon people who are injured as a consequence of the negligent driving of their spouses.

It was only after many years of battling by those on this side that the Government decided it would do something about the matter. Therefore in 1966, years behind other States in the Commonwealth—about seven or eight years behind, I think, South Australia—it became possible for one spouse, injured as a consequence of the negligent driving of the other spouse, to sue that other spouse.

From now on I propose to speak of the spouses in the sense that the wife is the injured passenger, and the husband is the negligent driver. If another vehicle is involved, I will refer to the driver of that vehicle as the stranger.

As I understand the law at the moment, an injured wife, if she happens to be the passenger—but it operates both ways—can sue her husband on the strength of the 1966 amendment if she can show to the court that her husband had driven negligently; and if, as a direct consequence of his negligent driving she has suffered injury, she can receive damages from her husband to the full extent of the damages sustained by her. It is important to mention that obviously the damages she or anyone else recovers are compensatory. They are not the result of some lottery. The figures are very high from time to time, but the damages are compensatory. The claimant is awarded an amount which will place him or her in the position which would have obtained had the injury not been sustained.

This Bill turns our attention to a slightly different position. It is a very slightly different position, but the consequences are far-flung, far-reaching, and extremely harsh. Section 8A deals with the position when a negligent husband is driving a vehicle which happens to be uninsured. I think we are all aware—those of us who own a motor vehicle, and very few people do not seem to own one these days—that when we license our vehicle we at the same time pay a premium for insurance which provides the cover which is extended and operates under the principal Act. We have no choice. If we pay the license we simply must pay the insurance.

This Bill deals with a section which touches on the position where, for some reason or other, the husband has omitted to license his vehicle and, as a consequence, has not insured it. That is what the Bill is all about; and the radical steps which follow are inserted simply because of that position. How many people wilfully refuse to license their vehicle? I would say the number would be very small and those concerned are to be pitied, rather than punished in the manner contemplated in this Bill.

We all know that the main reason, if not the exclusive reason, people do not insure their vehicle is because of sheer inadvertence or forgetfulness. We are all subject to the frailty of forgetfulness. It could also be that a man in his office or place of business has asked a clerk to license his vehicle and the clerk has forgotten. There could be all sorts of reasons. It could be that he is passing through a worrying period in his life. There could be no end of different reasons why the license of a vehicle has not been renewed. Irrespective of the reason, the fact is that if the license has not been renewed the vehicle concerned is no longer insured, and it is in these circumstances the Bill is going to make its impact.

If in that situation the wife is injured and her husband is 50 per cent. to blame and, I repeat, he is at the time driving

an unlicensed vehicle, the wife is punished to the extent of 50 per cent. because she can recover only 50 per cent. from the stranger-driver. She cannot, under this Bill, recover the other 50 per cent.

I have mentioned earlier that the provision in the Bill is inequitable in its impact, and I will demonstrate why. If husband A forgets to license his vehicle and so has omitted to insure it and his wife suffers damage to the tune of \$50, and the husband is 50 per cent. to blame, she misses out on \$25. On the other hand, if husband B on the very same day is in a similar accident under the same circumstances and has forgotten to license his car and therefore his vehicle is uninsured, and his wife is maimed and crippled to the extent of \$50,000, his wife is denied \$25,000. This is a distinction between \$25 and \$25,000 for the same offence. If the stranger is, say, 1 per cent. negligent, the wife can sue the stranger and obtain 100 per cent. damages. The Bill, as I have intimated, divides the blame, and the percentage of blame attributable to the husband is not recoverable by the wife. If 50 per cent. of the blame is attributable to the husband, the wife is denied 50 per cent. of the damages; in other words, she recovers only 50 per cent., and that is recoverable from the stranger.

If no stranger is involved because the negligent spouse ran into an electric light pole or something of that nature, then she does not get a cent. Why should she not? She has done nothing wrong. It may well be that she has urged her husband to license the vehicle. It may be that the husband has been driving for 50 years and this is the first occasion on which he has forgotten to license the vehicle. But what is the consequence? Because on this particular occasion he happens to crash his vehicle, his wife does not receive full compensation. If, as I have said, his wife suffers damages to the extent of \$50,000, she will receive only \$25,000. Do members think that is fair? That will be the position under this Bill. If members think it is an unconscionable, shameful procedure, they will reject the Bill.

Let us for a moment have a look at the consequences which could flow if this Bill should become law; that is, consequences as they apply to the negligent husband—who is not only negligent but has an unlicensed vehicle. It could be that he, himself, was injured in the smash. In consequence of this he might not be able to work, or if he can work he may have lost his employment nevertheless. If he has lost his employment, we have to think of all the adverse consequences which could flow from that, all of which accrue against him. He has already suffered humiliation, hurt, and embarrassment by the fact that his wife has been seriously

injured, and perhaps, in addition, his children have been injured. These all follow from his negligent driving. This is before we even get into the statutory field.

Under the Statutes he may be dealt with by being imprisoned or fined, or both, for having breached the Traffic Act and the Traffic Code. He may be deprived of his driver's license. If he is deprived of his license it may affect his work. If he has to have a license to carry on his job—that is, if he has to drive in order to earn a living—the only thing he can do is to make an application under section 33A of the Traffic Act for an extraordinary license, which he may or may not be granted. Whichever way it goes, it costs him time, inconvenience, and money. However, we are not finished yet, for next we come to the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act and, again, he can be dealt with under that Statute.

Under subsection (3) of section 4 he is fined a very significant sum for the offence of having failed to insure his vehicle. The penalty for the first offence is \$200 and the penalty for a subsequent offence is \$400. But we still have not finished with him. Members might think we have brought him to book and have taught him a lesson; but they would be sadly astray, because we have not.

We then come to section 4 (3) (c) of the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act which requires the poor fellow to pay the unpaid insurance premium—the one he had forgotten to pay. Although he has to pay that, we still have not come to the end of the road. I shall stay with section 4. Subsection (4) of that section reads as follows:—

Any person convicted of an offence under this section—

This is the section about not insuring. To continue—

—shall (unless the court thinks fit to order otherwise)—

Members should notice that the wording is "shall," not, "may." To continue—

—be disqualified from holding and obtaining under the Traffic Act a driver's license or a license in respect of a motor vehicle for a period of twelve months from the date of the conviction.

I do not know whether members will think that by now he has received enough treatment. If the Bill is carried tonight, obviously they will think he has not and he should be given some more.

If he injures his wife and she is granted damages of \$25,000, in effect that is just another penalty. This is nothing other than a penal Statute and it is most unfair.

I have looked at the remarks made by the Minister in another place and I see no justification at all for the Bill. If legislation with this kind of impact is to be

brought forward it is necessary to have a very heavy case to substantiate it and, in my view, there is virtually no case. All the Minister said was that in 1966 when the Bill was brought down the intention of the Legislature was not spelt out in the section. I suppose that is an equivocal sort of statement. If what had been intended was said, it may not have become law in this State.

I think the other remark which the Minister made is a gem. He said that the amendment is necessary because if an uninsured husband's spouse is to get her proper compensation, it is going to mean that those who have paid their insurance premiums are virtually carrying the uninsured man.

I put to members that there is nothing in that, and I think it is a miserly trait. If one were to go down the street and ask any person whether he would support the legislation on the strength of that, I am sure he would say, "Certainly not," and he would regard it as a slanderous thing to be considered too miserly to pay another dollar or so in order that a far more equitable law might remain on our Statute book. Sooner or later each person in the street may be hit by this clause and the little extra premium which would have to be paid does not amount to anything at all.

The proposition that the uninsured fellow will be carried by the insured fellow is just empty. I have already indicated that under section 4 (3) of the Act he has to pay, anyhow, if he is caught. If he has an accident he will most certainly be caught. It may well be that a person has been paying an insurance premium for 50 years. It seems to me that if he has paid for 50 years and has not had a claim he is not a bad sort of risk.

It is very important to draw to the attention of the House the fact that there is a sizeable difference between an unlicensed vehicle and an unlicensed driver. An unlicensed vehicle has nothing to do with the main element which has to be proved in a motor vehicle insurance trust case; that is, negligence. If a vehicle is unlicensed that does not amount to negligence at all. If one is an unlicensed driver it possibly could relate to negligence, but in 99 cases out of 100 it does not. It is not as though the unlicensed vehicle in any way operates adversely to the trust fund at all, because the vehicle may be a brand new one. It may not be the fault of a vehicle that an accident has occurred. As we are all aware, by far the greater preponderance of accidents comes about through negligent driving and not through some defect in a vehicle.

If we need further justification, I point out that every person who licenses a vehicle contributes to the trust fund under the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance)

Act. I think it is worth while to remember that whatever the business transaction in which we are involved, we have to suffer an occasional loss. We cannot win all the time.

It is just as well to remember, too, that under this Act we do a fair bit of winning and not too much losing. In my belief it is worth while to consider that lots and lots of people could bring claims against the trust but never do—not because they do not have excellent cases, but because they do not know they have the right to bring a claim. Others bring claims but, again, due to ignorance, they do not recover the full amount of their claims. That does not suggest, nor it is intended to suggest, that the trust goes out of its way not to pay claims. However, if people do not know how to present a claim, the trust is only obliged to pay so much of the claim as is supported by evidence.

There are plenty of cases where it is quite obvious that negligence of a high order has occurred but, because there is no evidence to prove it, the trust does not have to pay. It is not a case of whether or not a person is negligent, but whether negligence can be proved. It does not matter how much negligence there is, if it cannot be proved the trust does not have to pay.

These are all on the credit side. Every member in the House, together with myself, benefit from this in our premiums. All the people who miss out on damages, either wholly or in part, give, as it were, a bonus to us. If we have occasionally to pay out a little bit to a fellow who has not insured his vehicle, I think we should be prepared to do it. As far as I am concerned—and I am sure I speak for the man in the street—in a case like this I would be only too pleased to pay out, because the overall result of the operation of this Act is a splendid one.

If I have not already mentioned it, I should say that prior to 1966 lawful spouses—by reason of their foolishness in entering into a contract of marriage—were inferior people to paramours and *de facto* spouses. In 1966 this position was belatedly put right so that a spouse had the same rights at law as those other people whom I have mentioned.

Now we are seeking not only to turn the clock back, but to turn it back beyond 1966. As I have indicated clearly enough, this is a serious and retrograde step, not only from the standpoint of law reform but from every other possible standpoint.

The member for Kalgoorlie quoted, I think, section 12 of the Married Women's Property Act which says, amongst other things—

Except as aforesaid, no husband or wife shall be entitled to sue the other for a tort.

This is another word for civil wrong, opposed to criminal wrong. Negligence happens to be a tort.

If the Minister intends to proceed with the legislation, there are one or two queries which I wish to raise and I am sure the House would be most interested to hear the answers. I refer firstly to the Married Persons and Children (Summary Relief) Act, 1965. I will read the first portion of section 12 which states—

An order containing a provision for separation, while relieving the complainant of the obligation to cohabit with the other party to the marriage, does not otherwise affect the marriage or the status, rights, and obligations of the parties to the marriage, except that—

- (a) while a provision for separation is in operation either party to the marriage may bring proceedings in contract or in tort against the other party.

There is more to the section, but it is not relevant to what I wish to say. In other words, section 12 brings separated spouses into a different position from the one mentioned under the Married Women's Property Act. I do not know what all this adds up to. In fact the existence of section 12 of the Married Persons and Children (Summary Relief) Act may have been forgotten altogether.

Mr. Tonkin: It ought to add up to the defeat of the Bill.

Mr. BERTRAM: I would be in favour of that, as I have already intimated. What is the position here? Take the injured wife. Section 12 gives the appearance that the injured wife, to whom I have been referring, can sue a husband in any circumstances. As long as she has a separation order—that is an order made under the summary relief Act—it would appear on the face of it that she can sue, notwithstanding section 8A and the provision in the Bill now before us. However, if she is a happily married spouse and is injured in consequence of her husband's negligent driving, she does not get a penny.

Mr. Brady: What if she is a *de facto* spouse?

Mr. BERTRAM: If she is a *de facto* spouse, she is as safe as a bank. She just sues without any trouble at all.

Mr. Lapham: What if she is a girl friend?

Mr. BERTRAM: If she is a girl friend, she succeeds with no trouble at all. In fact, if she is a complete stranger she is successful.

Mr. Toms: It would seem there is something wrong with marriage.

Mr. BERTRAM: If she commits the cardinal sin of entering into a contract of marriage, she has had it. It may well be that the wife who possesses a separation order is the spouse who has done wrong and not the one who has been wronged. We know that under the summary relief Act a husband can sue in the same way, thank heaven, as a wife can now sue. This is an amendment of recent years.

It may well be that a wife who is subject to a separation order—an adulteress perhaps—can sue successfully under section 12 if she is injured, but a happily married and well-behaved wife cannot.

We could have the position, too where parties may be contemplating marriage: they could be proceeding to the church for the wedding and be injured in transit, which happens on occasions. It might be right outside the church. If the marriage has not taken place, the injured party can sue and succeed; but if they have been married and the wife is injured, even just outside the church—maybe the car has just left the kerb—she cannot sue under this Bill.

It may be that a spouse has a decree *nisi* and the day before the decree *nisi* ripens into maturity—at the expiration of three months—she is injured, possibly even wilfully, by her husband, but she cannot prove it. In that case she cannot recover damages because she is still married. She is still the lawful spouse. She has no separation order and so she misses out.

If we pause for a little and ponder the Bill we can see that there are many other provisions in it which are very bad, but the worst is the point I have already mentioned—penalising people for forgetfulness. Surely we have enough provisions in the Traffic Act and the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act to cater for forgetfulness. There are sufficient penalties in those measures to cover forgetfulness. The penalties I mentioned might be harsh, but they are maximum penalties and I suspect the courts, as a general rule, water them well down, in most cases, before they impose them. I certainly hope that is the position.

Another point is that if the Bill becomes law then in effect what will happen is that instead of the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust carrying the burden of the day, as it should do in the case of motor vehicle accidents, the burden, in many cases, may well be borne by the Social Services Department.

Another unfairness about the matter is that I suppose in 95 per cent. of the cases the people who will be hit hard by this legislation, and hit where it hurts, will be the wives. As we are all aware, for obvious reasons, as a general rule the husbands drive the motor vehicles. Therefore, does this legislation appear to be fair?

Generally we adore and protect our wives up to the limit; we protect them and do everything we can to uphold them. Yet the Government brings in a piece of legislation such as this which chops the very heads off them. That does not seem to be fair. It certainly does not seem fair to me and I am sure others feel the same way.

Finally, if I have not already said so, I point out that any law which punishes a person for contracting a lawful marriage is a questionable one to say the least and, in my view, a better case would be necessary to justify it than has been put forward so far. Virtually no case at all has been put up. I read the Minister's introductory speech in another place, and I read the introductory speech in this House; and virtually no case at all has been put before us to justify the passing of this Bill. Because of the reasons I have put forward, and the matters I have raised, and in ordinary fairness, I appeal to members to reject the Bill.

MR. JAMIESON (Belmont) [8.49 p.m.]: As the member for Mt. Hawthorn indicated, this Bill could more readily be called a spouse punishment Bill; because that is what it really is. Unless the legislation we introduce is equitable, then we should not agree to it; and this measure could be placed in the category of inequitable legislation.

During his speech, the member for Mt. Hawthorn instanced several cases where inequities would result from the passage of this legislation, and obviously the Bill does not cover the case of a wife who is in another car. She need not necessarily be in the same car; she may be living apart from her husband and she may be driving in another vehicle and be involved in an accident where the driver of the other vehicle is her husband, from whom she is not legally separated. In that case, even though the wife is injured she has no redress under this legislation. That is diabolical, and no Government should put such a proposition forward.

Surely the women's organisations should do something about it. Apparently they do not have a full appreciation of what is intended by the Government; and maybe the Government itself does not have a full appreciation of what the Bill provides for. Either way it would appear to me that more thought must be given to the measure before its provisions become operative. It is ludicrous that a person who is doing the right thing all the way along the line should be penalised if she is injured in an accident in which her husband is involved when he is driving an unlicensed vehicle. The husband may have a *de facto* wife with him in his car, and if she is injured she gets compensation, but the lawful wife, under the provisions of this Bill, gets nothing. She is left lamenting and is not likely to get anything.

That is stupid, and we certainly should not proceed with legislation which contains a provision such as that. I agree that very few cases would be involved, because most people pay their license fees; but there are some occasions—and this happens more in the country than in the city—when a license may have expired and, for some reason or other, the owner of the vehicle is not able to forward the necessary fees in the time prescribed. In such a case if an accident occurs the wife is the one who is penalised.

As the member for Mt. Hawthorn pointed out, if the provisions of the Bill were altered to provide for cover for the lawful wife, the trust would not be involved in any loss, because it has the right to claim in such a case. So I suggest that for some reason or other the Government has been led into a trap by somebody trying to protect the trust in regard to a very small number of cases. The provisions in the Bill are most inequitable and under those circumstances I could not support them.

I hope the Minister will delay the passage of the measure to obtain further advice. I read the introductory speech made in another place and the introductory speech here—it took only a few minutes to introduce the Bill in this House—and the Minister said that it was a very small Bill. He simply outlined the measure and that was that. However, as the member for Mt. Hawthorn said, I cannot see any valid reason for introducing such legislation, and until a valid reason is forthcoming I feel the Bill should be held in abeyance. The Minister should take some action to have it withdrawn.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. I. W. Manning.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 17th September.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Leader of the Opposition) [8.54 p.m.]: This is a very simple Bill and its purpose is to effect amendments which have been recommended over the period of the past 12 months by the Local Government Association and the Country Shire Councils' Association. In the main, I accept the proposals, but I have an objection to one which I will deal with as I proceed. The majority of the amendments are desirable and I am prepared to support them.

The first amendment is a very simple one indeed; it is merely to change the date of the 1st January to the 15th January. This adjustment is considered necessary to enable companies to nominate their representatives at the same time as enrolments of other people are entered

upon the council rolls. I think that is desirable, so I shall not waste any more time on the amendment.

The existing legislation provides that local authorities may take road-making material from properties within one mile of where work is being done. I suppose when this provision was put into the legislation originally there was a good reason for it, but it is now felt that it is somewhat of a restriction to leave the figure at one mile, and the local authorities have requested that no limit should be placed upon the distance. It is argued, and I accept the argument, that as the people from whom the material is being taken are adequately compensated, then they really have no argument against allowing it to be taken.

I can see no valid reason why a person who happens to be within a mile of where work is being done should be obliged by law to allow a local authority to take road-making material from his property, whereas if a person lives two miles away he should not be so obliged. If material exists which the local authority requires for road-making the principle is the same, irrespective of the distance involved. I do not think distance enters into the question, and provided a person is adequately compensated I do not believe there can be any argument against it. I am prepared to support that alteration.

A third proposal has emanated, I think, from a suggestion of the Chief Justice, although the Minister did not say so when he introduced the Bill. My recollection is that a case was taken some little time ago by a person who claimed compensation from a local authority because after he had built his house and put in his fence line the local authority came along and altered the height of the road to the disadvantage of the person concerned. This person argued that it was unfair and he was entitled to assume that the road level which was already down would not be altered and because it was altered he ought to be compensated.

The Chief Justice pointed out that as the Act stood, although the person appeared to have a moral right he did not have a legal one and he could not claim compensation. However, the Chief Justice did recommend that the law be altered to provide that if local authorities subsequently altered road levels, without any previous indication that at some time in the future they would be likely to do this, compensation could be claimed.

So the provision in the Bill is to set that matter right and to ensure that when a road has been constructed and levels have not been fixed by the council, the level of the pavement of the road shall be deemed to be the established level. Even though the local authority may not have fixed the level the mere fact that

it has constructed a road to that level should be sufficient and it will be deemed to be the level and if the local authority subsequently changes that level the action will give rise to compensation.

The Chief Justice has pointed out that this is a just course to follow and I agree with him. I think it is; and I think its having been pointed out, we should take the first opportunity—and this is it—to put the matter right.

A further provision in the Bill is to enable local authorities to borrow money for the purpose of installing sewerage works and then to empower those authorities subsequently to sell those sewerage works to the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board. This seems to me to be a method by which the lag in the provision of sewerage can be overcome to some extent. I agree with the proposal, but I am wondering whether there will be a sufficient source from which this money can be borrowed.

I noticed that recently the State Electricity Commission had a very bad experience. I think only 51 per cent. or 52 per cent. of its requirements were raised and the balance had to be found by the underwriters. This is something I pointed out some time ago when the Government introduced an amendment to various Acts—one in connection with the Fremantle Port Authority, and another in regard to the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board—giving power to borrow. At that time I pointed out there was not a limitless amount of money for all this borrowing, and I specifically mentioned that the State Electricity Commission would experience difficulty in obtaining its loan requirements if these various bodies were authorised to go onto the market and borrow money. That is precisely what has happened. So this is only adding to the situation.

I have no objection to the desire of local authorities to borrow in order to put in hand sewerage works, but I emphasise again that the more authorities that are empowered to borrow money in this way, the harder it will be for those that have depended upon this source to raise finance to carry out their works. I repeat: The recent experience of the State Electricity Commission emphasises that very point.

Mr. Nalder: That situation changes from time to time. The last loan was oversubscribed, while the previous one was similar to the present loan.

Mr. TONKIN: Can the Minister, offhand, offer any reason other than the one I have given as to why only 51 per cent. of the money was obtained.

Mr. Nalder: No, I cannot offer any reason, but the previous loan was oversubscribed only a few months earlier. We have experienced the same situation this time as we did about 18 months ago when

a loan was undersubscribed. One cannot give the reason why this situation comes up from time to time.

Mr. TONKIN: My opinion is that the State Electricity Commission will experience increasing difficulty in raising the money it requires, and one of the results will be that the underwriters will increase charges for underwriting loans and therefore the money the State Electricity Commission receives will become more and more expensive. However, that is only by the way. I agree with the idea that local authorities should construct sewerage works and, to enable them to do that, should be empowered to borrow money.

The next proposal is to enable local authorities to borrow money to provide parking facilities, and, having borrowed that money, to repay their loan indebtedness from the income they receive from the parking facilities they make available. As the Act stands, there is some doubt as to whether they can do that. So the purpose of this amendment is to clear away that doubt and make certain that where local authorities do borrow for this purpose and provide parking facilities, they will have power to meet their indebtedness from the revenue. I have no objection to that.

I do object to the next proposal and I am going to vote against it when we come to the clause unless, in the meantime, some more adequate reason than the one already given is supplied by the Government. This is the clause which proposes to increase the rates payable by people who own land in townsite areas in country districts. The argument is that local authorities in the country prefer to rate on the unimproved value and, because the values in country districts have not risen commensurately with the values in the city—for which I am grateful; I wish I could keep values down in the city as well—the local authorities are seeking to overcome the matter by doubling the rate. So the proposal will be that, with the approval of the Minister, country local authorities can obviate the need to change to annual values in cases where councils prefer the unimproved value system; and the limit will be raised from 7.5c in the dollar to 15c in the dollar.

As the legislation stands at present, if local authorities are rating on the unimproved value, the maximum rate is 7.5c in the dollar; and this amendment proposes to lift that maximum to 15c in the dollar, or to give the local authority, with the approval of the Minister, the right to double the amount it is obtaining from the rate on a piece of land in a townsite area.

Why should we attempt, by this means, to increase the impost on country people, simply because the value of their land has not risen comparably with the value of land in the more favoured parts? Surely

that is no argument! If the land has not risen in value in country areas, what justification is there, because it has not risen in value, for increasing the rate? There must be a reason why the land has not risen in value in the country districts. So I am not prepared to agree to this amendment for the reason already given—I want some more justification than that.

In the city, where values have been forced up because of speculation, people have an opportunity of reaping some financial benefit by selling land at the enhanced value, but no such opportunity exists in the country districts, because land has not risen in value. That is now to be used as an argument to increase the amount of rates which people are to pay. We are to say to them, "Your land has not risen in value and we are not getting enough revenue from it, so we are going to double the rates." I am not prepared to agree to that proposition unless some more substantial reason than that already given is vouchsafed to the House.

A further amendment is in connection with the procedures which are followed for the sale of land upon which rates have not been paid. I expect the opportunities that existed previously do not exist to a similar extent these days, because people are not likely to let their land go to sale rather than pay the rates, because they can get more for the land if they pay the rates.

This proposal is to ensure that where certain expenditure is incurred by the local authority in carrying out the requirements of the law with regard to advertising a memorial, and so on, the Act shall be altered so that what has been done shall not be cancelled at the end of 12 months as at present, but shall be allowed to carry on. I see no objection to that if rates have been unpaid and a situation has been reached where the local authority is entitled to put the land up for auction and it fails to sell the land.

I cannot believe there would be many instances these days where that would occur, particularly in the city. However, if it does occur, then I would not object to the situation remaining so that the local authority could, at some future time without incurring further expenditure, put the land on the market again and try to sell it—and that is all this proposes to do.

What I have said covers the proposals in the Bill. So, with the exception of the one provision to which I object, I am prepared to accept the Government's proposals.

MR. MITCHELL (Stirling) [9.12 p.m.]: I wish to make a few comments in connection with this Bill, to which I give my general support. I wish to refer to the amendment to section 281 which enables a council to use material from anywhere for roadmaking purposes. Previously it was accepted that councils operating with-

in one mile of the area from where they took material could do so without paying compensation; but if the material were taken at one mile or more, compensation had to be paid to the owner of the land, even if the land were unimproved. It is proposed that compensation shall be paid to owners of land in all areas from which material is taken.

I am in agreement with this, because with the extensive use of motor traffic and the distances over which people have to travel, there is a scarcity of roadmaking material and local authorities should have the right to take material for roadworks at a distance greater than one mile, which might have been all right in the horse and dray days. At that time one mile was quite a distance over which to cart roadmaking material.

Compensation has to be paid if the land is cleared; and in these days most of the material would have to come from cleared land because there is not much uncleared land in the south-west from which the roadmaking material can be procured. If provision is made in that regard then I am happy.

As was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, very often grave injustice is done to owners of land where they build up an entrance and construct a house and the council comes along and alters the alignment of the road. I think it is proper that owners should be protected in such cases.

The provision in the Bill that permits the raising of loans and the using of parking fees to recoup councils for the provision of parking facilities is very necessary. Even in country areas, councils are now having great difficulty in providing parking space for vehicles and they have to raise loans and make some provision for repayment. If they are permitted, as this Bill provides, to use the fees, as well as loan money, then it is all to the good.

I do not agree with the comments of the Leader of the Opposition about the doubling of the rate on town properties, for the simple reason that the amendment states that most councils rate their town areas on the annual value and the country areas on the unimproved value. Many councils desire to keep the one system throughout the district, but they cannot do this and raise sufficient money. Therefore if they cannot raise sufficient money on the unimproved value, they turn to the annual value of the town areas. It is necessary for them to collect the same amount of money, so they might as well rate on the unimproved value throughout the whole of the area and include the rate in the town section. I personally cannot see any harm in the rate being raised to 15c in the dollar.

With those few comments I give this small Bill my general support. I think that the last amendment is quite sensible and it enables a council to continue with the one system over the whole district.

MR. TOMS (Ascot) [9.16 p.m.]: I want to make a few comments with regard to the measure before the House. Members may recall that for some years I have been having a go at the Minister for Local Government and asking for a reprint of the Act. Since July, 1961, when the Act came into force, over 200 amendments have been made. This year we have a nice new reprinted Act and we start off again with nine amendments, with the promise of another series of amendments to come at a later stage of the session.

I cannot help but feel that far too many of the amendments made to the Local Government Act, since it was passed and came into operation in July, 1961, have been because of the whims and fancies of local shire councils. Many of the amendments have been brought to this House because one council has found that something has happened. It might never happen again in the history of local government, but the Act has been amended. The Road Districts Act and the Municipal Corporations Act stood the test of time for many years with very few amendments. Yet, in the life of this Act, there have been over 200 amendments. Indeed, the amendments have been so numerous that a reprint has been necessary. I only hope we will not continue to have as many amendments made to this particular Act because, surely to goodness, we must have nearly reached the stage of having something like a perfect Act.

I am prepared to admit that with changing times it may be necessary to amend the Act, but with 30 to 40 amendments, year after year, it does seem to be a sort of farce. When the Act was first passed it was considered to be almost perfect. We felt that some adjustments would be required now and again. However, we have the position where there has been need for a reprint after only seven years, and, if we keep going the way we have in the past, we will require another reprint in another seven years.

The Leader of the Opposition fairly well covered the proposed amendments which are before the House tonight. The member for Stirling made a brief contribution in which he dealt with the one-mile limit. I think this applies mainly in the country areas. I would say that seven out of the nine amendments before us tonight are dealing mainly with country shires rather than with metropolitan authorities. Compensation, with regard to the one-mile limit, is always paid in regard to section 281 of the Act, whether the gravel is taken half a mile down the road or not. The idea is to shift the one-mile limit.

I do not know why it was ever placed in the Act, particularly when one considers the distances covered in the outback areas. It will now be all right because compensation will be paid and the section will still contain the protection required. The material will not be carted outside of the district.

The clause which seemed to have the Leader of the Opposition worried is the one dealing with the power of a council to strike a general rate. If it had not been for the inflationary trend in land prices in the metropolitan area we would have had this problem not only in the country areas, but also in the metropolitan area. Members will recall that under the old Road Districts Act and the Municipal Corporations Act the maximum rate one could strike on unimproved land was 9d. in the pound. Some of the local authorities were up around 7½d. in the pound before we had the change in currency. If land prices had not spiralled through speculation we would have had to amend the Act to raise the rate to 15c, as is proposed in the amendment.

I cannot see any danger in the amendment, because a local authority can only rate in relation to the proposed expenditure in its area. Rising costs would have forced up the rate in the metropolitan area and we would have been above 7½c in the dollar. So I cannot see any danger in the provision.

The Leader of the Opposition seems to think that some councils will make a harvest and enjoy a bonanza. However, I think it is a necessary amendment and I see no danger. The only thing that concerns me is that there are far too many amendments to the Local Government Act which are brought forward because one local authority has found something wrong, which may never happen again.

I guarantee that a quarter of the amendments need never have gone through, but were simply brought forward because some local authority asked the Minister to amend the Act. I hope that any further amendments will be given serious consideration before being brought here, because it is time this Act settled down. Perhaps we could have one amendment a year, instead of nine, with the promise of another series at a later stage of the session.

I support the amendments and I hope the Minister will take some notice of the comments I have made in regard to future amendments to the Act.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [9.22 p.m.]: I wish to raise a few points. I thought this Bill would have gone through easily, but evidently one or two points have perplexed members. I think an amendment is necessary in regard to the

one-mile limit which refers to the carrying of gravel. The mile limit was imposed when no compensation was paid for the taking of gravel. It was taken from a person's property with the idea that it would be used on the roads adjacent to his property and he would receive the benefit.

Mr. Tonkin: Has that been the position all along?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: It has been for a long time.

Mr. Tonkin: But that is not in the Act at present?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: That is right. The idea was that so long as the material was used on roads adjacent to the person's property, he would not be losing much by contributing material because he would benefit from the use of the roads. However, when compensation is paid there is no reason why the gravel should not be taken over a distance.

The other query raised was in regard to the extension of the amount of rating on land which is assessed on unimproved capital value. We all know that rising costs have caught up with local governing bodies and, in most cases, this has been covered because of the rise in the values of the land on which the rates have been assessed. In fact, in many cases the values have risen so much that local governing bodies have been able to reduce the amount of the rate.

However, there are still some local governing bodies—not many of them—that assess townsites on unimproved capital values. Whether they do this wisely or not I would not like to say. The fact is that they do, and there has not been a rise in some small country towns in unimproved values. Therefore, there is no other way for the local governing bodies to compensate themselves for the rise in present day costs. They reach a limit and they have to show a deficit or change over to the annual rental value system.

I feel it is a better system and enables the local governing bodies to preserve the present system of rating. It has certain virtues, and the local governing bodies cannot assess rates higher than the previous maximum rates without the consent of the Minister. This gives the Minister full control. A local governing body cannot waste its ratepayers' money, because it has to go to the Minister for approval before it can raise the rate. I think this protection is sufficient and I think it is satisfactory from the public's point of view and from the ratepayers' point of view, and also from the local government's point of view. I hope that members will see it in that light.

MR. RIDGE (Kimberley) [9.26 p.m.]: I agree to a certain degree with the member for Ascot, that there have possibly been too many amendments to the Local

Government Act. Perhaps some have been made unnecessarily, but I think the current proposal which is before the House purely aims at streamlining the Act. I consider the amendments are very desirable and will have a good effect on shire councils and ratepayers generally.

The first amendment corrects an anomalous situation whereby some people have to apply to be placed on the electoral roll by the 1st January—which is New Year's Day—whereas other people have until the 15th January. In this instance, the aim of the Bill is purely and simply to standardise on the latter date. I think this proposal will be well accepted, particularly by shire clerks throughout the State, who are responsible for the compilation of the electoral rolls.

Previous speakers have referred to section 281 as being very restrictive, inasmuch as local authorities are only entitled to take roadmaking material from areas that are within one mile of where work is being undertaken. I would say that in Western Australia we are probably fairly well endowed with good road-making material. However, it is not always within one mile of where the work is being performed.

I think that by removing this restriction the Minister has adopted a realistic and common-sense approach which could have quite a cost-saving effect on many shire councils. If the shire councils complied with the Act it is possible they would have to cart the material from pits or reserves vested in the local authorities, which could be many miles away from where the work is being done.

The amendment relating to street levels is one which appears to be quite overdue. It seems to me to impose an explicit obligation on local authorities to determine street levels, and is a form of protection to adjacent property owners who could be adversely affected by ill-conceived roadworks.

Under existing legislation it is difficult to determine whether a level has been permanently established, and in some instances councils have undertaken works which have resulted in properties being flooded. The property owner who has been flooded out need not necessarily have recourse to compensation, and I think the amendment rectifies this situation.

Clause 5 appears to be aimed at speeding up the process of providing sewerage and drainage facilities in the metropolitan area. It is quite conceivable that local authorities, by taking advantage of their borrowing powers, would be doing themselves a good turn and, at the same time, would be helping out their ratepayers and, possibly, the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board. It is quite significant that the council would not be incurring any financial loss.

When the Bill was introduced the Minister said it was doubtful if section 525A of the Act gave councils the authority to borrow to establish parking facilities and to recoup themselves from the revenue of the undertaking instead of from loan rates. Although it might only be the phraseology in the Act that makes this doubtful, clarification is essential; because it must have been proved beyond any reasonable doubt that the parking meters throughout Perth are wonderful little revenue producers, considering the amount of real estate they occupy. In consideration of the return from these meters and the established parking areas, it is inconceivable that a technicality should preclude them from paying their own way.

From reading clause 7, one gains the impression that local authorities are being granted approval to increase their rating by 100 per cent., but when this is transposed to the parent Act it is obvious the amendment is aimed only at giving country shires the opportunity to standardise one form of valuation; and, although it will probably affect only a few councils, it will be welcomed as a very acceptable measure.

I think the Leader of the Opposition suggested that this was being done to assist local authorities whose valuations had not increased in accordance with the increases in city valuations. I do not think this is quite correct, because local authorities could still achieve the same financial result by using the annual value; and, as I said previously, I think this is being done only to give the local authorities the opportunity to standardise on the one form of valuation and, in this situation, it is the unimproved capital value system.

The next two clauses are designed merely to streamline the procedure that would be used only in isolated instances, and to correct an error in printing as a result of a previous amendment to the Act. I support the Bill.

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [9.32 p.m.]: I appreciate the interest in the Bill that has been taken by members, judging from the remarks they have made to the amendments suggested by the Minister for Local Government. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that the position brought about by including clause 7 in the Bill is merely to carry out the requirements of those local authorities that find themselves in such a position that it is necessary to receive a greater amount of income from town properties.

I would like to indicate that this situation arises mainly in the smaller country towns where there is no demand for building blocks that have been alienated by the Lands Department for a townsite. There may be only a store, a service station, and one or two homes, and the rest

of the blocks would not improve in value whatsoever. In fact, some of them would depreciate in value.

I know of several such blocks in areas where the townsites are situated on flat country bordering lakes. Some of the land has become salt eroded and the blocks are practically useless. In fact, I happen to own a block similar to the ones I have mentioned. This is situated in a country town and I paid \$2 for it.

Mr. Brady: Does it have a minimum rating of \$5 a year?

Mr. NALDER: What I am stating is a fact. So that particular provision is designed merely to allow local authorities to increase their income when they are faced with such a situation. I think that most members will agree that the provision will satisfy local authorities. They have accepted this proposal and in my opinion the situation is adequately covered. I therefore see no reason to be concerned over the amendment. The contributions that have been made by other speakers in support of the provision illustrate the existing situation.

There is one point I would like to make which concerns me slightly. It is in reference to the removal of road material from a distance beyond the one-mile limit. I hope this is reasonable enough. One of the main reasons why the provision was not included in the legislation previously was to ensure that local authorities did not take advantage of a gravel pit which was easily available and as a result denude the whole area of the material, when they could have availed themselves of a better grade of gravel situated at some other location a little further distant from the work in progress.

This is the pattern which has shown up in some country areas. Local authorities have been able to get gravel quite easily in one situation, and it was convenient to carry the gravel over a fairly long distance, but they overlooked the desecration they were committing to the property from which the gravel was being obtained. I know of several instances where gravel was available only 10 chains down the road from the works in progress, but because it necessitated a little scrub-clearing and was not easy to reach, the local authority continued to denude up to 10 acres of a person's property to obtain gravel.

Although we agree to this provision, we wish to remind local authorities that where gravel is available in close proximity to the areas they are improving they should be aware of their responsibility to look after the interests of the ratepayers instead of merely viewing the situation from the point of view that gravel is easily accessible at one particular spot. I make this point because I think that although local authorities in general are prepared to look after their ratepayers,

they should be made aware of their responsibilities and should obtain gravel from sites which are closely related to the roads they are making.

Several other points were made with reference to the amendments. Those speakers who have reminded the House that some of the amendments are perhaps a little trivial and could have been left until a later date should be acquainted with the facts. I remind the House that these amendments have been considered by the various local authority associations, and I understand a considerable amount of discussion and debate took place before the amendments were recommended to the Minister.

Mr. Toms: Not all of them were recommended.

Mr. NALDER: This is the information that has been given to me by the Minister for Local Government. Even in a case such as this we have to be prepared to accept the recommendations that come forward from these responsible people. I think every member of this House recognises the value of the work performed by any local authority. I do not think that in any instance we can deprecate the importance of the work done by these responsible people who, as we all know, without any recompense for their labours, volunteer to look after the interests of the ratepayers in the areas they represent.

Mr. Toms: You do not think I would be one to do that, do you?

Mr. NALDER: No, I am not pointing the finger at the honourable member. I do not think anyone would say anything derogatory about local authorities or deny that they are all doing a wonderful job throughout the State. I know that Governments in the past have endeavoured to assist them in every way, and we should continue to do so. We should assist and offer advice to them and be eager to amend the Local Government Act when the Minister is approached by them to do so.

Mr. Toms: As long as you know when to defer.

Mr. NALDER: There are quite a number of amendments which, because they can probably be dealt with by a little common sense, will never see the light of day, in spite of the fact that they have been recommended by local authorities, and even though at the time they were suggested there appeared to be great problems.

The Minister will be informed of the comments that have been made by members, and I assure them that the amendments to the Act that are brought forward from time to time are designed to assist local authorities to carry out the work they endeavour to do on behalf of the ratepayers in their various districts.

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.

House adjourned at 9.41 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 2nd October, 1968

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (13): ON NOTICE

LAND FOR HIGH SCHOOL

Gosnells

1. The Hon. J. DOLAN asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Has the Government recently acquired an area of land in the Shire of Gosnells as a site for a future high school?

(2) If so, what is the location of the site?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) Acquisition has not been finalised but negotiations are proceeding.

(2) The proposed site is in Ovens Road, Thornlie.

ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

Allocations to Local Authorities

2. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Is the statement contained in the August-September, 1968 issue of the *Transporter*, the official journal of the Western Australian Road Transport Association relating to details of allocations made to local authorities from revenue received from road tax for the 1967-68 year, correct?

(2) If so—

(a) from where was this information obtained;

(b) if the information was supplied by a Government department or instrumentality, which department did so; and

(c) how were the allocations paid to the local authorities?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) No. Since this statement was prepared, two minor errors have been uncovered. The allocation to the Mundaring Shire Council should read \$2,230, not \$2,890, and the allocation to the Swan-Guildford Shire Council should read \$1,980, not \$2,640.