area. I should like to refer to an article which appeared in the Press on the 16th May, 1961. Under the heading, "Mayor is Critical of Gaol" the following is reported:—

> Mayor W. F. Samson, who visited the Fremantle gaol on Sunday, said at the Fremantle Council meeting last night that there appeared to be an acute shortage of work for prisoners in most departments.
>
> Some were watering reticulated lawns with watering cans while others stood and watched.
>
> It was stupid that inmates should be forced to carry out non-productive tasks. There should be a more modern type of corrective institution, such as a prison farm.
>
> After conversion, the gaol could be developed into a civic centre unsurpassed in Australia.
>
> The main building, 100 yards off the road, with additions could make an ideal town hall, he said afterwards.

With the earlier part of that article I entirely agree. Mr. Ron Thompson in another place had something to say on this subject, and I fully agree with his remarks. The Minister, in commenting on Mr. Thompson's remarks, said that they were overdone. I visited the gaol with Mr. Thompson, the member for South Fremantle, and His Worship the Mayor; and as I said, I fully agree with the remarks Mr. Thompson made in another place.

The point is that the inmates of the gaol are crowded into a very limited space, and in my view a new gaol should and could be built. It was said that I was speaking contrary to the policy of the party to which I belong, but I believe that the inmates of the gaol could assist in the building of a new gaol under the supervision—and I emphasise this—of skilled tradesmen. After visiting the gaol I would say that there is no hard labour now. The inmates are getting around like a lot of listless malcontents, and if the gaol could be shifted to a market-garden area it could become self-supporting, and the inmates would have a healthy occupation.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Would you put it in Coogee?

Mr. FLETCHER: The Minister is asking me to commit myself and offend others. I will say this: I would like to see it built in a market-garden area other than Coogee. Sex offenders, youths, and all types of people are crowded in together at the gaol. There is no proper segregation, and something should be done to overcome the problem as quickly as possible. A new gaol should be built elsewhere. The gaol officers are doing splendid work under very difficult and primitive conditions, and they are just as conscious of the gaol's shortcomings as the Minister, and members who represent that area.

Mr. Grayden: What were you saying about putting it in the Melville area?

Mr. FLETCHER: If a gaol were built in some other area, such as I have suggested, a great deal more could be done for the inmates than is possible under existing conditions. There should be more Pardelups and more segregation. The Minister recently said that he intends to introduce a parole system; but, irrespective of whether that is done or not, I believe a new gaol in a new area is vitally necessary.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Owen.

House adjourned at 10.16 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 30th August, 1961

CONTENTS

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

QUESTION ON NOTICE

VERMIN CONTROL OFFICER AT KALGOORLIE

Name of Appointee

The Hon. J. D. TEAHAN asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Has an appointment yet been made to fill the advertised vacant position of Regional Vermin Control Officer (Kalgoorlie)?

(2) If so, what is the name of the appointee?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) George Charles Owens.

COAL MINERS' WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 29th August.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (West) [4.33 p.m.]: As the Minister explained when introducing this Bill last night, it is purely a machinery measure for the purpose of changing something that should have been changed many years ago. I cannot see anything wrong with the principle of putting something in order. There are many of our Acts which contain anomalies and they should be put in order as they are brought to the fore. I support the second reading.

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.

DIVIDING FENCES BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 29th August.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [4.37 p.m.]: The Minister, in introducing this Bill with, I think, considerable clarity as to its specific provisions and with sufficient detail to give us the necessary clues as to its main objectives, mentioned that it is one which should be supported by city and country dwellers alike. From the somewhat cursory study that one could give such a Bill of 17 pages from the time it was introduced yesterday until now, I would say that its objectives are certainly most laudable in the endeavour to clear up what have been most anomalous circumstances for very many years.

The Cattle Trespass, Fencing, and Impounding Act has created difficulties in regard to suburban blocks and pastoral leases because under the fencing provisions of that Act there is no description of what constitutes a sufficient fence as it would apply to neighbours in suburban allotments, to farmers, or to anyone else.

The Minister, in the course of his speech, mentioned that some of the provisions of this Bill were lifted from the New South Wales Act; and through the courtesy of the clerk of this House I was able to obtain, at short notice, the consolidated statutes of New South Wales, which include the Act from which many of the provisions of this Bill have been lifted—and I think they are lifted from a context which suits the circumstances of any State.

A brief analysis suggests that the provisions are, to a very large degree, applicable to the circumstances of this State. Without in any way being finnicky on the subject, I would suggest this to the Minister: that it would be most helpful to members in a case such as this if the marginal note showed—particularly when a complete statute has been presented to Parliament and will become law—just where the provisions came from; because the speeches of Parliament will be of no matter or concern to anyone referring to the statute when it becomes law. For example, a marginal note alongside clause 16 of this Bill—which is lifted in its entirety from the New South Wales legislation—showing it has come from section 15 of the New South Wales Act would be very helpful, I suggest, in the years to come. It is a very minor matter, but, I consider, a very important one in referring to subjects of this kind after a Bill has become law.

The circumstances of today cannot in any way be said to be satisfactory in regard to dividing fences between owners of land, rural or urban. There is the prospect of far too much contention. All neighbours are not equable people, or friendly coves. Some are very difficult whether they are over the back fence, on the side fence; or whether they are across the road. They are very difficult to get on with; so difficult, that some people almost have to look in the mirror to see whether they are the offending persons at times

So it is necessary, in a law of this kind, to have the sort of provisions that are made in this Bill. If amicable relations cannot be obtained, and if there cannot be an agreement on what sort of fence to provide, then the local governing body has prescribed the type of fence for that locality; and if there cannot be anything but disputation, the courts can decide the matter. That is a much more satisfactory approach than in available to us today.

There are some things to which I would like to draw attention: matters which, I think, will require a lot of thought before the relevant clauses pass the Committee stage.

For example, this Bill takes in all lands and all property, and relates the same responsibility of contributing the share of the cost to adjoining owners. This could apply to vast areas of country. I refer to line 12 and onwards on page 4 of the Bill—the definition clause—which were lifted partly from the New South Wales Act. There could be 100 miles of fencing along a single boundary of one property abutting on five or six properties on the other side of the fence; the one side being held by a very wealthy company, but the other side held by half a dozen people battling with not much means. However they may be anxious to contribute, but financially are unable to do so.

Members will find, if they turn to clause 13 of this Bill, that such a person would have a very definite responsibility in being

able to have a charge raised against him —a payment made against him—and to be sued for his share of the cost.

I would like more time to have a look at this clause, and the impact that could occur on long boundaries and long frontages where different sorts of interests have a common boundary.

Then, the relevant clauses of the Bill provide for renewing of fences; and we can anticipate the sort of proposition in the metropolitan area where, say, 20 years ago a person built for himself in an isolated area, a nice home costing, say, £1,800 to £2,000. I repeat, a nice home, with a brick fence in front, fronting the road; and side fences and the back fence of pickets—which were the only standard fences in those days.

Subsequently, neighbours arrived and built nice homes. The person concerned may be a generous sort of a person and might not ask anybody to contribute to the cost of the original fence. But as the years go by, different fences become the rule in different suburbs, and the picket fences are wholly unsuitable, whether from the aesthetic or the utilitarian point of view; and the original owner may wish to remove the picket fences. But he could, quite possibly, have an unpleasant sort of neighbour who would not agree at all to the sort of fence he wishes to put up and which would suit the circumstances of today's structures. As this Bill provides for the local governing body to ascribe the sort of fence appropriate in the circumstances, the support could be against the sort of person who should have consideration.

I know of one or two cases at the moment where great difficulty is likely to occur when the renewal of a fence must be faced by joint owners. There could be, as this law will provide, litigation unless there is great clarity on what a local governing body decision could mean, and how far-reaching it could be; because it would be far better if we could specify in the law—more clearly than this, I think, does prescribe at the moment—what one person may reasonably expect of another.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: We are not here to generate litigation.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: That is right. I think we are here to make our laws quite clear; and I think that is the intention of the Minister. The Minister raised that point in his speech last night. He is not advocating that the aggrieved person seek recourse to the law. He mentioned that the cost to go to court might be 10s. if the persons concerned could avoid the use of legal help. I remember the Minister saying that. Therefore, we should, I think, make it as clear as we can that this sort of thing—in the metropolitan area; in the farming areas; and in the wide open spaces—should be, as much as possible, settled without recourse to the law, if we can so specify.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: What does the Act say now with regard to fences?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It says "reasonable." This Bill ties the classes of fencing into the Local Government Act; namely, paragraph (e) of section 210 of that Act, and the authority of the council to make by-laws in that connection. That paragraph is very clear, even to the extent that the local governing body can prescribe different sorts of fences, or classes of fences, for various parts of a district. The Act is quite explicit on that.

Local governing bodies have very wide authority. But I think we also have a responsibility to try to put ourselves, as legislators, in the position in which suburban residents might find themselves under the varying conditions, some of which I have endeavoured to illustrate, so that when we get to those clauses which involve either new fences, renewals of fences, or repairs—which may mean renewals—we must be quite sure that we are not imposing a burden on a person willing and anxious reasonably to meet a circumstance but who is prevented from doing so by some unpleasant sort of person.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: What do you think of the provision about the Act not binding the Crown?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I am a bit concerned about that. I looked for it immediately the Bill was introduced, and an early clause—clause 4—states that the Crown is not bound. If we tie that in with a subsequent clause which refers to the duration of leases, under which a person shall be obliged to contribute half the cost of a fence as between owners, provided the lease has more than five years to run, it could impose a hardship because the person concerned could be a lessee of the Crown. If it were a short-term lease, the lessee could be responsible for the whole of the cost of the fencing if he wished effectively to use the country.

There could be other illustrations of hardship, too, but I do not imagine that the intention of the Crown would be a harsh one where short-term leases were concerned. However, where the Crown is an adjoining owner, say of a reserve, I think some provision could possibly be entertained, or looked at by the Minister; because as the Bill now stands, a person with a long road frontage in the country, a road running along the side of his property, and a reserve at the back, would have a very big expense in fencing three sides with no possible recourse to a claim from an adjoining neighbour, the local governing body, or the Crown. I realise it is difficult to impose a charge on the Crown in the fencing of reserves which the Crown would normally leave unfenced, and where the proper use and

development of land adjoining Crown lands necessitates fencing. I think there is a point worth looking at in that regard.

As I said initially, I think there is much merit in the Bill. I think its objectives are excellent, especially when we think of the law as it obtains today in so far as boundary fences are concerned. I have no intention of holding it up, but I would like to have an opportunity to discuss some of the provisions in the Bill with people who are affected by it, so that questions can be raised in Committee as to the validity of some of the points I have raised. I support the measure.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. N. E. Baxter.

MOTOR VEHICLE (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 29th August.

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [4.55 p.m.]: This is a very short Bill which is confined to amendments to section 31 of the principal Act. As the Minister explained last night, section 31 is that section which provides for the appointment of a committee known as the premiums committee. The Minister also explained that the functions of this committee have been more or less of a negative character; they have been confined to that role by the limitations on the appointment of members, and it is now proposed to give those members wider powers to enable them to make a more positive contribution in respect of what are reasonable premiums to be charged. The amendment also makes it clear that they are to report to the Minister, their role in that respect at present being somewhat ambiguous.

Another amendment alters the present constitution of the committee. At the moment the Auditor-General is chairman, but this Bill proposes to replace him with a practising chartered accountant, the reason being, as I understand it, that the Auditor-General is an extremely busy man and the work of the committee is such that if its chairman is a chartered accountant he should be able to make a useful contribution towards the fixation of premiums and all the matters that have to be considered in connection with that aspect. It will be appreciated therefore that the Bill is a very short one, and I think its provisions are such that we can all agree with them. I propose to give the Bill my support.

However, while I am speaking to the measure I intend to make a few comments in respect to the principal Act. I am a little disappointed that the Government has not seen fit to make some over-all changes to the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act, because I think the time is now ripe to give it a fairly comprehensive review. It is an Act of Parliament which in importance, nowadays, almost equal the Workers' Compensation Act. As we know a very large section of the community drive motorcars, and the risk of accident on the highways seems to be increasing all the time. The consequences of legislation such as this, therefore, are very far reaching for the general community.

Although I have the greatest respect for the way in which this Act has been administered by the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust, I think the Act does fall short in many respects. For instance, I think it is not generally realised that the liability of the trust in regard to a passenger in a vehicle is limited to £2,000. The position therefore is that a passenger can be driving in a motorcar and meet with a very serious accident through the negligence of the driver; and all he can recover from the Motor Vehicle Trust is £2,000.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He could insure himself, of course.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Yes; of course he could insure himself. In the case I have mentioned, the driver could possibly be a man of straw; and the passenger might be an invalid for the rest of his life. He might also have very large medical and hospital bills to meet, and all he could be sure of recovering would be £2,000.

I think the time has arrived when we will have to revise that state of affairs; because I personally have had a number of instances brought to my notice where great hardship has ensued, and where nothing could be done about it because of the way things stand at the moment. I think that position is not generally realised until some person finds himself in the unfortunate position to which I have referred. Accordingly I hope we will revise that aspect and make some more generous provision.

Another shortcoming in the law as now exists applies to the position of a spouse. If a husband is driving a motor vehicle, and he has his wife as a passenger and she is seriously injured in an accident which is the result of his negligence, she cannot recover anything from him; and *vice versa*, if a man is travelling in a motorcar with his wife, and the wife through her negligence, meets with an accident, the husband cannot recover anything from her, or from the trust. If, for instance, one is a passenger with some one else, one can recover £2,000 in the case of accident; but the common law provides that the spouse cannot recover anything in either instance. That also is a state of affairs which, I think, needs correction.

These are a couple of matters which occurred to me and which, I think, should have occurred to the Government when it was considering amendments to this important piece of legislation, which affects the lives and wellbeing of almost everyone

these days. I hope, therefore, that the Minister will pass on my views and see whether we cannot do something about the matter. Meanwhile I am pleased to support the Bill before us.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [5.5 p.m.]: There is only one point I wish to raise with the Minister. I think he said last night, or possibly he referred to it by interjection, that the committee shall consist of six, the first of whom shall be a chartered accountant. Can the Minister say whether he will be a person outside of the Government?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Yes.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Thank you.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [5.6 p.m.]: I would like briefly to refer to the point raised by Mr. Heenan with regard to the recovery of only £2,000. Today, whilst many of us are motorists in the sense that we are drivers of vehicles, and therefore responsible for the payment of insurance, we are, all of us, sometimes passengers. We fill the dual role daily.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Some of us are like that in life, are we not?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is so. It behoves us, therefore, to insure against that risk ourselves. In the general sense of the term, as drivers, we insure against the risks we run. We insure our vehicles, and we must by law take out third party insurance to cover our responsibility as drivers.

But, I repeat, as we have now become, almost daily, passengers in vehicles, then if the risk is as great as Mr. Heenan says it is—and I think it is—it behoves us to insure ourselves against that risk; that is, when we accept a lift from a kind-hearted neighbour or, as often happens here, a fellow member. Obviously if Mr. Heenan's suggestion is followed to the end it will result in the driver having to pay more. That follows as night follows day.

In actual fact it could be argued that the £2,000 referred to represents the limit of the real responsibility of a driver when he says, "Do you want a lift?" in a kind-hearted well-meaning way. If he does it out of pecuniary gain, that, of course, is a different matter. Therefore we are only loading on to the man who owns and drives the vehicle our personal responsibility if we do not take out insurance cover for risks which we are prepared to accept when we are given a lift.

I think we should be extremely careful about that aspect; remembering, of course, that all sorts of people own motorcars. The owning of motorcars is not limited to the wealthy or the privileged—today all sorts of people own cars—and we do not want to make this matter so costly that we would automatically limit those who could own a car; because it is most desirable that all sorts of people should own cars.

It would spread the costs more evenly if the Bill were left as it is in the sense referred to by Mr. Heenan; and if a person wishes to cover himself against the risks mentioned, in excess of £2,000, he can take out his own insurance cover for that purpose. I would like to present those views *contra* to the view put forward by Mr. Heenan on the point raised.

THE HON. G. BENNETTS (South-East) [5.10 p.m.]: I wonder whether third party insurance premiums would be raised if we did extend extra payments to injured persons? So far as my own case is concerned, I have insured my car with the State Insurance Office and have paid an extra 10s. which covers my wife in the event of an accident. I do not know to what extent it does cover her; but I do think that people could, perhaps, contribute a little towards their own insurance, because if the payments are made too high for third party insurance it would be a further burden on the careful driver.

I see that in the country areas—in Kalgoorlie, Boulder, and Norseman particularly—matters have been tightened up in relation to the licensing of cars, to the extent that many of the vehicles are now thoroughly overhauled after an inspection. This is carried out very rigidly. I had my own new car tested recently. In the case of my trailer which, five years or so ago did not need a tail light—reflectors were good enough then—it is now compulsory to fix tail lights, and so on.

This high standard of efficiency which is required does ensure greater care on the roads. But the people in the goldfields area are a bit perturbed about the rate they have to pay for third party insurance, as compared with people in the metropolitan area; particularly as they consider that there are a greater number of cars in the metropolitan area where the accident rate is also higher. I think the Minister said, when I interjectd, that there were more accidents in the country.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I said the number was about the same.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: Of course that would be spread all over the country areas; it would not be confined to the goldfields area alone. It might relate to Bunbury and Albany which are more built up, and where the traffic is greater as compared with that on the goldfields. I hope the Minister will look at the point I have raised and see whether something cannot be done for the people of the goldfields about lessening their payments for third party insurance.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [5.13 p.m.]: Naturally a Bill such as this, which deals with third party insurance, will always be subject to discussion. I would like to inform Mr. Heenan that I have not been altogether asleep on the job. I obtained a copy of Dr. Coppel's report from Victoria. He was directed by the Government of Victoria to report on third party insurance. I have also gone to the trouble myself of getting a report from the manager of the trust in this State on the following headings:—

Spouse v. Spouse.

Raising or abolishing present passenger limit.

That is one that was mentioned. The next are—

Limitation of trust's liability.

Maximum limits for certain types of injuries.

Separate premiums for town and country vehicles.

That was mentioned by Mr. Bennetts. The others are—

Loading of premium or driver's license of persons convicted of traffic offences resulting in accidents.

No claim bonuses.

That is one Mr. Jones generally talks about. To continue—

Legal fees.

Pension scheme in lieu of general damages.

Independent tribunal or permanent judge to hear all cases.

Progress payments.

Delays in payment.

Premiums to be paid with driver's license and not on vehicle license.

Now I think that Mr. Heenan will appreciate that I have been doing some research into this matter, but unfortunately I have not had time—and that is perfectly honest—to try to put any of these thoughts into an amendment to the Act. Any attempt to make alterations in the payments must of course necessitate increased premiums. That is obvious.

I have had many requests in regard to spouse v. spouse; and the Royal Automobile Club has hammered me more than anyone else. South Australia amended its legislation about 18 months to two years ago to allow a provision for spouse v. spouse, and I have been waiting to find out what the situation there is as a result. The last report I had when I was over there recently was—and the report of the premiums committee was the same—that because of the spouse v. spouse alteration of the Act, the premiums were altered quite considerably. Naturally if the limit is to be raised from £2,000 individual and £20,000 maximum, the premiums will also have to be raised.

The trust is working on a pretty fine margin. As I said last night, it did make a profit this year as a result of the increased premiums last year, but the chairman says the premiums are still not high enough. Therefore, whatever we do to allow for increased payments must mean an increase in the premiums. I know that in this House last year quite a few members did not like the idea of an increased premium.

I think we must take into consideration that the insurance companies which originally came into this scheme were to get 5 per cent. profit on the amount of premiums paid, but up to date they have not had one penny. I am concerned that the heads of these insurance companies, some of which are in the Eastern States and some in London, may eventually decide to pull out. As a matter of fact they have already issued the threat to me that unless they get something out of this they are not going to stay in it. I have stood up to this threat up to date because I feel they came into it with their eyes open.

However, it has been a wonderful scheme for the benefit of the injured people; and I would not like to see these companies withdraw, because we could eventually find ourselves in the position where our own State Insurance Office would have to carry the whole baby. The experience in New South Wales, particularly, where they have had to carry the whole of this amount has been that millions of pounds have been lost over the last few years despite the fact that the premiums there are twice as high as they are here. Therefore it is essential when we do consider these points of view that we make sure we are not loading the motorist with a premium that is unrealistic and one that will eventually force the insurance companies out of the trust.

It is fortunate that we are able to keep our premiums reasonably low. The thought about putting the added amount on to the driver's license and not on to the vehicle license is one which has merit, because there are more drivers' licenses issued than there are vehicle licenses. Therefore it would be competent to say that some of the drivers of vehicles have not contributed anything to the scheme at all. If a person with a driver's license is driving someone else's car and is involved in an accident, it is the car which carries the cost and not the driver. Therefore there is a possibility that some surcharge may be made if premiums have to go up again, and it might be better if we do it that way than by putting it on the car.

Those are some of the thoughts I have in mind at the moment. In regard to payments, I think that matter is fairly well under control. I had a conference in my office with the Medical Department and the trust over hospital payments. These payments were held up for some

time because of disagreement, but we were able to come to an agreement; and from that day to this all the outstanding claims have been paid.

Naturally the trust cannot pay out unless a claim has been specified in court; and some of these cases take four or five years before they get into the court. For instance the case of the Clontarf boys has not been completed, and those hospital bills have to wait until liability has been established. I do not know how that problem can be overcome, if at all. However the ordinary day-to-day accident hospital accounts have all been brought up to date.

I thank members for their contributions to this debate. Irrespective of who is the Minister handling this matter next year, these papers will be made available. If I am still here I will endeavour to see—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You have no doubts about it, have you?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I have no doubts, but I think other members might and I like to be fair in these things.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: There are only two certainties—death and the Taxation Department.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes; they both catch up with us. I assure members that I will continue my studies on this matter, and if I think it is advisable I will suggest amendments to the Act.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2: Section 31 amended—

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: Under this clause one of the members of the committee of six shall be the General Manager of the State Government Insurance Office. It seems out of balance to me that although the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association in Western Australia is comprised of approximately 150 insurance companies it has only one representative the same as has the State Insurance Office.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The insurance companies discussed this with me and they are quite happy about the set-up. It is not as much out of balance as the honourable member thinks, because at the moment about 35 per cent. of the business being transacted is through the State office. Therefore when it is worked out it will be realised that the quota is pretty right. The manager of the State Insurance Office was on the previous committee, and I did not want to upset that arrangement either.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I was very pleased to hear the Minister say that arrangements have now been made to meet contingent accounts with hospitals and doctors. Last year the Minister and I crossed swords once or twice because he misunderstood me when I tried to force this issue.

In regard to raising funds towards the cost of these accidents, I believe that the fines being imposed for negligent driving resulting in accidents should be allotted to the trust in order to helping alleviate some of the costs. I believe, as does Mr. Hall, that the fines imposed for speeding and such like should be allocated to the Traffic Department for revenue, but not the fines imposed for negligent driving resulting in accidents.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

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

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 12th September.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.29 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 30th August, 1961

CONTENTS