

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 17th September, 1959

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :	
Lotteries Commission, salary of secretary and assistant-secretary	1671
Government instrumentalities, fees payable to, and meetings of boards	1671
Superannuation, recipients and amounts paid	1672
BILLS :	
Nurses Registration Act Amendment, 3r	1672
Main Roads Act (Funds Appropriation) Act Amendment, 3r.	1672
State Electricity Commission Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r.	1672
Industrial Development (Kwinana Area) Act Amendment—	
2r.	1673
Com., report	1676
Noxious Weeds Act Amendment, 2r.	1676
Interstate Maintenance Recovery, 2r.	1677
Tourist, 2r.	1681
ADJOURNMENT	1689

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (the Hon. W. R. Hall) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

LOTTERIES COMMISSION

Salary of Secretary and Assistant-Secretary

1. The Hon. A. L. LOTON asked the Minister for Mines:

Will the Minister inform the House the salary payable to—

- (a) The secretary; and
- (b) The assistant-secretary, of the Lotteries Commission?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (a) Salary range, £2,178-£2,228.
- (b) Salary range, £1,488-£1,533.

GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES

Fees Payable to, and Meetings of Boards

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

What are the fees paid per sitting, or annually, to the following:—

- (1) (a) Chairman, Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust;
- (b) Member, Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust?
- (2) (a) Chairman, State Electricity Commission;
- (b) Member, State Electricity Commission?

- (3) (a) Chairman, Midland Junction Abattoir Board;

- (b) Member, Midland Junction Abattoir Board?

- (4) (a) Chairman, Robb Jetty Committee of Management?

- (b) Member, Robb Jetty Committee of Management?

- (5) How often and for what periods do the above organisations meet?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) (a) (i) Chairman (full-time), £4,000 per annum.

- (ii) Deputy Chairman (full-time), £3,000 per annum.

- (b) Member (part-time), £1,000 per annum for first two years and £500 per annum for the remainder of the five-year period.

- (2) (a) Chairman, £500 per annum.

- (b) Engineering representatives (3), £250 per annum each.

Consumers' representatives (3), £200 per annum each.

Employees' representative, £200 per annum.

- (3) (a) Chairman, £6 6s. per sitting. Annual limit, £350.

- (b) Members, £4 4s. per sitting. Annual limit, £150.

- (4) (a) and (b). There is no appointed committee of management. The general manager is responsible to the Minister through the Director of Agriculture.

- (5) (a) The Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust meets regularly on one half-day each week, and has numerous special meetings and conferences of varying duration.

- (b) State Electricity Commission: Approximately 24 regular meetings per year and occasional special meetings. Meetings last until such time as business is concluded.

- (c) Midland Junction Abattoir Board: Meets fortnightly for one day.
 (d) Robb Jetty Committee of Management: See answer to No. (4).

SUPERANNUATION

Recipients and Amounts Paid

3. The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) For each of the last five financial years, will the Minister advise—
- the total number of recipients of pensions payable pursuant to the provisions of the Superannuation Act, 1871-1958;
 - the aggregate amount paid pursuant to this Act?
- (2) What is—
- the highest individual amount; and
 - the lowest individual amount paid per annum to any recipient pursuant to the abovementioned Act?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) (a) Year ended 30th June—

	No. of Pensioners	Total amount paid each year
1955	358	173,805
1956	323	166,244
1957	294	154,195
1958	270	148,881
1959	243	142,756
		<hr/> £785,881 <hr/>

(b) See (a).

(2) Present highest pension per annum is £1,352.

Present lowest pension per annum is £169.

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [2.36]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

THE HON. L. C. DIVER (Central) [2.37]: I take this opportunity of making a suggestion to the Minister, following his statement regarding the legality of the payment of an annual registration fee. It is conceded that that is prescribed in the Act, but it has been suggested to me by married women holding nursing certificates that it is highly desirable for the department to send out notices every two years

to registered nurses to draw their attention to the need for renewing their registration. In many instances the failure on the part of nurses to re-register has been occasioned by oversight.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government—in reply) [2.38]: I do not know what does happen on occasions, but I am aware that in some instances notification is sent out. I have two daughters who are nurses, one of whom received notification that the registration fee was due. If that happens in one case, then it should happen in all others.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Is this a material factor?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I agree it is not. I raised that point when I said that under the Nurses Registration Act all nurses had to be registered, and that if they failed to renew their registration every two years they would be taken off the register. I was drawing a comparison between what the nurses had to do, as distinct from what the mental nurses had to do. I think it is wrong in principle to make registration automatic. The nurses will appreciate their profession more if they have to apply for renewal of their registration.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with an amendment.

MAIN ROADS ACT (FUNDS APPROPRIATION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [2.41] in moving the second reading said: Careful consideration was given by my colleague, the Minister for Electricity, to the proposition in this Bill before he decided to recommend to the Government that it be submitted to Parliament. The proposal is to add to the State Electricity Commission a further representative of those consumers of electricity who live outside the metropolitan area.

At present, the commission—which is appointed by the Governor—is composed of eight members, one of whom is the chairman. Two members are nominated by the Minister to represent the consumers—one for the metropolitan area, and one for the remainder of the State. One member is representative of the commercial consumers. This member is one of a panel of three names submitted to the Minister by the Western Australian

Chamber of Manufactures and the Perth Chamber of Commerce. Another member represents the employees of the commission. The Minister selects him from a panel of three names submitted by the Western Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party. The Under Treasurer, or his deputy, is an *ex officio* member, and the three remaining members must be corporate members of either the Institution of Electrical Engineers, London; or the Institution of Engineers, Australia.

The move to have another representative of the country consumers added to the Commission came from the Road Board Association and other bodies connected with the rural areas. The argument in favour of this additional country representative was based on the fact that the power lines of the commission are steadily moving into previously unserved country areas.

When the present country representative was appointed to the commission, power was being supplied only to the South-West area of the State. I am advised that those who are seeking this amendment appreciate that this member has carried out his duties in a manner that could not be excelled. However, now that the commission's power lines are spreading into the Great Southern district, along the Eastern Goldfields line, and to other districts, country spokesmen have asked that another country representative be added to the commission.

The Minister for Electricity, himself representing a country Parliamentary district, has told me that at first he wondered whether another country member was required on the commission. However, the country arguments were strong enough for him to decide that the proposal merited its submission to Parliament. The Minister was told that the present country member was originally appointed to represent the South-West of the State where, of course, the commission commenced its country programme. It was felt that now the commission's activities had moved into areas far distant from the South-West—and will continue to spread—those areas should have their own representative on the commission.

It is proposed that, if this Bill is agreed to by Parliament, it shall, as an Act, come into operation on a date to be proclaimed. This is to give adequate time in which to appoint the most suitable person available to the commission. Members will note that the new member, as does the present country member, will represent all country consumers; not those from any particular district. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (KWINANA AREA) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [2.46] in moving the second reading said: This Bill contains only two provisions. The first one seeks to appoint the chief executive officer of the Department of Industrial Development to the advisory committee constituted under the principal Act. At present this committee consists of four members—the Surveyor-General, the Director of Industrial Development, a member of the Town Planning Board, and a representative of the Chamber of Manufactures. As the position of Director of Industrial Development has been abolished, it is proposed to amend the Act so that the chief executive officer can be appointed to the committee in place of the director.

The second amendment, which is of importance, provides for bringing under the principal Act an area of land that was acquired by the State from the Commonwealth in 1954. When the Kwinana refinery agreement was signed, there arose a threat of rapid inflation of land values within some miles of the refinery site. In order to combat this threat, the principal Act was agreed to by Parliament in 1952. Among other things, the Act fixed the price of land over a large area for a period of time, and gave the Government wide powers of resumption and usage of the resumed land. Included in the area defined in the Act was a considerable amount of land then owned by the Commonwealth Government, and this was expressly excluded from the provisions of the Act.

In 1954, after lengthy negotiations, this land was purchased by the State. It was then placed under the Land Act, but not under the principal Act. There is no doubt that the Land Act is not a suitable measure under which to handle land of this kind, which is intended for the very definite purpose of industrial development in the Kwinana area.

The land under discussion comprised 2,478 acres, and the price at which it was transferred to the State was the very favourable one of £50,000, the object of the acquisition being to enable the State to utilise the area for industrial and other purposes.

In 1955, the Lands Department created a number of reserves on a section of this land between the Old Rockingham road—or the Naval Base Road—the Rockingham Road south of its junction with the old road, and the ocean. These reserves were established for the purpose of recreation, parking, campsites, and public utility. This leaves an effective area of approximately 1,880 acres to be brought under the principal Act.

In order to assist members to understand my remarks, I have arranged for two maps to be placed on the table of the House. One map shows the total area under discussion in respect to the land purchased from the Commonwealth, and the other sets out in detail the reserves that have been set aside by the Lands Department.

From these maps, members will be able to appreciate more readily the significance of the second schedule, and will be able to observe the exact areas that the Government proposes shall be incorporated within the principal Act. Members will also be able to see the orientation of the area in relation to established industries such as the B.H.P. rolling mill and the Kwinana refinery.

The transfer of this area from the Land Act to the principal Act is very important; because, without it, the Government cannot progress with the development of the Kwinana area in accordance with the original concept. Members may be aware of the concern being expressed by residents and others at Medina. The problem that confronts that settlement is the need for a more diversified and greatly increased amount of industry. If this does not eventuate, it will be increasingly difficult for children of residents to obtain employment within reasonable proximity of the town-site.

If the industrial development at Kwinana is to remain at its present level, the township of Medina will not have very bright prospects. I am sure that all members are desirous that the township of Medina and other townsites in that area should develop to such an extent that they can take their rightful place, as originally conceived, in the overall development of the metropolitan region. At present there is a demand for more employment and more opportunities for young men and women. The industries at present developed in the area do provide a certain amount of employment for young persons launching on a career; but there is not a great prospect of employment for female labour, which is essential if we are to have a well-balanced employment opportunity for a community such as we hope to develop in Medina.

Therefore, it is important that the Government have at its disposal this land from the Commonwealth Government, which was originally intended to be part of the overall industrial development of the Kwinana area. It follows that if industry can be attracted to the Kwinana area, the township of Medina will grow and prosper. This would then justify the establishment of better educational and hospital facilities, improved transport, more amenities, and other vital things in the well-being of a community.

That is the objective of the Government; and we want to achieve it as quickly as we can. We have some industry in prospect for the area; but it is not practicable

to negotiate satisfactorily, unless we have the land I have referred to brought within the ambit of the principal Act.

In closing, I would remind members that the advisory committee I referred to, when introducing the Bill, has very definite powers. Section 6 of the principal Act provides that any land brought under the provisions of the Act may be reserved, used, developed, leased, sold or disposed of by the Minister on such terms and conditions as he thinks fit; provided that any action of this nature is first approved by the advisory committee. The committee can recommend an alternative proposition to the Minister in connection with any specific case, but the Minister is not compelled to accept the alternative. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [2.55]: I examined this Bill carefully, after hearing of its introduction in another place, and scrutinised the plans to which the Minister referred when introducing the measure. This rather considerable area of land, which is at present held under the Land Act, and which was acquired from the Commonwealth, appears to be more suitably assigned to Crown use—if it is placed under the parent Act of this Bill.

The areas which are excised from the operation of the parent Act and of this Bill, and which are Class C reserves which have been set aside for recreation purposes, have been taken out of the total area formerly acquired; but with the addition of the land already controlled under the Industrial Development (Kwinana Area) Act, they will make a very sizable area which, without disclosing the Government's intentions, would give to any Government tremendous scope and opportunity, if its use is properly placed.

The Minister has given us no hint at all as to what may be the use to which the land will be put. He has suggested that the Government has ideas, and needs to have this matter finalised because of certain things which are developing. I have assumed that from the remarks the Minister made when introducing the Bill. In a general sense, therefore, the whole of the area surrounding the land, the subject of this Bill, has already been acquired by the Crown—indeed it took in an area on which I recall laying a foundation stone for an institution for crippled children—to give to the Kwinana industry, as now established, a very big area of land. I am one who would hope that something could be done to give to Medina that fillip which it must get if it is to survive as a town; otherwise it will just pass from its present stage, without any transition to anything larger.

If the Government has some real opportunity in view, as hinted by the Minister, I think we are entitled to know a little

more about that. In principle, and in general, I have no objection to the Bill. I think those of us who are under the Leader of the Opposition in this House, would have no objection to it; nor can we have any objection to the change in personnel, because of the abolition of the position of Director of Industrial Development. That follows as a sequence of events. I hope, therefore, that the Minister can, when he replies to the debate, give us a little more information as to the objectives of the Government; but in the meantime I support the Bill.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North) [2.58]: While I will not oppose the Bill, I would like an assurance from the Minister that we are not again going to see miles of beaches taken away from public use, as happened in 1952. We all remember the acquisition in 1952, by the McLarty-Watts Government, of extensive areas of land for the oil refinery—followed later of course by Broken Hill Pty. Ltd.—and those of us who are conversant with that area know the effect which the resumptions had upon land values at Kwinana itself.

Whilst the then Government—in 1952—very wisely, I think, placed a blanket over many hundreds of thousands of acres of land in that area, with the object of preventing speculation and inflated land prices, it forgot to provide for the owners of land that depreciated in value.

Anybody travelling south along the Rockingham Road to Rockingham will witness a number of empty houses on the eastern side of the road, because the beach has been taken away from them. Some of those areas had lost their beach frontages. Those houses were built there by somebody and were let as beach cottages during the summer holiday season. When the beach was fenced off they, of course, lost their value. They were in effect removed some half mile from the beach; where previously they were only 100 yards from the beach.

So there is an area of land between the Rockingham Road and the Mandurah Road which depreciated considerably on its 1952 values. The depreciation was substantial; and it has remained so. Accordingly I hope the Government is not going to deprive any more of the residents living around the Naval Base area of their beach frontages. The idea is to have all this land as an industrial area and then leave it entirely to the Minister's discretion to dispose of at any figure and under any conditions—providing, of course, the committee of reference agrees; and naturally it will agree, because it is one of those authorities appointed from the Government department itself.

I hope the Minister will be able to give us an assurance that the beaches available, and the reserves mentioned in this Bill, will not be taken over by the Reserves

Bill. I would like an assurance that the reserves will not be cancelled. I would like to refer to a new beach which has just been established—Lillian beach. A bitumen road has been built by the local road board, electricity has been supplied, trees have been planted, and bathing and other facilities have been established. Its purpose is to serve a growing community in that area. The building activity around what I call the Naval Base area—just north of the land owned by Broken Hill Pty. Ltd.—is very intense. Some nice houses have been established on the hills back from the beach; and an excellent view is obtained from them.

My concern and hope is that miles of beaches will not be taken away from the public. As long as we have an assurance that the public will always have access to the fine calm beaches in that area I am prepared to support the Bill.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines—in reply) [3.4]: I appreciate the co-operation given by Mr. Strickland and his colleague, Mr. Wise, to the quick passage of this Bill. The Government does regard the matter as most important. I regret to say I am not in a position, for reasons which I think would be fairly obvious to members, to disclose—at this point of time anyway—in any particular degree the Government's hopes and desires for this area. The Government, and particularly the Minister for Industrial Development, has great hopes and great desires; and, should the occasion arise, it will be necessary for that particular Minister to be able to have this land easily at his disposal in order to allocate it in the terms of the principal Act.

I know it would be nice if I were able to tell the House just exactly what some of these things are, but in propositions under negotiation it is sometimes not desirable to disclose particulars in the early part of those negotiations. In respect to the question raised by Mr. Strickland regarding the beach area, I refer members to the map which I laid on the Table of the House, and at which I am looking at the moment. It reserves areas along the beach. The locations and the numbers of the land are printed on the plan; and, in some cases, the organisations to which this land has been leased are shown.

Lillian beach, mentioned by Mr. Strickland, has been leased to the Lillian Beach Association. These reservations of beach areas have been made in accordance with the plan laid on the Table of the House; and the location numbers of the various areas of land are marked on the map. I think that covers the main points raised by Mr. Strickland and Mr. Wise.

I join with Mr. Wise in his statement that if Medina is to survive it must receive some fillip. As Minister for Housing, I

am not at all pleased to know that I still have a few houses there from which we are not collecting any rent for the State.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: How many have you?

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Avaricious landlord!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not an avaricious landlord by any means. The last time I made inquiries, there were more houses than I liked from which we were not collecting rent. The number of houses vacant was about 20. Since then we have had a few occupied, and to one industrial inquirer I gave an assurance that if these houses were required for employees we would make them available. So it is quite true that if Medina is to survive it must receive some fillip. It is also true to say that the Government is very conscious of this fact; and one of the things we are trying our hardest to do is to encourage more industry to come to Western Australia.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2—section 6 amended:

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I would just like to point out that the map the Minister laid on the Table of the House would be most interesting if we had time to study it. How we are expected to do so in five minutes is not clear to me. We should be given a little time, after the second reading debate on Bills of this nature, to gather their full import. I do not oppose the clause.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am never averse to members securing the adjournment of the debate of any Bill, but I am desirous of seeing this measure go through the second reading today, if possible. The third reading will not be presented to the House before next Tuesday. With respect, I suggest to Mr. Watson that he can then raise anything he wishes. If he feels that the Bill should not be considered next Tuesday—and if he tells me privately—I will arrange for it to be left on the notice paper for a reasonable time.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 and Title put and passed.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

NOXIOUS WEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [3.14] in moving the second reading said: The purpose of this Bill is to give the Agriculture Protection Board the power to delegate to local authorities its powers under sections 22 and 23 of the principal Act to deal with primary noxious weeds growing on private property. The Act gives the Governor power to declare certain weeds to be of primary or secondary danger.

It also confers an obligation on occupiers of private land to destroy declared primary noxious weeds, and provides for a penalty of £20 for the first failure to observe this responsibility, and £50 for any subsequent lapse. Section 22 of the Act provides that if the Agriculture Protection Board is satisfied that an occupier of private land is not making a reasonable effort to destroy his weeds, the board may, in writing, direct him and the owner of the land, to take the necessary action. Any owner or occupier who fails to comply with this direction is liable to a penalty of £20 for a first offence, and £50 for any subsequent offence.

In the event of failure to comply with such a direction, the Agriculture Protection Board is given power by section 23 of the Act to enter on the land, carry out the necessary work, and charge the cost jointly and severally to the owner and occupier of the property. In the event of non-payment, the money is recoverable in a local court.

At the request of the Road Board Association, the Bill seeks to give the Agriculture Protection Board the authority, with the approval in each case of the Minister, to delegate these powers to any local authority which may request them. A local authority given this right may pay for any eradication work out of its ordinary revenue or out of the revenue derived from the noxious weeds rate, which it is empowered to levy under section 52 of the Act. The Bill gives the local authorities the right to claim payment of any expenses from the owner and occupier of any property, and to proceed for payment in a court of competent jurisdiction.

At present, local authorities have the power, which was given them by an amendment, in 1957, of the principal Act, to enter on to any land for the purpose of controlling, destroying, or eradicating any primary noxious weeds. They have not the powers, however, proposed to be delegated by this Bill, which should be of distinct advantage in the campaign in this State against noxious weeds. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North) [3.16]: The Bill, which one might say deals with the further eradication of noxious weeds—which are becoming more prevalent in the State—appears in the main to delegate the authority of the Agriculture Protection Board to local authorities to deal with primary noxious weeds growing on private property; and to give power to the Governor to declare certain weeds to be of a primary or secondary danger. The material factors contained in the Bill are, I think, set out in proposed new section 23A(1) which states—

The Board may, from time to time with the written approval of the Minister, by written authorisation under the seal of the Board, delegate to any local authority power to exercise any of the powers conferred, or to carry out any of the duties imposed on the Board by the provisions in sections twenty-two and twenty-three of this Act in relation to any private land situate within the district of the local authority and the owner or occupier thereof, except this power of delegation.

Proposed new subsection (3) (b) reads as follows:—

Where an owner or occupier of private land fails to comply with the requirements of a direction given to him under this Division, by a local authority under the powers conferred on it by delegation under the provisions of this section, if the local authority carries out the requirements of the direction, the expense of so doing—

(b) is a debt due by the owner or occupier served with the notice of direction—

and so on. When listening to the Minister's second reading speech it struck me that there was a tendency to place more than ordinary emphasis on the obligation of an occupier. The Minister said that the Act confers an obligation on occupiers of private land to destroy declared primary noxious weeds, and provides for various penalties. I feel that if an obligation exists in this matter, it should be primarily on the owner of the property. It could be made a joint responsibility of both the owner and the occupier, but certainly the primary responsibility for the eradication of noxious weeds should not be conferred on the occupier. In most instances the owner will benefit from the eradication of noxious weeds.

There could be quite a lot of waste land on a leased property, and an occupier may be gaining his living on a small portion of the land. However, the occupier could be served with a notice to deal with the noxious weeds on the uncleared acres of the property, and this would create a hardship for him, although it would be of a direct benefit to the owner. In the first

instance, I feel an order should be served on the owner; and, if he cannot be located, the expense should be a charge on the property. It is true that an occupier must accept some responsibility in this connection; and I think he would accept responsibility for the particular piece of land he was cultivating under lease. However, he should not be responsible for vast acreages over which he has no control.

Perhaps I am stretching my imagination a lot when I think of pastoral properties of very large dimensions, but, at the same time there is a grave danger in this proposal because the occupier can face all the responsibility. I think one part of the Act mentions "occupier and owner." However, the fact remains that the Minister in his opening remarks emphasised that the onus would be on the occupier.

The rest of the Bill deals with provisions to ensure that any moneys expended by a local authority will be recoverable; and if a local authority is not successful in this regard, the board will revoke its powers of delegation and take action under the parent Act.

There is little doubt that if a person who is served with a notice does not carry out the work, it will be done by the local authority—or subsequently by the board—and ultimately the expense will be recoverable in a local court.

I have nothing against the Bill in principle. The more action we take in eradicating noxious weeds the better it will be for all concerned; but I ask the Minister to give further consideration to see that in the first instance an owner will be responsible for any noxious weeds on his property and that a lessee or occupier shall be called upon to be responsible only for the portion of the property which is under his jurisdiction. With those comments, I support the Bill.

On motion by the Hon. J. M. Thomson, debate adjourned.

INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE RECOVERY BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Child Welfare) [3.23] in moving the second reading said: The intention of this Bill is firstly to repeal the Interstate Destitute Persons Relief Act, 1912-1931; and, secondly, to make better provisions for interstate maintenance actions than existed in the earlier Act. It also proposes to extend these facilities to the Dominion of New Zealand as well as to territories of the Commonwealth of Australia. I might say here that it is my intention to endeavour to do the same with regard to India.

In 1912 or thereabouts, each State of the Commonwealth had an Interstate Destitute Persons Relief Act by means of

which maintenance defaulters could be dealt with irrespective of which State they were residing in. That is to say, if a man deserted his family in this State and went to live in South Australia, his wife could take proceedings against him under the Interstate Destitute Persons Relief Act; obtain a maintenance order; and cause the order to be transferred to Adelaide through the two Child Welfare departments concerned, and that order would be enforced on the deserter in the same manner as if it had been made in a South Australian court. In a reverse set of circumstances, an order made in South Australia could be enforced in this State if the defaulter came to reside here.

The principal objection to the Interstate Destitute Persons Relief Act is that once an order is made, there is no power to vary it in any way. The defaulter could, and often did, suffer a change in circumstances, such as illness or unemployment, which prevented him from complying with the order. Conversely, if his circumstances improved, the complainant could not take any steps to procure increased maintenance for herself and family.

This Bill makes it possible for variations to be made in accordance with the circumstances of both parties; and adequate safeguards are provided to ensure that both parties are heard even though they reside in different States.

The commencement of the Act will be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 will repeal the Interstate Destitute Persons Relief Act. Section 15 of the Interpretation Act preserves the legality of documents, regulations and court orders made under the Act to be repealed; and it is necessary that the Child Welfare Act, 1947-1958, be amended because of the first schedule in this Bill.

In order that reciprocity of action may be achieved with other States, it is necessary for the Governor to proclaim that the relevant parts of this Bill should extend to the other States. It is intended that the collector shall be the assistant director of the Child Welfare Department as was the case under the Interstate Destitute Persons Relief Act. If any person in this State, responsible for the maintenance of another, leaves that other person without adequate means of support and goes to reside in another State, a summons may be issued against him to show cause why he should not support the dependant left in this State.

The summons cannot be issued unless it is supported by an affidavit or declaration made by the plaintiff in accordance with form No. 1 of the second schedule of this Bill. The justice issuing the summons is required to deliver the supporting documents, together with the application to the clerk of the appropriate court where the

application will subsequently be heard. Affidavits will be sworn before a commissioner, and declarations will be made before a justice. The summons will state a place and time for the hearing of the application, due regard being paid to the distance of the defaulter from the place of the hearing.

A summons may be served either in or outside Western Australia depending on where the defaulter is living. The summons may be heard and determined by a court of summary jurisdiction composed of a stipendiary magistrate and at least one justice; or by a children's court if the summons relates to a child only. Both types of courts are granted jurisdiction to deal with interstate applications. Provided that service of the summons is proved, or the court is satisfied that a reasonable attempt was made to effect service, the court can proceed to hear and determine the summons.

Under clause 9 an order may be enforced in the manner provided in the Justices Act, if the defaulter returns to the State. A summons issued by a justice for a maintenance order made by a court in another State may be served on the defaulter in this State. A summons issued or a maintenance order made in this State may be served in another State to which the defaulter has gone, provided that a justice endorses the summons or the order, as the case may be, to this effect. When endorsing the summons or other document for service, the justice must make allowance for the distance when fixing the date of the hearing. Such summons or other document may be served in Western Australia or in another State, depending on the whereabouts of the defaulter at the time of service. Service or attempted service shall be proved by affidavit or declaration. Clause 12 sets out the procedure to be followed where it is desired to transfer an existing maintenance order to another State because the defaulter has gone to reside there.

The collector, in order to transfer a maintenance order to another State for enforcement, must send forward to the other collector two certified copies of the order; an affidavit setting out the state of the account; a statement containing as much information as possible concerning the defaulter; and an official request to have the order enforced in the other State. At the same time, he is required to advise the court which made the order that he is taking this action.

To enable the collector to take this action, the clerk of courts must supply him with—

- (a) four certified copies of the order;
- (b) a statement of the arrears on the order; or
- (c) a certified copy of an affidavit sworn by the complainant as to the state of the account if the

said complainant has been receiving money direct from the defaulter.

The clerk of courts, after receiving notice from the collector that the order is to be transferred to another State for enforcement shall—

- (a) recall and cancel any process which may have been issued (e.g. a warrant of commitment for arrears of maintenance);
- (b) refrain from issuing any fresh process against the defaulter;
- (c) supply to the collector certified copies made after the commencement of proceedings under this Bill, varying, suspending or discharging the original order.

When the collector in this State is advised by the collector in another State that enforcement proceedings are no longer required, he will notify the clerk of courts accordingly, and supply him with a statement of the account as at the date interstate action ceased. The court will then resume its own action at the request of the complainant.

The Bill also provides for the collector in this State to enforce a maintenance order against a defaulter when he receives from the collector of another State—

- (a) two certified copies of the maintenance order;
- (b) an affidavit setting out the state of the account; and
- (c) an official request that the order be enforced in this State.

These documents are to be accepted as being valid unless they can be proved otherwise.

The collector in this State must cause a copy of the maintenance order received from another State to be served on the defaulter, otherwise it cannot be enforced in this State. The service of the order may be effected by personal delivery of a copy to the defendant; or by sending him a copy by registered post; or by the collector carrying out an order of a court for substituted service. The court is granted power to make an order for substituted service. When service is effected, the order is enforceable in Western Australia.

After the order has been served on the defendant, he is required to make all his payments to the collector, who is authorised to receive them and to take such action as is necessary to enforce compliance with the order. The collector's receipts are valid discharges of the liability to pay such maintenance.

Orders made enforceable in this State may be enforced in accordance with the provisions of the Justices Act, 1902; i.e., by means of warrants of execution and commitment. Recovery action is not limited to six months' arrears as is usually the case when orders are enforced by

means of the Justices Act. This is necessary because many orders are already more than six months in arrears when they are received for enforcement here.

When proceedings are taken through a court to enforce an order, it is not competent for that court to question the legality or justice of the original order. The collector, or other officer, may take proceedings to enforce an order as if he were the complainant. The collector is authorised to appoint officers to take enforcement proceedings on his behalf in any particular case. The officer appointed by the collector shall have all the powers of the collector for a specific case, and his written authority shall not be questioned.

Orders made enforceable in this State may be varied at the instance of either the defendant or the complainant—if in this State—by an appropriate court. "Appropriate" court means the court in this State which would have been competent to make the original order if both parties had been residing in this State at the time.

The appropriate court is given jurisdiction to hear the application for variation and to make a provisional order. Before hearing such application the court must give notice to the collector and to the other party to the order, if the other party is in this State.

The collector is entitled to take an active part in these proceedings. The court can deal with an application for variation of an order even though the applicant is in arrears with his payments. The court has power to hear and determine the application in the absence of the other party to the order. Application for variation of interstate orders may be dealt with by the appropriate court nearest to the applicant's place of abode, or at other places by agreement between the applicant and the collector.

The court hearing the application for variation may grant it if satisfied to do so. Such variation may be retrospective in effect; or, in the cases of increase, decrease or suspension of payments may be granted from time to time. Evidence given by all parties at the hearing shall be reduced to writing, read over to and signed by them respectively.

An order made by an appropriate court in this State for variation of an order made in another State is provisional only and has no force at law until it is confirmed by a court in the other State. If the application for variation is dismissed, no further action is necessary. If it is granted, the court may, if it thinks fit, state in writing the grounds on which it might have been opposed if the other party had been present.

If a provisional order is made by a court, the clerk of that court shall send to the collector in this State, certified copies in

duplicate of the provisional order, the statement of grounds on which it might have been opposed, and the depositions taken during the proceedings. The clerk of courts must certify that the depositions were read over to and signed by the deponents. After noting his records accordingly, the collector sends these documents to the collector in the other State.

The court in the other State may not confirm the provisional order but may refer it back to the court in this State to consider further evidence. The court here will then act accordingly, following out the procedure in clause 18 once more. The court in this State may, in its discretion, consider any deposition taken in the other court. After considering the fresh evidence, etc., the court in this State may rescind its earlier decision if it appears desirable to do so.

Copies of depositions and of the decision are passed from the court to the two collectors. The collector in this State shall cause the applicant to be served with a certified copy of the confirming court's decision. The parties to an application for a provisional order have the same rights as parties resident in this State who apply for variation of an order made in this State.

If a court in another State makes a provisional order varying an order made in this State, the collector on receiving certified documents from the collector of the other State, forwards them to the court which made the original order here. The clerk of courts then arranges a hearing of the provisional order and notifies the local collector, and the original complainant. The court may remit the matter to a more appropriate court.

At the hearing, the collector or his officers may take an active part in the proceedings. The court has power to finalise the matter in the absence of interested parties. The court may confirm the provisional order with or without modifications; refuse to confirm it; or remit the provisional order with all relevant documents through the collector to the court which made it in the other State.

When a provisional order is confirmed, it has the same effect as the original order. If it is not confirmed, it has no effect whatsoever. The clerk of courts shall forward a certified copy in duplicate of the confirming court's decision; and he, in turn, forwards it to the other collector. Power is given to make regulations, and a penalty of up to £20 is provided for a breach of the regulations. Judges of the Supreme Court may make rules of court in regard to matters affecting the Supreme Court.

All documents which conform either with the law of another State or with the law of this State are deemed to be valid for the purposes of this Bill. Documents

sworn or made by the collector setting out the amounts of money paid on maintenance orders shall be admitted as evidence by a court. Documents sworn or made by the collector as to imprisonment of a defendant, credit given for a named sum, etc., shall be accepted as *prima facie* evidence.

The clerk of courts shall accept the documents referred to in subclauses (1) and (2) of clause 28, and adjust his records accordingly. Police and other officers shall allow credit for payments, etc., as set out in subclauses (1) and (2) of the same clause and proceed to recover any balance outstanding. If, for instance, a police officer holds a warrant of commitment for £40 arrears, and the collector certifies that £15 has been received since the warrant issued, the police officer would then execute the warrant for £25 only.

The collector's accounts are subject to annual audit by the Auditor-General. For the purposes of these audits, the Auditor-General has all powers and authorities in accordance with the Audit Act, 1904.

A person served with a summons, notice, or maintenance order is deemed to be the person concerned in the case unless he can prove otherwise; and the onus of proof lies upon himself. This only applies if the person who served the document states in an affidavit or declaration that he believes he served the papers on the correct person.

In order to protect State funds, the recipient of the proceeds of an interstate order—usually the complainant—may procure the payments to the Child Welfare Department. This happens in cases where payments on an order are irregular and the department is obliged to support the family from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. It does so, and payments received on the order are used to offset departmental expenditure.

The collector must file the procuration order with his records. While the procuration order is in operation, the collector's payments to the department shall be a sufficient discharge. While the procuration order is in operation, the complainant cannot allow credit or waive payments due under the order except with the consent of the department. Any procuration order signed before the commencement of this Act will continue to be effective. General authority is provided for the collector to delegate all or any of his powers under this Act.

Statements in complaints or made on oath by the collector, etc., that regulations, proclamations or rules of court have been published in the *Government Gazette*, or that any person has been appointed to an office under this Act or its regulations, shall be accepted as *prima facie* evidence. The authority of the collector, etc., to do any act or take any

proceedings under this Act shall be presumed unless there is proof to the contrary. All documents purporting to be signed by such officials as judges, magistrates, justices, clerks of court, collector, etc., shall be accepted as being authentic unless proof is produced to the contrary.

Depositions taken in courts in other States and which are certified as correct by the clerks of those courts may be received in evidence by courts in this State. The salaries of officers and the expenses of the administration of this Act may be paid out of money provided by Parliament. There are one or two schedules attached to the measure. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Hon. F. R. H. Lavery, debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.5 p.m.

TOURIST BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the previous day.

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [4.5]: I would like to have a few words to say on the second reading of this Bill, the purpose of which, according to its title, is the development of tourist resorts and the tourist industry in Western Australia. I am sure that the aims and objects of developing this industry in Western Australia are worthy and need all the encouragement that we can give them. But whether this Bill will achieve anything in that direction is, I am afraid, very doubtful; and, like other members who have preceded me, I cannot get at all enthusiastic over the measure.

However, in the brief space of time that I propose speaking, I want to add my comments to emphasise the importance of the tourist industry, and the immense potentialities that lie ahead of Western Australia if we only have the good judgment to develop and expand the industry in this State. On the 20th April, 1959, there appeared in *The West Australian* an article by John D. Bates, Chairman of the Australian National Travel Association. In case the majority of members did not notice it, or pay a great deal of attention to it at the time, I shall read one fairly brief extract from it. It reads—

To a country like Australia which depends so much on its export income, the tourist industry holds tremendous promise.

It is one of the easiest ways of boosting our overseas earnings.

Look what it has meant to other countries. In just over ten years, visitor spendings at Hawaii multiplied nearly fourteen-fold to \$36,000,000 last year. Nor does that include what the visitors spent in getting there and back.

In Britain, France and Italy more dollars are gained from North American tourists than from any single item exported from those three countries. Canada earns more American dollars from tourists from over the border than from any other Canadian export apart from newsprint.

The tourist industry is big business. In Europe, the West Indies, Florida, Hawaii, Japan and other countries, big strides have been made in the development of the tourist industry and large sums have been invested by Governments and private enterprise to ensure that they attract and go on attracting steadily increasing numbers of international travellers.

Scientific and technical developments in the post-war era have resulted in higher standards of living and more leisure and, therefore, more opportunity and desire for travel.

And there is every reason to believe that the numbers of international travellers will go on increasing. The passenger-carrying companies, both surface and air, are making enormous investments in new equipment to cope with this increase.

With the coming of the jet air age and the introduction of great new liners on the Australian run, we will be right on the outskirts of the tourist markets of the world—only a little more than half the distance away in time that we were a year or so ago.

Last year just on 60,000 overseas visitors came to Australia and they spent more than £10,000,000 while here. There has been a steady increase in the tourist traffic to Australia in recent years, but it is to the benefit of us all that this business must be developed.

Those comments by John D. Bates, Chairman of the Australian National Travel Association, emphasise clearly and concisely what an important industry tourism is going to be; how it has developed in Australia; and how it is likely to go on developing. The question arises in one's mind, "How much of the £10,000,000 that was spent by tourists in Australia last year was spent in Western Australia; and how many of the 60,000 overseas visitors who came to Australia last year came to Western Australia?" I would hazard the opinion that a very small proportion of the money, and a very small quota of those visitors came to this State.

The question which now arises is, "How can we attract not only overseas visitors but also interstate visitors to Western Australia in increasing numbers so that we will get our proportion of the large sums of money being spent by tourists these days?" I think we all agree that the tourist trade is one which is well worth catering for; it is one that we in Western Australia should be able to cope

with on an almost equal level with other Australian States. It has to be admitted, of course, that we are far removed from the larger centres of population; it has to be admitted that we are a comparatively young State with large distances between many of our towns; and it has to be admitted that in this early stage of our development we have not been able to provide the standard of hotel and other accommodation which is provided in the more densely populated parts of Australia.

Also the factors of distance and population have a good deal of bearing on what can be achieved in this direction. At least we have to make a start by going after this attractive business which is offering and which will continue to be offering in greater quantities in the years that lie ahead.

I am pleased that the Government is showing an interest in the development of a tourist industry in Western Australia. There is a lot to be done, and the time is opportune for some up-to-date planning. At any rate, the Bill causes us to think; and although we might criticise its inadequacies, at least it gives us an opportunity to present our views before Parliament and the public of Western Australia. My view is that the main question that has to be solved is accommodation. I agree entirely with the views put forward by Dr. Hislop last night; namely, that one of the first things we have to do is to overhaul our licensing laws and bring them up to date.

By doing that we would also improve the standard of hotel accommodation. People who save all their lives to go on a cruise to other parts expect the best that is offering; and in this connection accommodation is of the utmost importance. It rests with the Licensing Court to apply new standards to improve our hotels; but, there again, finance enters into the question. Modern hotels cost an enormous amount of money and the renovation of existing ones is a costly business. Sooner or later, however, such construction and renovation will have to be done.

Should a fund be created it should be under the aegis of the Licensing Court. If money from the sale of State hotels is to be eventually placed in a fund, my idea would be to place that fund under the jurisdiction and control of the Licensing Court so that it could lend money for the building of new hotels and for the modernisation of many of the out-of-date structures that are scattered all over Western Australia.

As a commencement, if something along those lines were done, we would be taking a longer step towards attracting more tourists than we have in the past. We must bear in mind that there are various classes of tourists. There are those who come from overseas with unlimited money to spend; but their numbers are limited. The bulk of the tourists are people of ordinary means

who, because of our higher standard of living and our modern means of travelling, are able to travel about occasionally.

Last year I was at the Gold Coast in Queensland. I was surprised to learn from the manager of the large modern hotel there that most of his patrons were from the middle group of tourists. I noticed that the majority of the people in those tourist resorts were young women, young men, and other ordinary people who had travelled up from Melbourne and Sydney for their Easter holidays, or other holidays that occur throughout the year. The manager told me that if he were to rely on the wealthy or the millionaire-type of tourist, the hotel would never pay its way. However, most of the ordinary types of people did not stay at the hotel. Their accommodation consisted of attractive flats and rooms, most of which were available at a reasonable tariff. There were also restaurants and snack bars in the towns where they could buy meals at reasonable rates.

As a result, young men and women and other people of modest means were able to travel to the Gold Coast for a long weekend and enjoy themselves at relatively small cost. Coming back to Western Australia, I am convinced that we have all the attractions necessary to draw tourists. As pointed out by other speakers, the North-West has many alluring beauty spots, and I am sure that the majority of Western Australians have not seen them. However, in years to come, with better roads and better means of communication, towns such as Carnarvon, Derby, Broome, and Wyndham, will get more patronage from tourists than they have in the past.

I am told that the accommodation provided at those places at present is inadequate to meet the standards required by people who may visit them.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Enormous cost is involved in building those places.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: That has always been true, but if we want tourists to visit those parts we will have to face up to meeting the capital cost that is necessary to provide the type of accommodation that tourists expect. Most people do not want luxury accommodation; but, with the advent of refrigerators and a higher standard of living, it is not only the millionaire who expects decent meals, a clean room, hot and cold running water, and, perhaps, a toilet adjacent to his room. That is the type of accommodation which the average person now expects when he goes on a holiday to spend his savings; and surely he is entitled to such amenities!

In the past we had too many hotels that sought the patronage of tourists, expecting them to spend all their savings in the bar, but providing them with only third-class accommodation. Those days are gone. That is why I submit the proposition that if the Government intends to provide money

from the proceeds of the sale of the State hotels, the money should be vested in the Licensing Court for the purpose of creating a fund from which money could be loaned to those who wished to modernise and improve the hotels which at present are offering inadequate accommodation.

This State has excellent roads, and more are being provided. Mr. Cunningham pointed out last evening that people can travel over a bitumen road all the way from Perth to Esperance via Coolgardie; whereas when I enlisted at Esperance in 1918 it took me two days to travel from Esperance to Norseman by coach, a journey of 120 miles. That was not so long ago; and now we have a bitumen road all the way.

It was only a few weeks ago when I left Perth and travelled via Ravensthorpe to Esperance, and I did this trip comfortably in one day. The average businessman in Esperance travels in that way to Perth—they all do the trip in one day. So distances appear to be contracting. With the modernisation of aeroplanes and with the provision of better roads, places like Derby and Wyndham are not very far away in terms of travelling time.

Tourists visiting those places create employment for the people. Cooks and others have to be employed at the hotels. Furthermore, the tourists are able to observe the opportunities for investment in this State, and so forth. One project of which I am very much in favour, and which should be commenced as early as possible, is the East-West road. As surely as the sun rises, there will be a bitumen road from Norseman through to South Australia. That is a tangible way of attracting tourists from the Eastern States, wherein lies the greatest population of this country.

The Tourist Bureau, and those concerned with the development of tourism in Western Australia, should, for all they are worth, advocate the commencement of that project. That would be the most important single contribution in attracting motorists and other types of tourists from the Eastern States. It might take five years to complete, but if all or half of the road could be bituminised in the next few years, so much the better.

The tourist spots in this State are not confined to the coast-line. I agree with the remark of Mr. Cunningham that many tourists—not only those in Australia but those from other parts of the world—would be glad to be able to see the marvels and the places of interest which are to be found on the Goldfields, and even on the Nullabor Plain. Those are my views.

I think the tourist industry is well worth encouraging. In the past we may have lagged behind, but, as surely as the sun rises, the amount of money which is spent in this country in the development of the tourist industry will, in the years

that lie ahead, be returned manyfold. This State should be able to attract its proper share of the tourist potential. It is not only the money spent by the tourists directly, but also the amount they spend indirectly that is worth going after.

I have not said much about the Bill. Although I applaud the Government's interest in the subject, I am greatly disappointed with the Bill that has been placed before us. I share the views of others that the existing Tourist Bureau should be expanded and developed. Therein lies an organisation which is capable of handling the situation for some years to come. Build up the Tourist Bureau; build up the Licensing Court; modernise our licensing laws; get on with the problem of improving accommodation of not only hotels but motels and the like; and encourage the building of better and more modern accommodation, and the problem will largely solve itself.

I fail to see the necessity for superimposing any authority on the Tourist Bureau. Last year, as the Minister stated in answer to a question by Mr. Loton, this State spent £41,527 on the Tourist Bureau, including the Melbourne and Sydney branches. In my opinion that is a very small sum. We cannot criticise the Tourist Bureau here and the branches in the other States for not accomplishing more than they have accomplished. I have no contact with the local bureau, but I am aware that its management has some splendid ideas—

The Hon. J. Murray: A pity it has not put those ideas into effect!

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: —but presumably money is required to put them into effect. What could we provide if the Tourist Bureau next year arranged to send 100 tourists to Carnarvon for a week? Could they be accommodated there?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Carnarvon can accommodate plenty of visitors. There is even a swimming pool at a hotel.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The sum of £41,000 seems to be a small outlay if we are to take the matter seriously and compete with other States and other countries for our share of the tourist business.

As regards the Bill, I cannot see that it will improve the situation greatly. I find that on the proposed authority are to be appointed representatives of the Minister for Lands, the Minister for Works, the Main Roads Department, country municipalities, and road boards. Will that help tourism very much? That is not my idea. I would help the Tourist Bureau and improve the Licensing Court—and the licensing laws—so that those two bodies will be able to assist the people who are engaged in providing accommodation and food for tourists. Good roads and similar facilities are, of course, also required.

In my view the Tourist Bureau should be improved and expanded; it should be given more money. In the same way the Licensing Court should be expanded and improved, so that it would be in a position to help in the provision of new hotels and in the improvement of old ones. If we did that we would get somewhere.

I share the views of Dr. Hislop. I cannot become enthusiastic about the Bill, but I can get enthusiastic about the proposition to do more than we have done in the past to develop the tourist industry.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [4.42]: Many members in this Chamber share the views expressed by Mr. Heenan. This Bill is framed and intended to meet the needs of an industry, but it falls far short of what is really required to meet the needs of the tourist industry which is so highly profitable in many places and many countries.

I fear that with the formation of the proposed authority the objectives, as outlined initially by the Premier and confirmed by the Minister for Mines in this House, will not be reached. I can readily understand the enthusiasm of such members as Mr. Thomson. He represents a province which possesses a great potential for tourism; and an area which will receive, through the local governing body under the proposals in the Bill, much largesse to assist in providing the needs; in initiating projects; and in creating the interest to attract tourists there.

It is true to say that this State has a lot to sell in the way of tourism. The scope is limitless. We have features of singular interest, not to be found elsewhere, and which, if properly presented, would attract people who are interested in the spending of their money as they move about. The tourist industry, as was said by the Leader of the Opposition, is an industry in its widest sense. It could even come within the ambit of the title of a Bill recently before this Chamber. This industry has meant very much to the State of Tasmania. If the tourist trade and Tattersalls had been taken away from Tasmania simultaneously it would have been difficult for the Government to function. It is a little island which could be put many times into some of the provinces of this State. It could even be put on a single station.

As outlined by Mr. Heenan, Canada's experience is an outstanding one. Irrespective of its wheat exports, which are famous, and its exports of paper pulp and paper, the tourist trade is the second largest of Canada's interests; and from where do the tourists come? From the United States, just over the border. They go there and spend their dollars; and, more particularly, when the exchange rate is in their favour. Canada has built,

through its railway systems, amazing attractions using natural advantages to the full and enjoying, through the tourist industry, a very great income of foreign capital.

Switzerland is another case in point. Next to the profit from the manufacture of watches, the greatest profit comes from the tourists. I admit that even without the manufacture of watches, it would still have finance control.

As the Leader of the Opposition remarked in the course of his speech, the Bill is more or less to socialise the tourist trade of this State; and it is my belief that, instead of selling the State hotels—and I think they will be sold—the Government should build hotels in the interests of tourist traffic. Modern structures should be erected at strategic points by subsidising private enterprise initially—if it is so desired—until tourists are attracted to the area. When the initial stages are passed and the tourist traffic is evident, they could be handed over to private enterprise and the Government could go on to build others elsewhere.

I know it is the firm belief of my Leader that if the State hotels are sold we should build others where private enterprise will not do so—for instance, in places like Derby in the North—and once they were established as a State enterprise and were making a profit, the Government could sell them and start others elsewhere.

There is much in the thought that by our giving the accommodation and amenities which free-spending tourists require—and, indeed, demand—a fillip will be given to the tourist trade. The development of motels is something which has made certain cities of America. Davis, the University city and the capital of California, has miles and miles of them side by side catering for the tourists. In Davis one can see the ordinary standard type of hotel neglected because it cannot accommodate a car; the owner must park his car a mile or two away. However, the motel meets his need. It accommodates his car as well as himself. I believe there is much to be said for making a humble beginning in this State in this matter, because tourists are anxious for that type of accommodation and are prepared to pay for the service they receive.

I repeat that we have much to offer. There are many quaint things here which, if they existed in other countries, would be featured in a limitless fashion. Take the North, as an example. The baobab tree of North Australia grows in only one other part of the world—the Transvaal. The trees are so large that they have been used in earlier days as prisons holding as many as 26 to 30 people overnight. There are many people who would pay pounds to obtain even a photograph of such sights.

The Hammersley Range is another example. The Wittenoom Gorge and the adjacent one have colours equivalent to

anything ever painted by Albert Namatjira. Then there is Millstream, one of the unique places where water comes out of the earth at the rate of tens of millions of gallons a day, and then disappears. These parts are only in our middle North, a place which was talked about when irrigation schemes for the North were propounded; and they are remarkable centres for tourists. In every city of Australia the attractions of King's Park are loudly praised.

The Hon. J. Murray: As a swimming resort!

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: A wonderful place is King's Park. I would point out that the beauty of King's Park is mostly man-made.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Quite true.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Starting from the entrance gates where the lodge is situated there are exotic trees growing on all sides: The red-flowering gums, replaced by the lemon-scented gums of the Eastern States. There are extensive oaks at the other entrances; beautiful lawns round the tea rooms; and exotic trees surround the area. Then there is the vista from the drive itself with the beautiful man-made contours of the river. If we were to use King's Park to the full to attract the tourist trade, we would certainly have to arrange for controlled burning of places which would soon become dangerous. It must be obvious that I am one who supports a pool in the park. I make no apology for that. I am.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You have a few friends there.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I repeat that the opportunity is available to make it a feature which will greatly appeal. There is already the man-made skyline of the City of Perth, a thing of beauty at any time from King's Park. We now have added to that the beautiful aesthetic bridge to cross the Narrows. However, we are not making enough of it. If controlled burning were to take place, especially from the Subiaco end, we would not have to drive to New Norcia, nor to the 50-mile peg on the Albany road, nor half-way to Bunbury, to show visitors wildflowers. We would have a better chance of displaying them within a stone's throw. But it is a heritage not being used for the attraction of tourists. What is the ultimate future of those areas? They cannot be preserved in their natural state.

I agree with Dr. Hislop and Mr. Heenan concerning the need for more and better hotels. Some of those we consider to be first-class hotels will, in the lifetime of some members of this Chamber, be considered to be almost curios. It reminds me of the time in England when, on a Cook's tour, the passengers were told that they were then passing the oldest inn in England, and a voice said, "What the devil for?"

Let us be a bit imaginative in the naming of places and buildings, so that they attract attention. The inns of England are a feature of the life of that country and they incite the interest of tourists by their very names. What is the good of calling a place "The 58 Mile Peg," or "The Half-Way Inn"? I could be much more imaginative than that! Call it something that is ridiculous, or interesting; something that will make people say, "What is the background of this place? Let us go in and see." There is a lot of merit in calling a place "The Pig's Tail," or "The Cow's Horn." It incites interest.

We must feature anything unusual or interesting. For example, the tallest tree; or the artesian water at the zoo. If we were in Germany we would have to pay a bob a nobby for it, which fact Dr. Hislop would verify. However, we give it away. One could go on and on at great length about the advantages this State possesses and which we are not selling at all. The tourist is fair game, especially if from another country. He likes to be taken down, but never talks about it if he really is. Have not some of us seen an Egyptian come furtively around the door of a cabin with a few zircons or cheap stones to sell? We could probably go and buy them for 10s. in a shop, but he will sell them to us at a concession rate of £1! However, we enjoy being taken down.

I believe that in the case of saleable articles from our native art, referred to by Mr. Cunningham, we should exploit them to the full. Let us manufacture boomerangs with a saw, a buff, and a lathe; and sell them by the thousands at high prices, because they are of this country. Let us sell the interesting artifacts of the natives, without encroaching on their traditional things: This sort of thing. I have in my hand the claw of a mud crab, hollowed out, and with a hole cut in the end to contain tobacco. Many an old lubra has smoked that one; and these are to be obtained by the hundred on the north shores of this continent. What would a tourist pay for that? As a curio for a museum it is worth a lot of money; but what would it mean to a southern American tourist?

I have now in my hand the matrix of the spears which are found between the Gulf of Carpentaria and the Kimberley coast. In one place in North Australia is that stone found, and in one place only. The stone is carried by the itinerant native from one side of the continent to the other; and the next stage is the fashioning of the spear, by infinite patience and tapping the stone; and the ultimate result is the spear which the native uses, the spearhead being that which I have in my hand.

These things are valid articles for sale, in my view; for sale at prices which would bring in an income to be used for the benefit of the natives of this country in a most extensive fashion. I would not support the selling freely of the traditional

things of the natives—such things as I now have in my hand: a pair of song sticks, which are the medium of the music which sends the bone-pointed native to his death; priceless things to an individual —

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Be careful where you point that thing!

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I have not the bone itself, or I might be tempted to point it. Here are these things, with totemic symbols inscribed on them. Here is a churinga, perhaps a thousand years old; and it is priceless. This churinga was given to me by Albert Namatjira. It is a totem stone of the Arunta tribe, got from a cave where these things were stored. But what would a display of such material be worth? I admit that I have given quantities of such things to the National Museum and to the Museum of this State; because the public should enjoy them. But what an opportunity for the tourist! I am simply exhibiting these things, with your concurrence, Mr. Deputy President, to show that I would draw the line at the exploitation, even by tourists, of our natives.

Let us sell, by all means, all of the things which may be saleable and which are commonplace, but nevertheless attractive to the tourist. I would make him pay a pretty high price. I would let the tourist at all times have access to view these other things which belong only to this country. There are, too, some ceremonies of the natives which should be portrayed—ceremonies which some of us have been privileged to see. I refer, for instance, to the Pookamunni or tabu ceremony and the corroboree; and there are others which involve painful operations on very sensitive parts of the human body. Perhaps the public should not be permitted to see those; but the scientists certainly should.

In those surroundings, and particularly in the surroundings of the North-West, in their natural habitat, these things would greatly interest tourists; and the natives will willingly, through their headmen, turn on a real corroboree. In the Botanic Gardens at Darwin they turned on one or two corroborees for the Governor-General; corroborees which were amazing in their presentation and concept; and every penny which we could get from overseas visitors for the viewing of such spectacles could be applied to the well-being of the natives of this country, thus rendering a great service.

We should protect the natives absolutely from any intrusion on their traditional lore and tribal customs. I agree that we could use their works of art, whether their paintings, stone creations, or their work in wood, to the limit, so as to give to the tourists something, at a high price, to take away as valuable relics and reminders of their visit to this country.

So I say, by all means let us sell our tallest tree and our deepest mine. Let us sell our unusual industries, such as the

pearl shell industry. Let us sell to the tourists our historic landmarks, by making them pay to look at them; by getting from them an income for this country and the invisible export that tourist traffic represents. I am sure that with proper organisation our tourist bureau or bureaus could be stimulated into action at strategic points of this State; but I fear not with the set-up for which this Bill provides.

I have not found anybody in this Chamber, so far, who has spoken enthusiastically about this proposal, except the Minister and Mr. John Thomson; but rather than put any limit or wet blanket on the proposal to expand tourism in this State, I intend to support the Bill.

THE HON. J. MURRAY (South-West) [5.7]: It was not my intention to speak to this measure but, certain matters having been brought forward, I feel that I should have something to say about them. I support the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks about the set-up of the proposed new authority. I do not think that highly-placed public servants would be voted on to this authority; but, in any event, my experience of public servants generally is that they lack vision and imagination; and lacking those two essentials, an authority of this description would become stale. Having reached that stage, it would resort to the usual alternative and throw the responsibility back on the Minister.

I must dissociate myself from the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in regard to enlarging our present Tourist Bureau; because it must be entirely reconstructed if we are to get anywhere. I can think of nothing less imaginative than the present set-up. According to the figures given in answer to a question asked in this House, the vote for our Tourist Bureau last year was £41,527.

I have been associated with several local governing bodies that put forward suggestions to improve the tourist attractions of their own areas, and asked for some assistance from the State Tourist Bureau. In each instance the stereotyped answer was, "I have not sufficient money for myself." As long as that attitude is adopted and only places near the metropolitan area, which can be reached by tourist buses, are given prominence, we will never attract tourists to Western Australia.

We must exploit our farflung areas, as Mr. Wise and Mr. Cunningham have stressed; and we, from the South-West, must also insist on that. Mr. Wise mentioned our tall trees—we have much more than tall trees in the South-West, as members know. But if we are going to be lacking in imagination, and frightened to take any risk or to spend money in making

these attractions available to the people, we will not sell Western Australia to the tourists.

While I criticise the composition of the proposed authority, on general principles, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition because the personnel are to come, in the main, from the public service; and I must again be almost contradictory, because I feel I must take Mr. Heenan to task for saying that he cannot see why one person nominated by the Minister for Lands, one nominated by the Minister for Works, and one by the Minister in charge of the Main Roads Department should be on the authority. I still say that the members of the authority should not be civil servants; but I agree that the nominees should be the nominees of those three Ministers.

Do not tell me that the Minister for Lands and his department are not closely associated with the tourist attractions of the South-West; but what are they doing in various places now? Instead of leaving a reasonable area of land around certain of the attractions in that part of the State, so that private enterprise could help in this regard, and build up attractions—as some people have tried to do at Walpole and elsewhere—they have established a blanket coverage on them by means of a reserve. Are they going to step in and provide a socialised tourist attraction in those places? At the moment they do not leave anything to private enterprise. Accordingly, if we are to have a tourist authority, the Minister for Lands must be represented so that people can talk turkey to him and suggest that certain areas be made available to private enterprise to enable it to furnish tourist attractions. Such attractions are available—of that there is no doubt—but amenities and facilities are lacking.

The Minister in charge of the Main Roads Department is concerned with the provision of main roads and access ways to those places; and he, of course, should also be represented. At the same time, however, I feel that it is not the best thing to have a representative from his department on the committee. All that is necessary is to have the department represented, and I would far sooner see somebody on it who would not be under the thumb of the director of works, and who might, as a result, lose his job if his recommendations were not liked.

The job that is to be done is one that must be completed without respect for the departmental viewpoint. Money must be spent on this venture, even if at the immediate time it looks as though it is not warranted. I am sure we will find that in the future we will get a return of 200 to 300 per cent. for the very small expenditure we make on roads and access ways to some of the attractions we have to offer tourists in this State.

The Minister for Works, of course, must be represented, because he is responsible for supplying electricity and water. Certain

facilities are available at very little cost, but in the case of electricity, it is felt the immediate return would not measure up to the requirements of the State Electricity Commission; nor is it thought that it would justify the expense of putting in extensions to carry electric current to certain areas.

If, however, that electric current is conveyed to the places in question, the usage of that current will be far in excess of the minimum requirements. The same thing applies to water. In most of those areas in the south—not in the North—water is immediately available; and it would need little cost to establish it where it is required. It is, however, still beyond the purse of the local authority. In the past the local authorities have appealed to the State Tourist Bureau for assistance in providing that type of amenity to certain areas, but, of course, they were refused this help because of the lack of finance.

To my mind, £41,527 appears to be a lot of money for the service which has been rendered by the holders of the present positions in the Tourist Bureau of Western Australia. It is a lot of money that has been spent irresponsibly, through a lack of imagination of what we have to sell to the people who come here. We lost our opportunity over the years of selling many parts of Western Australia to the tourists. They visited the State and saw the near areas of it. I admit that those areas have certain attractions, but views from Kings Park, the Canning Dam, and Mundaring Weir, while most interesting, are not sufficient to sell the State to tourists.

I point out that I asked a question inquiring what part the Agent-General (Mr. Hoare) is playing in London with regard to the sale of our hardwoods. This relates very pertinently to the tourist attractions of Western Australia; and, having viewed the rooms of the Minister for Works, and having heard what the Conservator of Forests has in his room, I would say that if a like room were to be incorporated in the Agent-General's office in London, it would enable the people there to view the variety of timbers that are available to us. They would view the timber in its dressed condition; and, when they came to Western Australia, they would be able to see it in the rough, while having in mind what the finished article looked like.

From what I have been told, there is no more depressing or dismal place than the Agent-General's office in London. It has absolutely nothing to show. There are probably a few pictures of tall trees on the walls which have been taken there by the present Agent-General. I feel it was too late to start trying to sell Western Australia in 1956-57. I wish to stress the point that before any Government brings down a Bill in an endeavour to promote

and sell the tourist potential of Western Australia, we must rectify the position that obtains in the State today.

We must first of all discontinue the practice of shutting out private enterprise from those places that have attractions to sell. It is no good telling private enterprise, "You must go 10 or 20 chains back from the estuary, or back from the river, and build your hotel, or motel and camping areas, there, because all the land in front is a reserve." We must provide private enterprise with the key situations before it will be prepared to make these amenities available. Once they are established, there will then be no need for the Government to supply funds for that purpose.

Let us give private enterprise those spots that are likely to sell themselves once they are established. We should not shut them out; but that, I am afraid, is what is happening today. Mr. Heenan suggested that if the State hotels were sold—and I hope they will be—the money should be handed over for disposal by the Licensing Court to put into such hotels as it might like to visualise in certain places. What I have said might not be his exact words, but it is the tenor of his speech.

I should hate to see the Licensing Court laying a pattern of what we should have in the way of hotels for the purpose of attracting tourists to Western Australia. Over the years there has been no other court, commission or board—we may call it what we like—that has done a worse job for the State than has the Licensing Court. Time and time again that body has had the wool pulled over its eyes by various hotel licensees in the country districts. It has been told, "Because of war-time restrictions we cannot get the timber," and so on. That is what the Licensing Court has been told; and it has put up with that sort of excuse, and it will continue to do so in the future.

Let us have people on the Licensing Court who have an imaginative viewpoint; people who think in terms of progress for Western Australia. This body is all-powerful; there is no doubt about that. I am probably one of those who do not like all-powerful bodies which can dictate their own terms. When the court issues licenses to people for a restrictive trade, and when it keeps it a close preserve for the licensee of the district, then it must be an all-powerful body; it must be able to dictate terms with reference to matters beyond that of the immediate profit that is received by the hotel proprietor.

The members of the court must have imagination and look ahead to see what is required by the general public; not only by the general public but also by tourists. If a licensee or a future licensee is not prepared to build such accommodation, then he should not be given a license. If a present license-holder is not prepared to bring his premises into a condition

which is considered decent, then he should not get a renewal of his license. He should not be given 12 months or two years to carry out the necessary renovations; he should be given three months to issue a contract to complete the necessary alteration, or else!

Too much latitude has been allowed in the past; and unless the Licensing Court is prepared to face up to its obligations, then the sooner the Government thinks about sacking the personnel of the present Licensing Court, instead of trying to encourage tourism by means of this Bill, the better. For many years we have had a Licensing Court lacking not only in imagination but also in common decency in its idea of what the travelling public is entitled to.

I can name country hotels that are very short of what common decency would expect them to provide. I noticed when one member was speaking that there was an interjection to the effect that any hotels provided for the North-West would cost a lot of money because of transport and various other things. My view has always been that there is no area more suited in Western Australia for the setting up of motels than is the North-West; and that should be done if we are going to encourage tourism; and if we are going to encourage settlement. Of course, the same applies to the south.

Motels are a comparatively inexpensive way of providing good facilities for the travelling public; and there is no reason why, if reasonable standards are laid down by the Government and the Licensing Court, motels should not be licensed in the same way as hotels. That would be a start.

When Mr. Strickland was speaking he drew attention to the fact that overseas ships pass through Fremantle and visit such places as New Zealand. There is no reason why Western Australia should not enjoy that type of trade. There may be some harbours in the North which those ships could enter; and, as Mr. Strickland pointed out, if accommodation is provided on the ship there are many points to which tourists can be taken.

There are three ports in Western Australia where ships could call; and, by using the ships' accommodation, it would be possible for tourists to see many strange things; things that are strange, but true. Mr. Wise mentioned the baobab tree. Down south we have the tingle tingle tree; and from the butt of one tree, a four-roomed house can be constructed. These things are strange, but true. Once some people are able to see them, others will follow.

I support the second reading of this Bill with a lot of reserve. I say with reserve on the ground that I am sorry to see so many civil servants are to be appointed

to the authority, as I know full well that the majority of them lack imagination and will not take risks.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [5.34]: I desire to make two complaints and a suggestion in regard to this Bill. The suggestion is this: Like other speakers—I want it to be clearly understood I am not criticising civil servants—I think there are to be too many civil servants on this authority, and they will not have time to attend properly to the matters which will come before this body. Therefore, if there was ever an opportunity for this Government to give effect to all it has had to say about private enterprise, I believe this is it. Nothing has been said about appointing a female representative to this authority. I know of one lady in the city—she is not of my political faith at all—who is an outstanding person, and who could well be appointed to this authority. This lady has worked in some of the biggest hotels in Australia; she has plenty of time at her disposal, and she would be a valuable asset on an authority such as this.

Outside this Chamber I will give the Minister this lady's name so that if he is interested in my suggestion he will be able to approach her and discuss the matter. I believe that many of the complaints which have been made about hotel accommodation in Western Australia are quite justified. However, there are many reasons for this. I point out that the situations which call for complaint do not apply only to country hotels; they can also be found in some of our near-city hotels. I am not a drinking person; I do not worry about the bars, saloons, or lounges; but I do worry about the accommodation. I have been very concerned about this aspect of the hotel trade since I have been left alone in the world. I have stayed many nights in suburban and outer-suburban hotels, and I have been dissatisfied with the accommodation I have obtained.

I would like to see a lady on this authority, because it is the little niceties which attract people to our cities. I have no complaint to make about the hospitality of the people in this State, and I have never heard any. The criticism has not been about the staff in any of the hotels; it has been directed against the hotels, which have been starved on the financial side and have not been able to bring their accommodation up to the reasonable standard we would desire for visitors to our State.

I believe that our railways could play an important part in the matter of tourism. Various types of reso tours should be conducted with people living on the train. Some trips could be conducted to places near the city, and others to places much further away. When I visited the Perth railway station last Thursday evening I saw something to which I wish to

draw the attention of the Minister for Railways and also the new Commissioner of Railways. I am sure he would have been disgusted had he been there. The complaint I make is one which could be multiplied many times in regard to our railways; and could be experienced by people travelling from East to West.

I have travelled East many times lately, and I have done my best to tell people what a great State we have here. The people get on the Westland train from Kalgoorlie to Perth; it is a small train, but the people are satisfied because it is always clean. However, when, last Thursday night, I saw one of the carriages which was to take people to Kalgoorlie, I was disgusted, because there were no lights. When I say that, I mean there was just a flicker. The conductor reported the matter to the stationmaster, but what he was told I do not know. However, I am led to believe that the stationmaster said, "It will be all right when the train gets up the track a bit; the batteries are a bit flat."

I do not believe we should talk about tourism while we are prepared to expect people to travel long distances in a carriage which is not equipped with proper lighting. I believe that the stationmaster, or whoever was responsible, should have seen that the particular carriage was not used; especially as in the middle of the train there was a spare carriage which could have been used by these people. I was not travelling on the train, but a great many of my parliamentary colleagues were.

I wish the new Commissioner of Railways well in his position; and I believe there exists an opportunity for him to help the tourist trade. He should see that carriages are fit for people to travel in, particularly when they are travelling 375 miles. I hope my criticism is constructive. I wish the Government well in its attempt to do something for this State in the way of tourism; but I join with others who have criticised the composition of the proposed authority. People whose interests are outside of Government should be appointed. I support the Bill.

On motion by the Hon. R. C. Mattiske, debate adjourned.

ABSENCE OF PRESIDENT

Tributes to Relieving Officers

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

That the House do now adjourn.

As this is the last time that you, Sir, will be in the Chair as Deputy President during the absence of the President, I would like to take the opportunity of conveying to you my personal thanks for the very excellent way in which you have conducted the business of the House. You have done this to the credit of yourself and to the credit of the members of this Chamber; and I would like you to know that I appreciate what you have done.

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT (the Hon. W. R. Hall): Before putting the question for the adjournment, I desire to thank the Minister for Mines for the kind reference he has made concerning the carrying out of my duties as Deputy President. I also want to thank the Deputy Chairmen of Committees, members, and officers of the Legislative Council for their kind co-operation and consideration extended to me during the period concerned.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.43 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 17th September, 1959

CONTENTS

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :	Page
Water from Henty Brook, availability to Burekup farmers	1690
Land resumptions, Mt. Yokine-Wanneroo districts	1691
Rottnest Island, leasing of land	1691
Government Printing Office, tenders for Government requirements	1691
Geraldton slipway, size and completion	1691
Fruit fly, efficacy of ethylene-di-bromide fumigation	1692
Accommodation of natives, position at country hotels	1692
Diamond drilling, subsidy from Mines Department	1692
Commissioner of Railways, transfer of leave entitlements	1692
Water shortage, position at Marble Bar	1693
Used-car dealers, fidelity guarantee	1693
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE :	
Sittings of the House, adjournment during visit of overseas parliamentarians	1693
Bore water, gallonage used in metropolitan area	1693
Unemployment—	
Comparative figures for 1958 and 1959	1693
State with highest percentage	1694

BILLS :

Town Planning and Development Act Amendment (No. 2), 1r.	1694
Juries Act Amendment, 1r.	1694
Hire Purchase Act Amendment, 1r.	1694
State Hotels (Disposal), Com.	1694
Nurses Registration Act Amendment, returned	1705

CONTENTS—continued

BILLS—continued	Page
Main Roads Act (Funds Appropriation) Act Amendment, returned	1705
National Fitness Act Amendment—	
2r.	1705
Com., report	1706
Filled Milk, Council's amendments	1706
Fire Brigades Act Amendment, Council's amendment	1706
Land Tax Assessment Act Amendment, 2r.	1707
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act, Amendment 2r.	1707
SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE :	
Show Day adjournment	1709

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

WATER FROM HENTY BROOK

Availability to Burekup Farmers

1. Mr. I. W. MANNING asked the Minister for Works:
 - (1) Is he aware that several farmers at Burekup who are pumping their domestic water supply from Henty Brook upstream from the South-West Highway are being denied their riparian rights by being levied with an annual charge under the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act?
 - (2) Does he know that Henty Brook has adequately supplied the domestic needs of these farms since pumping commenced in 1917?
 - (3) Is he also aware that Henty Brook has always been generally regarded as a permanent stream and was only reduced to pools during a particularly dry summer?
 - (4) Which office in the department directed that these particular farmers be denied irrigation supply although their irrigation rates have been accepted by the department?
 - (5) Will he consider his previous decision and waive these illegal charges?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) Because the Brook was not perennial in all years until irrigation commenced, the settlers could not have riparian rights during later summer months. As departmental works now contribute to summer flow, annual charges are raised.
- (2) The department does not agree that this is so.