Point of Order

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: On a point of information, Mr. President, I try to be most generous when Bills are introduced. I would point out, however, that copies of this Bill were not available to us until the Minister had nearly finished his speech. It is requested that in future the Ministers endeavour to ensure that copies of the Bills are available to us before they make their speeches.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am sorry this happened. I was merely trying to fill in a gap between one Bill and another while my colleague was on the telephone. I did not realise that copies of the Bill had not been distributed, but I shall ensure that such distribution takes place in future before I make my speech.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. F. J. S. Wise (Leader of the Opposition).

DEBT COLLECTORS LICENSING BILL

Further Report

Further report of Committee adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Justice), and transmitted to the Assembly.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Further Report

Further report of Committee adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Justice), and transmitted to the Assembly.

House adjourned at 5.8 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 18th November, 1964

CONTENTS

	Page
BILLS—	
Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	2727
Com.; Report; 3r.	2735
Debt Collectors Licensing Bill—	
Receipt; 1r.	2744
Electoral Act Amendment Bill (No. 3)—	
Receipt; 1r.	2744
Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act Amendment Bill—Council's Amendmen	2745
BILLS—*continued*	Page
Iron Ore (Mount Goldsworthy) Agreement Bill—Council's Amendment	2746
Iron Ore (Mount Newman) Agreement Bill—Council's Amendment	2738
Mine Workers' Relief Act Amendment Bill—2r.	2748
Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—	
Intro.; 1r.	2719
2r.	2746
Weights and Measures Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	2720
Com.; Report; 3r.	2727
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Darryl Beamish—Offences: Confessions of Guilt	2721
Education—	
Carnarvon Junior High School: Enrolments for 1965	2720
Shearers: Technical Training at Albany	2722
Electricity Supplies: Power Stations—	
Site for New Station	2723
South Fremantle: Reduction of Output	2723
Eric Edgar Cooke—Offences: Claims of Commission	2721
Flooding at Harvey: Area of Evacuated Land	2722
Gas from B.P. Refinery at Kwinana—	
Amount Manufactured and Sold	2721
Surplus: Use for Proposed Power Station	2721
Land—	
Esperance Area: Sale of Undeveloped Blocks	2720
Esperance Land Development Company—	
Financial Assistance	2720
Road Work	2720
Shannon River Mill Clubhouse Land: Ownership	2724
Meat Inspection: Establishment of a Single Authority	2719
Medical School—Graduates: Number, and Districts of Practice	2726
Mine Workers' Relief Act—	
Dependant's Allowance	2721
Registrations under Section 50	2720
Narrows Bridge: Hump on Northern Approach	2725
Railways—	
Flashing Lights: Installation in Market Street, Guildford	2721
Kalgoorlie Train—	
Buffet Car Menu	2719
Second-class "Sit-Up" Accommodation	2719
Midland Railway: Burning-off in Shunting Yard and along Line	2726
Roads—	
Esperance-Ravensthorpe Road: Sealing Required and Date of Completion	2725
Main Roads Funds: Allocation to Esperance Shire Council and Works Programme	2724
Ravensthorpe-Ongerup Road: Sealing Required and Date of Completion	2725
State Engineering Works: Transfer of Machines to Doncaster-Hadfields	2722

CONTENTS—*continued*

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—*continued*	
Strawberry Production : Investigation of Queensland Methods	2722
Thomson, Mrs. Rona : Reduction of Minimum Sentence	2720
Totalisator Agency Board : Disbursements	2723
Traffic—Crosswalk for Guildford : Establishment near Penn-Rose Hospital	2722
W.A. Trotting Association : Increase in Returns	2725
Western Australian Marine Act : Appointment of Inspectors	2723
Workers' Compensation Act : Section 8—Successful Applicants for Compensation	2720
SHANNON RIVER MILL SITE—	
Tabling of Hawker Siddeley Lease Permit	2719

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

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Introduction and First Reading

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

SHANNON RIVER MILL SITE

Tabling of Hawker Siddeley Lease Permit

MR. BOVELL (Minister for Forests): Yesterday the honourable member for Warren asked me if I would lay on the Table of the House a copy of the lease or permit made between the Forests Department and Hawker Siddeley in connection with the Shannon River mill site.

I submit Saw Mill Lease Permit 169/33 for tabling for one week.

The lease permit was tabled.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

MEAT INSPECTION

Establishment of a Single Authority

1. Mr. W. A. MANNING asked the Minister for Agriculture:

   (1) Is it a fact that there is a growing requirement by authorities in our meat export markets for a meat inspection service to be organised and administered by the National Government?

   (2) Would conditions in this State be best met by constituting one authority to inspect both export and home consumption meat in registered export abattoirs?

   (3) Is he aware that agreement on those lines has already been established between the Commonwealth and South Australian Governments?

   (4) Is there any reason why the same agreement should not be adopted in this State?

   (5) Would legislation be necessary in order to adopt the South Australian system?

   Mr. NALDER replied:

   (1) and (2) It is a logical development for meat inspection to be carried out by a single authority whether the meat is destined for export or local consumption. This matter is under consideration.

   (3) Yes.

   (4) No. Negotiations are in hand.

   (5) No State legislation would be necessary.

KALGOORLIE TRAIN

Second-class "Sit-Up" Accommodation

2. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Railways:

   Would he please give earnest consideration to having the coaches used for second-class "sit-up" accommodation on the Kalgoorlie train converted so as to provide for comfortable facilities and more in keeping with the first-class "sit-up" accommodation?

   Mr. COURT replied:

   There are not any plans being considered to alter the present accommodation, prior to the introduction of standard gauge.

Buffet Car Menu

3. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Railways:

   (1) Have any complaints been received by him or the commission in respect of the limited variety and the use of canned foods comprising the menu available on the buffet car service on the Kalgoorlie train, since I drew his attention to this matter by correspondence soon after the buffet service was instituted on the Kalgoorlie train?

   (2) Will he now agree that my original representations in regard to this matter were justified?

   (3) Will he give early and earnest consideration to having a more interesting range of foods available, such as a greater variety in choice of cut sandwiches (cheese and ham being the only two types at present available) and the introduction of cold meats and salad during the summer season?

   Mr. COURT replied:

   (1) Not from any passenger on the train. The only occasion the service has been questioned was

in correspondence received from the Kalgoorlie Chamber of Commerce

(2) No.

(3) This matter was recently discussed when it was decided that no alteration would be made to the present service.

MRS. RONA THOMSON

Reduction of Minimum Sentence

4. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Child Welfare:

(1) Where the release of a woman from gaol because of the needs of her children is of concern to the Child Welfare Department, is there any provision for the Director of Child Welfare to make representations to the Probation and Parole Board for reducing her minimum sentence to a term related to the needs of the children for their mother?

(2) Has any such representation been made in the case of Mrs. Rona Thomson?

(3) If so, with what result?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

(1) There is no statutory provision.

(2) No.

(3) Answered by (2).

ESPERANCE LAND DEVELOPMENT COMPANY

Financial Assistance

5. Mr. MOIR asked the Treasurer:

(1) Have funds been made available to the Esperance Land Development Company by the Rural and Industries Bank?

(2) Have funds been made available to this company by the Government?

(3) If so, what amounts, for what purpose granted, and from what source?

Mr. BRAND replied:

(1) No.

(2) No.

(3) Answered by (1) and (2).

Road Work

6. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Has the Esperance Land Development Company carried out work for the Main Roads Department?

(2) If so, will he supply details?

(3) Have funds been made available at any time to this company by the Government to carry out road work?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) No.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) No.

LAND IN ESPERANCE AREA

Sale of Undeveloped Blocks

7. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Is he aware that undeveloped blocks in the Esperance area are on offer for sale by successful applicants who have not carried out any improvements?

(2) Will he take action to have this practice stopped?

(3) Will he indicate if there have been any blocks transferred from the allottee to another person where the development requirements have not been carried out by the person allotted the block by the Land Board?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

(1) No.

(2) Appropriate action will be taken, if and when necessary.

(3) Records show that improvements were in accordance with requirements for which allottees were responsible in blocks transferred by the allottees to other persons.

MINE WORKERS' RELIEF ACT

Registrations under Section 50

8. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

(1) How many persons have been registered under section 50 of the Mine Workers' Relief Act for the years 1960 to 1964 inclusive?

(2) What are the number of persons who have been notified as early silicosis, advanced silicosis, or who have contracted tuberculosis for each of these years?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

(1)

Year	Numbers Registered
1960	45
1961	58
1962	69
1963	105
1964 (to date)	101

(2)

Year	Early Silicosis	Advanced Silicosis	Tuberculosis
1960	50	5	11
1961	54	13	5
1962	50	10	6
1963	188	22	13
1964 to 30/9/64	53	8	4

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT: SECTION 8

Successful Applicants for Compensation

9. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Labour:

(1) Will he supply the numbers of successful applicants for compensation under section 8 of the Workers' Compensation Act for the years 1960 to 1964 inclusive?

(2) What number for each year were in various categories of percentage disability?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) and (2) Considerable research will be required to obtain and collate this information from metropolitan and Kalgoorlie sources.

As soon as the information is to hand the honourable member will be informed.

MINE WORKERS' RELIEF ACT

Dependant's Allowance

10. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

Is a dependant's allowance payable to a beneficiary under the Mine Workers' Relief Act who is—

(a) a single man and marries;

(b) a widower who remarries while receiving such benefits?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

(a) No.

(b) No.

GAS FROM B.P. REFINERY AT KWINANA

Amount Manufactured and Sold

11. Mr. MITCHELL asked the Minister for Electricity:

(1) What amount of gas is manufactured by the B.P. Refinery at Kwinana?

(2) What amount is at present sold?

Surplus: Use for Proposed Power Station

(3) Will the surplus gas from the refinery be used as a source of power for the proposed power station to be built in this area?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) This varies with the oil product pattern. Currently it is approximately 500 tons per day and except for a small quantity all is used in the refinery for refinery process operations.

(2) Approximately 10 tons per day.

(3) In view of the future nitrogenous fertiliser plant the utilisation of gas as a fuel for external organisations cannot be assessed until all refinery requirements are satisfied.

ERIC EDGAR COOKE

Offences: Claims of Commission

12. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Police:

(1) Apart from cases of homicide, did E. E. Cooke claim to have committed any offences which were subsequently considered not to have been his responsibility?

(2) If so, what were they?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) One case of assault causing bodily harm to a female; and 10 cases of breaking and entering.

DARRYL BEAMISH

Offences: Confessions of Guilt

13. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Police:

(1) Apart from offences for which he was adjudged by courts to be responsible, did Darryl Beamish "confess" to committing any offences which were subsequently accepted as not having been committed by him?

(2) If so, what were they?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

(1) During September and October 1960, the police questioned Beamish and his deaf and dumb accomplice, Elliott, on approximately 60 cases of stealing and receiving. The two men concerned made a number of admissions, but owing to lack of proof in certain cases charges were preferred in only 24 instances.

(2) Answered by (1).

FLASHING LIGHTS

Installation in Market Street, Guildford

14. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) When was the last meeting of the Level Crossing Protection Committee held?

(2) Was the matter of crossing bell or lights over Market Street, Guildford considered and what decision was arrived at?

(3) Is he or the department aware that approximately 15 to 20 slow learning children cross this spot twice daily in addition to doctors, patients and staff visiting St. Vincent's Hospital?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) The 16th September, 1964.

(2) Yes, the committee agreed that as the crossing served a relatively small residential area flashing lights could not be recommended ahead of other crossings. It was further agreed that consideration be given to closure of the crossing; also that the cat's-eye "Stop" signs be replaced with the fully reflectorised type to be made available by the Main Roads Department. Replacement will be effected within a few days.

(3) Yes.

CROSSWALK FOR GUILDFORD

Establishment near Penn-Rose Hospital

15. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Transport:

As children attending the slow learning school at Market Street, Guildford, twice daily are required to cross the road in the vicinity of Penn-Rose Hospital, will the department provide a pedestrian crossing to ensure right of way for the above children?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

As the children are always in the care of a responsible attendant, usually an adult, it is not considered that the provision of a crosswalk is warranted.

16. *This question was postponed.*

STRAWBERRY PRODUCTION

Investigation of Queensland Methods

17. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Is he aware of a letter to the editor in *The West Australian*, the 13th instant, regarding production of strawberries in Queensland for home consumption, canning, and export?

(2) As a crop of approximately 2,000 tons is alleged per annum, will he send a suitable officer to that State to investigate the type of plant, soil, cultivation methods, and other conditions which make possible such a remarkable crop?

(3) As Geraldton, Carnarvon, and possibly other areas of Western Australia have similar climatic conditions to Queensland, will he have his departmental officers investigate trial plantings in such suitable areas with a view to perhaps later satisfying local demand and possible markets in Malaysia, Singapore, and other Asian markets?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Horticultural officers are aware of the Queensland areas mentioned, which have been recently visited by two officers from Western Australia.

(3) Soil and climatic conditions in Western Australia are different from those in the Redlands area of Queensland. Trials with strawberry varieties are being continued in certain suitable areas of the State. These have included Carnarvon, the metropolitan area, and Manjimup.

SHEARERS

Technical Training at Albany

18. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Education:

(1) In furtherance of technical training now undertaken under government authority, has he considered including the teaching and training of shearers?

(2) If so, has consideration been given for this course to be included in the curriculum at the Albany training centre?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

(1) No.

(2) No.

FLOODING AT HARVEY

Area of Evacuated Land

19. Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister for Works:

What was the total area of land over which people were evacuated from their homes at Harvey late on the 3rd August and early and late on the 4th August, 1964?

Mr. WILD replied:

Approximately 20 square miles in an area bounded by South-Western Highway on the east, Hope Avenue on the south, Uduc townsite on the west, north end of Plain Paddocks on the north.

STATE ENGINEERING WORKS

Transfer of Machines to Doncaster-Hadfields

20. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Has the firm of Doncaster-Hadfields selected the machines from the forging section of the State Engineering Works sold to it by the Government for £10,000?

(2) If "Yes," how many machines have been selected?

(3) Was the Keiserling upsetting machine one of those selected?

(4) When is it anticipated that the machines selected will be removed?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Eleven, and associated plant and equipment.

(3) Yes.

(4) Tenders have been called for the factory building. A timetable can be determined more accurately when a contract is let by the company. Transfer of the machines will commence when the factory building is completed. The machines will be transferred progressively.

POWER STATIONS

South Fremantle: Reduction of Output

21. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Electricity:

(1) What was the reason for reducing the output of power from the South Fremantle station several years ago and transferring the load to the station at Bunbury?

Site for New Station

(2) If it were a matter of economics, what are the factors which outweigh those previously considered as decisive and now favour the establishment of the proposed new station at Kwinana against its erection on or near the Collie coalfields?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) Bunbury power station is more efficient and the freight rate for coal from Collie is lower.

(2) Adequate water is as essential as cheap coal for a modern power station and the raising of Wellington Dam is the important factor which made possible the siting of a large power station at Muja. The commission's combination of power stations will use all the presently known resources of economical coal and water in the Collie area.

The commission, therefore, must now turn to the next most economical development and site two generating units at the load centre, burning oil.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MARINE ACT

Appointment of Inspectors

22. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Works:

Have final determinations and decisions been made by the Harbour and Light Department on the appointment of full-time, part-time, and honorary inspectors to police the Western Australian Marine Act at coastal resorts, rivers, tributaries, and inland waters in the interest of safety and life preservation this coming holiday season?

Mr. WILD replied:

One of the terms of reference of the Royal Commission on the Safety of Vessels required the commission to make recommendations regarding the policing of the Navigable Waters Regulations. Until the findings and recommendations of the commission are received, no action can be taken regarding the appointment of full-time and part-time inspectors.

The Harbour and Light Department has appointed six honorary inspectors to assist in policing these regulations. Others will be appointed if reputable organisations in various localities, where it is considered such an inspector would be an advantage, would submit a recommendation for some suitable person.

23. *This question was postponed.*

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Disbursements

24. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Police:

(1) What amount was paid to the State Treasury by the Totalisator Agency Board for the three months of July, August, and September, 1964?

(2) What amount was paid to the Treasury from the receipts of the off-course betting tax?

(3) What amount was paid to the W.A. Turf Club and the W.A. Trotting Association by the Totalisator Agency Board in the same period?

(4) What was the amount of the disbursements of these two clubs by money received from the Totalisator Agency Board to—

(a) country racing clubs;

(b) country trotting clubs?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

(1)—

	£	s.	d.
July, 1964	44,388	1	0
August, 1964	71,234	7	0
September, 1964	67,197	3	0

(2)—

	£	s.	d.
July, 1964	14,199	6	6
August, 1964	21,443	18	0
September, 1964	19,447	2	6

(3) The amounts paid to the W.A. Turf Club and the W.A. Trotting Association by the Totalisator Agency Board in, but not for, the three months of July, August, and September, 1964, were:—

		W.A. Turf Club £	W.A. Trotting Association £
July		Nil	Nil
August		84,684	51,316
September		Nil	Nil
(4) (a) July		Nil	
August		16,936	
September		Nil	
(b) July		Nil	
August		Nil	
September		7,698	

25. *This question was postponed.*

SHANNON RIVER MILL CLUB-HOUSE LAND

Ownership

26. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) How does he reconcile the answers to questions given on Wednesday, the 23rd October, 1963, and Wednesday, the 11th November, 1964, in relation to the ownership of land on which the Shannon River Mill Club House stands?

(2) To what department did Mr. Asplin make his application for a grant in fee simple—the Lands Department or the Forests Department?

(3) Has Mr. Asplin been informed of the obvious change of status of the land in question?

(4) Does he consider the failure to inform Mr. Asplin, if any, on behalf of the club a distinct lack of ethical behaviour?

(5) Is it customary or legal to include land set aside as a townsite (*vide* the Minister's answer on Wednesday, the 23rd October, 1963) in a sawmilling site permit?

(6) If so—

(a) what authority is there for so doing;

(b) what precedent exists of this having been done?

(7) What action is necessary before land may be set aside as a townsite?

(8) Was this done in the matter of Reserve No. 13305 on which the Shannon River Mill Club House now stands?

(9) What action is necessary to revoke or rededicate land set aside for the purpose of a townsite?

(10) Has this action been so taken in this case?

(11) Will he consider the following:—

(a) Under an agreement operative from the 31st July, 1961, the Treasurer agreed to dispose of the State Building Supplies to Hawker Siddeley Building Supplies Pty. Ltd.

(b) On the 28th February, 1962, an application for a grant in fee simple for the land on which the Shannon River Mill Club stands.

(c) The Shannon River Mill was an integral part of State Building Supplies disposed of by the Treasurer on the 31st July, 1961.

(d) On the 25th August, 1964, Hawker Siddeley Building Supplies informed the Conservator of Forests that arrangements were being made to lease club premises on suitable terms to Shannon River Mill Club?

(12) Why the delay from the 31st July, 1961, to the 25th August, 1964, on the part of Hawker Siddeley Building Supplies to issue a lease to the club?

(13) Was the Shannon River Mill Club premises included as part of the agreement between the Treasurer and Hawker Siddeley Building Supplies?

(14) If so, what part?

(15) As it appears that an injustice has been done to the members of the Shannon River Mill Club because of doubt as to whether this club stands on—

(a) land set apart for a townsite; and

(b) land which is part of sawmilling site permit No. 169/33 granted Hawker Siddeley Buliding Supplies;

and the club has been further prejudiced by the delay on the part of departments to resolve this doubt, will he use his good offices to ensure that justice is done in the matter of this club's lease?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

I ask that this question be postponed until Tuesday. It will be seen that a considerable amount of information is required. As a matter of fact it is more like a cross-examination.

MAIN ROADS FUNDS

Allocation to Esperance Shire Council and Works Programme

27. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What is the expenditure allocation from main roads funds for the Esperance Shire Council district for the current financial year?

(2) Where will the works be carried out?

(3) How much of the works programme wil be carried out by—

(a) the Main Roads Department;

(b) the Esperance Shire Council?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) £261,120.

(2) Funds will be expended on the following roads—

	£
Coolgardie-Esperance Road	34,950
Ongerup - Ravensthorpe - Esperance Road	32,000
Esperance-Israelite Bay Road	57,500
Esperance Ring Road	40,000
Esperance-Mt. Merivale-Boyadup Road	2,000
Roads in Grass Patch Area	2,000
Dalyup-Gibson Road	1,500
Tourist Roads	4,500
Cape Le Grande Road	1,500
Gibson East Road	1,500
Balladonia-Israelite Bay Road	500
General allocation	4,000
School bus routes	2,170
	£181,120
Neridup-Lort River area	3,000
Lort River-Munglinup River area	12,000
Esperance Plains North of Location 13 area	10,000
Grass Patch West-Lort River area	14,000
Scadden-Truslove area	5,000
Scadden-Fleming Grove area	6,000
Neridup Locations area	30,000
	£80,000
	£261,120

(3) It has been arranged that the Esperance Shire Council will carry out work with Main Roads Department funds on developmental roads to the limit of the capacity of their plant and work force, and that the department will do the remainder of the work. The Divisional Engineer is in contact with the shire on this matter.

ESPERANCE-RAVENSTHORPE ROAD

Sealing Required and Date of Completion

28A. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What amount of sealing is required to complete the Esperance-Ravensthorpe Road?

(2) When is completion of this work expected?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) 16 miles in the Shire of Esperance and 31.3 miles in the Shire of Ravensthorpe.

(2) The sealing of the 16 miles in the Shire of Esperance will be carried out during the coming summer. Of the 31.3 miles in the Shire of Ravensthorpe, 13.8 miles will be sealed early in 1965 and 14 miles will be primed with tar before the end of this year. Sealing of the road between Ravensthorpe and Esperance will be completed in 1964-65.

RAVENSTHORPE-ONGERUP ROAD

Sealing Required and Date of Completion

28B. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What amount of sealing is required to complete sealing the Ravensthorpe-Ongerup Road?

(2) When will this work be completed?

Mr. WILD replied.

(1) 37.8 miles in the Shire of Ravensthorpe and 20.8 miles in the Shire of Gnowangerup.

(2) The sealing of the 20.8 miles in the Shire of Gnowangerup is now in hand and will be completed before Christmas. Provision of funds for sealing the section of the road in the Ravensthorpe Shire will depend on the growth of traffic and availability of funds, having regard to the overall road needs of the State.

W.A. TROTTING ASSOCIATION

Increase in Returns

29. Mr. O'CONNOR asked the Minister fo Police:

(1) As the annual reports of th Totalisator Agency Board sho returns to metropolitan trottin for the years ended the 31st Jul 1963, £115,871; 1964, £139,992, a increase of £24,121, and the an nual report of the Western Aus tralian Trotting Association show returns to the 31st July, 196 £95,666; 1964, £83,562, a decreas of £12,104, was there a change i the W.A. Trotting Association ac counting procedure which cu short the full year?

(2) If so, what was the increase i the trotting clubs' returns based o a full year?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

(1) Yes, the Trotting Associatio changed its accounting procedu to take into account only mon actually received during the yea

(2) £24,121.

NARROWS BRIDGE

Hump on Northern Approach

30. Mr. D. G. MAY asked the Minister f Works:

(1) Is he aware of the existence of large hump in the road on t northern approach to the Narro Bridge?

(2) Is he further aware that the hump is occasioning considerable inconvenience to the travelling public and also retarding the flow of traffic during peak hours?

(3) If the answer is in the affirmative, will he have the matter investigated with a view to obviating the present unsatisfactory position?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) Yes. The hump is caused by the settlement of a road pavement on each side of the Spring Street drain pipes. Work is well advanced on the construction of a diversion of this drain down William Street. It is anticipated that this work will be completed next month. The Perth City Council will then construct a drain to cope with local drainage from the car park. It is expected that this will be done towards the end of January and the section of the existing drain under the approach road will then be removed and the road levelled.

(2) and (3) Answered by (1).

MEDICAL SCHOOL

Graduates, Number, and Districts of Practice

31. Mr. BURT asked the Minister for Health:

(1) How many students have graduated from the W.A. Medical School since its establishment?

(2) Of these, how many are practising—

(a) in country districts in this State;

(b) in the metropolitan area;

(c) elsewhere?

(3) How are the remainder of the graduates engaged?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) 168, including 28 who were awarded Adelaide degrees, having completed the last years of their course in W.A. in 1957 and 1958.

(2) (a) 13.

(b) Hospital posts 91;
Specialist practice 3;
General practice 9.

(c) (i) Academic posts—University 5;

(ii) Eastern States:—
Hospital posts 6;
General practice 2;

(iii) Overseas — postgraduate study 32;

(iv) Armed Forces:—
Army 2;
Navy 2.

(3) Not in practice 3.

CARNARVON JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Enrolments for 1965

32. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Education:

What is the estimated enrolment at the Carnarvon Junior High School in—

(a) primary school, and

(b) in secondary school in first, second, and third-year classes, for 1965?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

(a) 600

(b)

1st-year class	70
2nd-year class	55
3rd-year class	35
	160

MIDLAND RAILWAY

Burning-off in Shunting Yard, and along Line

33. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is he aware the normal burning off of grass, weeds, etc., has not taken place on the Midland Railway Company's line or shunting yards this year?

(2) Will he have the matter investigated?

(3) Will he have steps taken to burn off along the line in the Crescent area and in the shunting yard area at an early date to save anxiety to residents?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) Yes, the fuel is not yet sufficiently dry for satisfactory burning.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) Arrangements for burning-off are in hand.

34. *This question was postponed.*

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 17th November, on the following motion by Mr. Craig (Minister for Police):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [2.33 p.m.]: The Minister who introduced the Bill did so in a speech that was illuminating and inspiring, so much so as to cause me to interject occasionally. It would appear that the Bill has been brought down as a result of conferences held between the representatives of the States and the Commonwealth, and that it has been introduced in anticipation of the introduction of the metric system of measurements.

As a result of the amendment, the law will not come into operation until a date has been fixed by proclamation. I was very relieved to find that set down in the Bill after reading the explanation on page 5 of the metric system of measures and weights which is to apply. Before I resume my seat I propose to read that particular part of the Bill. I think it is a good idea to have it inserted in *Hansard* as a permanent record. Its incorporation in *Hansard* should be a great help to students of the metric system in the future. I doubt very much whether I will become one of those students.

Apparently the need for action at this time arises out of the fact that there has been some degree of agreement, especially on the part of the Commonwealth, in relation to the new system of measurement which is to take place, particularly in regard to the drugs which are used in the medical profession and which have been approved under what is known as the *British Pharmacopoeia*, 1963, system.

Mr. Craig: Can I help you on that one?

Mr. HAWKE: I was happy yesterday to find the Minister and myself finally in agreement as to the exact pronunciation of the word. I could tell a long story about a similar word, but the time is, perhaps, not opportune or sufficient.

The proposal in the Bill will allow the State Government to be in a position to issue a proclamation at the proper time to bring this new metric system of measurement into operation. The system is already operating to some extent in connection with the Commonwealth scheme. I understand it is also being used by a number of doctors in prescribing Commonwealth pharmaceutical benefits, and also in the training of medical students.

So it would appear that the system is to some extent in operation within Australia, and it is advisable for each State Government at least to have legislation on the Statute book capable of being brought into operation by the issue of a proclamation when the time comes to bring this new system into effect. Most other States have, I believe, passed similar legislation to this. Some have probably gone a bit further than we propose to go in the Bill.

I propose to read the explanation of the metric system given at page 5 of the Bill, commencing at line 10—

Measures of Weight

The standard kilogramme shall be the unit of standard measure of metric weight from which all other metric weights and all measures having reference to metric weight shall be ascertained.

One thousand such kilogrammes shall be a tonne; and one hundred such kilogrammes shall be a quintal.

One-tenth part of such kilogramm shall be a hectogramme; one-hu dredth part of such kilogramme sh be a dekagramme, and one-thousand part of such kilogramme shall be gramme.

One-tenth part of such gramm shall be a decigramme; one hundred part of such gramme shall be a cen gramme; and one-thousandth part such gramme shall be a milligramm

Measures of Capacity

The standard litre shall be the ur or standard measure of the metric sy tem of capacity.

One thousand such litres shall be kilolitre; one hundred such litres sh be a hectolitre; and ten such litr shall be a dekalitre.

One-tenth part of such litre shall a decilitre; one-hundredth part of su litre shall be a centilitre; one-tho sandth part of such litre shall be millilitre; and one-millionth part such litre shall be a micrilitre.

I am sure honourable members will deeply grateful to me for having explain the intricacies of this system, and for ha ing explained it very clearly, I hope. support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. CRAIG (Toodyay—Minister Police) [2.38 p.m.]: I would like to tha the Leader of the Opposition for his su port of the Bill. I feel that any doul honourable members might have had to what is implied by the metric syst have been dispelled by the explanati given by the honourable gentleman.

Mr. Hawke: Thank you.

Mr. CRAIG: It is suggested that t system will come into effect approximat on the 1st May next. In any case t legislation will fit in with the propos Commonwealth legislation. We are anxi that we do not contravene the Commo wealth Act so far as benefits under t free medicine scheme are concerned. commend the second reading of the I to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion Mr. Craig (Minister for Police), and tra mitted to the Council.

ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 17th Nove ber, on the following motion by Mr. Nal (Minister for Agriculture):—

That the Bill be now read a sec time.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [2.44 p.m.]: This Bill proposes to amend the Abattoirs Act in one very important particular. Under the present law the authorities controlling the Midland Junction Abattoir have the right to borrow money and obtain credit. Apparently this provision in the law has not been found to be very workable, with the result that the board of that abattoir has had to call very largely upon State loan funds, as against raising its own capital requirements by the use of borrowing powers at present under the law.

Under the amendment contained in the Bill the board will be given more extensive borrowing powers which will enable it to borrow money on a much wider basis than the existing Act permits. The borrowings of the board are to be guaranteed by the Treasurer. I do not anticipate that the board will at any stage not be in a position to meet capital repayments, and interest payments, but the Bill provides that in the event of such a situation arising the Treasurer would have authority to meet such shortages from the public account.

It is clear from a number of Bills with which we have had to deal during the last year or two that various boards which exist are given extensive borrowing powers to carry out their own borrowing operations. This will certainly relieve the Treasury from making funds available from the General Loan Fund. It has been the practice in previous years to enable these authorities to carry out capital works and capital improvements, and as a result of this development more of the general loan funds available to the Treasury each year will be capable of being used on schools, hospitals, and activities of that kind.

Obviously, under this new line of policy, the State as a whole will go much more heavily into debt; but, at the same time, additional assets will be created by the various governmental authorities which are given their own independent borrowing powers. As we seem to live in an era when going into debt is the acknowledged and approved thing—the Australian way of life as it were—I suppose we need not be unduly worried at this new development. Governments and individuals seem to be encouraged to go head over heels into debt in the belief that everything will be all right tomorrow, or the next year. I am sure we will all join very earnestly in hoping that that anticipation will, in fact, be proved correct. Should the day of reckoning come for governments, semi-governments, individuals, and other organisations, then, of course, it will be a very sad day of reckoning for those people.

However, as this proposal would appear to put the Midland Junction Abottoir Board in a position to raise its own capital requirements as a result of the borrowing power granted to it, thus relieving the moneys from the General Loan Fund from pressures placed upon them, I support the Bill.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [2.48 p.m.]: I support the Bill, but I wish to say a few words concerning it. I support the idea of raising funds in this way for various boards, because it does relieve the loan funds available for use in the State.

The only point I would query is the advisability of doing this in connection with the Midland Junction Abattoir. I make these remarks in the form of a warning as to what the position could be. I notice that over recent years varying amounts have been spent on capital expenditure—amounts varying from about £70,000 to £150,000. Some of these details are worth recording and noting. For instance, in 1960 the loan capital increase for the year was £74,906. I have no details of that. But in 1961 the total was £120,000 which included an amenities block for slaughterfloor employees, two mutton chillers, extension to sheep and pig lairages; two 100-ton evaporator condensers; one 78-ton compressor, and a 460 ft. bore with pump.

In 1962, the loan capital increase was £150,000. This included a new building for the use of the sheepskin buyers on sale days; a 10,000 lb. water tube boiler; new hollow shaft melter, and extensions to sheepyards. In 1963, the loan capital increase was £90,000, which included the second stage of sheep and pig lairage extensions; six sets of track scales; additional Laabs cooker in by-products section, and overhead bridge connectiong the northern end of saleyards with the existing bridge. I have not yet received the figures for 1964. I believe they were laid on the Table of the House this afternoon, but it is too late for me to get hold of them.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to a matter dealt with by the Controller of Abattoirs (Mr. Rowland) in his report of 1960. I do this because I see that in the future the Abattoirs Board will decide whether it needs expenditure of £100,000 in a year. It will still have to be passed by the Treasurer—that is true—but up to now when it has made a request, the Treasurer would analyse the position and say, "I cannot afford it out of loan funds. Perhaps you had better have another look at this and see if you can reduce it." However, next year with this money-raising permission, the board will submit its requirements, perhaps for £100,000, for the approval of the Treasurer, but on that occasion the Treasurer could say, "This appears to be a reasonable requirement and the board can raise its own money." I imagine in those circumstances the proposal would be more readily endorsed than in the past. This expenditure may be justified, but it could mean an

expenditure of £100,000 each year which could be fully justified in the eyes of the board.

I notice the capital in the works at the present time is something just over £1,500,000. In 10 years' time, £100,000 per year, capital investment at Midland Junction would be £2,500,000; and in 20 years, which is not a long time in the way we look at things here, it could be £3,500,000. I think it is worth noting the large amount of money that will be invested in the Midland abattoir in 10 or 20 years' time and asking ourselves how long the abattoir will continue where it is. I think that is the point. I wish to draw attention to page 11 of the report of Mr. Rowland.

Mr. Jamieson: You only say that while the honourable member for Swan is not in his place.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: In this special report of the Controller of Abattiors in 1960, on page 11, he refers to what he saw in various parts of the world in regard to the aspect about which I have been speaking, but I have selected Chicago, as it is the meat city of the world. I will read some extracts, which are as follows:—

> Perhaps the most stark lesson in decentralisation is provided by Chicago, which in the past had been the recognised meat production centre for the United States—located as it is in the centre of the Mid West, famous for its gigantic packing houses, none of which operate today.
>
> The great firms of Swifts and Armours have in recent years and months entirely closed down. These multi-storied, huge establishments employing many thousands, capitalised to enormous sums involving scores of millions of dollars, have been forced by a number of influences to decentralise into smaller units, located in the areas of production and over a range of anything up to two hundred and fifty miles from Chicago.

Further down on the same page he had this to say—

> . . . the story can be told of Armours who, in an endeavour to bring their works up to date and cope with wage and industrial improvements, invested something in the vicinity of fifteen million dollars on new plant and mechanical equipment. This enormous expenditure, invested to economise on the labour and time-distance factors, failed to ensure economical results, so that sooner than suffer further losses, that company sold its new plant as scrap and shut down the works. Armours have now decentralised works throughout the States, with small, compact, and modern two-storey packing houses located in zones of livestock production.

The last paragraph is as follows:—

> The former throughput of livestock through Swifts and Armours in Chicago is now treated, and in increased quantities, by some twenty or so smaller establishments in a scheme of decentralisation, and under various ownership. These decentralised works are located in the Mid West corn belt and all through the South into the Mississippi Valley. It is interesting to note that the very great competitive element which exists between these several packing house establishments has caused them to locate their plants in strategic centres where controlled livestock supply is being produced.

I give this evidence because I feel that although at the moment this Bill can be justified, there should be a note of warning attached to it that Midland Junction cannot go on forever where it is. Its days must be limited because of congestion of traffic, population, and so on.

I cannot imagine the honourable member for Swan would think that Midland Junction is going to be stagnant in growth: and over the next few years we will find these works are in the middle of a built-up area. The position of the works will be most inconvenient as are metropolitan works in Victoria and New South Wales at the present time. In those States these works have become a tremendous problem and it is difficult to know how to get rid of them.

The abattoirs will be forced to do the same as the people in Chicago and sell their plant as scrap and get further away to where the stock is being raised. As I have said, at the present time this Bill can be justified; but I wanted to add these remarks as a note of warning that the future must be closely watched or we will have a loss of £3,500,000 or £2,500,000 as the case may be, because we may have to scrap what we are now trying to build up.

No-one would say the present works must not be kept modernised while they are in their present location. I would not say that. They must be modernised in these days of demands from overseas for inspections and different ways of preparing the meat, and we cannot be behind the times in these respects. As I have said, for the time being this measure is justified, but it must be accepted with a note of warning. The position must be carefully watched in the ensuing years to see that we do not build up a capital asset which turns out to be something of a liability because of its location.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [2.57 p.m.]: I listened with interest to the honourable member for Narrogin and his ideas in respect of things that may occur at the Midland Junction Abattoir. Incidentally

he kept referring to Midland Junction closing down rather than the abattoir closing down; and on that issue the honourable member for Swan will take him to task.

Mr. W. A. Manning: I was referring to the abattoirs.

Mr. JAMIESON: We appreciate that.

Mr. Brady: The Midland Junction Abattoir is in Bushmead, not Midland.

Mr. JAMIESON: The honourable member compared the set-up at Midland Junction in a State with something like a population of 700,000 with the position in Chicago where there is a population of between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 in the city itself, together with the fact that it had been the principal abattoir supplying meat to the nation by the package method. The total population is about 140,000,000 and such a comparison is taking things a little too far.

Mr. W. A. Manning: I said that Mr. Rowland found the same position throughout the world, according to his report.

Mr. JAMIESON: The honourable member instanced that in Chicago the abattoir was concentrated in areas where the meat producers were; and nothing like that has been done in Australia, nor could it be, because it would be unreasonable and uneconomic. It would not be possible to arrange for an economic supply of the vast number of beasts required to feed the whole of the Australian continent.

I think it will be a long while before we have to shift the Midland abattoir; but the honourable member has suggested something on which we should keep our eyes in regard to decentralisation. It is necessary to make a study and see just how economic a proposition is before a new project is commenced. Even cities these days are uneconomic when they reach a certain development; and for pointing this out the honourable member is to be commended. However, I think the principal works at Bushmead have a long way to go before they will reach the size where they will give us any particular worry, bearing in mind that we have associated works up to 100 miles away; and others will no doubt be developed.

At present there is need for doing something about building up the modern floors that are provided to economically treat the carcase meat. There is this need even though Perth is small in comparison with the very large cities of the world. It would seem to me that because of our transportation methods and because of its central location, the abattoir at Bushmead is likely to have a long life. Ultimately we may have to decentralise our abattoirs instead of developing them into multi-storey buildings on which there are high rates and taxes. It will then be time to look around for some form of decentralised abattoirs that would effectively supply all centres. But at this juncture it would appear that the abattoir at Bushmead will have to continue to serve Perth until the city grows to such an extent that it is no longer an economical proposition to centre the abattoir in one area.

MR. BRADY (Swan) [3.2 p.m.]: The idea of allowing the board to raise finance in order to carry on its work is necessary. I cannot agree with the honourable member for Narrogin that we will have to be careful in case we build up a capital asset which is not justified. This abattoir has been built up over the last 30 or 40 years and it is proving more economical every year. That is so because there is a greater through-put, and methods are now being adopted in regard to slaughtering which were not thought of years ago. More work can be done at the abattoir than is being done at present. It is uneconomical to the State to have abattoirs built up in country centres to handle a few hundred head of cattle when there is an organisation already in existence which can handle thousands of head of cattle.

Mr. Nalder: The honourable member for Albany won't agree with you there.

Mr. BRADY: I know that; and the Minister will not agree, either. But I have seen this abattoir grow and the experts have been trained there. In my opinion, there should be more work done at this abattoir than is being done at present, and as this Government envisages will be done in the future.

It is one of the most modern abattoirs of its kind in the southern hemisphere. The works manager cannot be faulted in regard to his views concerning treatment of carcases and the general activities of the abattoir. He has travelled widely and is a dedicated man. He must have saved the producers of this State thousands of pounds in the way in which he has handled the activities of that organisation. It is not an easy organisation to handle. There are most difficult problems from an industrial point of view alone. It is not the type of employment which the average man seeks. But the manager and his staff, and the board controlling the abattoir, have done a remarkable job in the face of grave difficulties.

In addition, during the years in which it has been established there have been established holding paddocks alongside this abattoir in order that it can do the work it was set up to do. That land is already tied up and cannot be subdivided. It would be a grave mistake to see the work of the abattoir in any way interfered with and these holding paddocks subsequently cut up into residential lots.

If we are going to expand the S.E.C. and have suitable back-loading and forward-loading for our standard gauge railway and for our 3 ft. 6 in. railway, then we have to have the works in the metropolitan area to be able to have this forward and

outward loading. The abattoir provides the opportunity of having this centre whereby the railways can be used most economically. As the member for the district, I feel there should be greater activities undertaken at the abattoir than are undertaken at present, in order to absorb the great amount of labour that from time to time is unemployed. In recent years I have referred to the chronic state of unemployment in the Swan electorate. If we are going to take away these local establishments and reduce their activities, we are going to reduce the employment factor, and we are going to reduce the future outlets for our young people who are leaving school.

Mr. W. A. Manning: Who suggested taking them away?

Mr. BRADY: The implication is there. The honourable member for Narrogin does not want to see any more money spent on the abattoir. He wants to see it spent in Narrogin; but I do not agree that that would be economical. The abattoir has existed for 30 or 40 years, and it should remain where it is. The men have been trained and the work can be done most effectively, efficiently, and economically. To curtail the amount of capital expenditure here would be to reduce the efficiency of the abattoir. While I am the member for Swan I shall advocate that the money be spent where it should be spent; namely in the Bushmead area—the same as we should be spending railway money in the railway workshops instead of giving the money to Tomlinsons.

Mr. Court: They will be pleased to hear that!

Mr. BRADY: We should not widen the whole of the cost structure to make it more difficult for the State to carry on economically the activities which should be carried on. Instead of widening the area where the money is being spent, we should be converting it so that we can achieve the greatest economical result from the money being spent. Even though it might not satisfy some of the country members to see that take place, that is the logical approach from an economical viewpoint. It might not be a logical approach from a political viewpoint, because it might not satisfy some honourable members; but if it is going to cost twice the amount of money to slaughter cattle in Narrogin, Albany, or Geraldton, then it will not be an economical proposition for the State and for primary producers.

I am all for seeing that the money is spent where it is being spent in order to improve the efficiency of the abattoir at Bushmead, and we should let the board, which has done a good job, continue with its work. I could suggest a lot of improvements to the board, but I would probably be told that I did not know anything about the industry; that I did not know the first thing about it. Strangely enough, one of the first industries about which I learnt anything was the slaughtering industry.

However, that is by the way. While on the matter of the abattoir, I think the board could do well by having a member of the trade union sitting on the board to help with difficult industrial problems which arise from time to time. The union representative might be able to suggest various methods of approach to some of the problems which would make the working of the abattoir more economical than at present. But, as the board is at present constituted, it does not want anything to do with the views of the trade union movement. It only wants the views of certain people who think they know all about the industry but who really have a lot to learn. Even the Works Manager himself saw a lot of improvements while overseas about five or six years ago. He did not expect to see such advances, and he has introduced some of them, where advisable, into the works.

I wanted to make these few remarks because it might be considered that silence is consent. If I sat here like a dumb galah, or dumb cluck, and said nothing while honourable members on the other side of the House told the Government and the Opposition what should be done in regard to the Bushmead abattoir, I would not be worthy of my salt.

Mr. W. A. Manning: You didn't hear what I said when I interjected.

Mr. BRADY: I heard a lot more than the honourable member thinks I heard. Money should not be spent on abattoirs away from Bushmead because it would not prove to be beneficial ultimately. It might be beneficial to the people of Narrogin, but not for the State, and that is what we have to consider. That is what I am considering when I speak as I am doing at the moment. I believe that abattoirs should function efficiently, and one of the ways to function efficiently is to have the money spent in the area where it proves most economical.

MR. HALL (Albany) [3.13 p.m.]: On this particular occasion I must be at variance with my colleague. He sits very close to me, Mr. Speaker, and I hope you will give me some protection. The honourable member for Swan has elaborated on the points for the protection of his electorate and we must congratulate him on that fact. However, when he talks about centralising the abattoirs of the State I want him to realise that when we export our beasts from the country, and do not agist them in the country, and the by-products are not treated in the country, we are exporting employment from those areas. The employment is going from the country to the metropolitan area.

If we can establish small abattoirs adjacent to our road and rail services, we can have refrigerated meat in perfect condition available for the metropolitan area and we will have achieved the first

major step in the decentralisation of our small industries. We will also achieve the true equity of the zone for the people who live there and establish openings for juvenile labour and adult labour.

Mr. Brady: Such abattoirs would not operate as efficiently as those at Bushmead.

Mr. HALL: Some of the so-called professionals from the metropolitan abattoirs have had to spend a few weeks at Borthwicks to study the chain system. Borthwicks have established an export market for their good products and I think we can look to expansion in that sphere.

I had no intention of speaking to this measure, but I think we should bear in mind the importance of establishing abattoirs in country areas. The employment opportunities are being exported from the country zones to the metropolitan area and I think we are entitled to try and completely justified in trying to get equity for the decentralised areas. The honourable member for Geraldton and the honourable member for Bunbury are toying with the idea of breaking into this field. There is good reason for them to do that and get the maximum equity for employment and the retention of youth in the decentralised areas. Also, they will gain another industry in the treatment of the by-products. Another advantage is that the primary producers would not have to wait until sundown to travel many hundreds of miles with their stock to land them in first-class condition at the Midland saleyard, and subsequently to the abattoir, which is complementary to that industry.

I stress the point that it is very doubtful, if we look at the balance sheet of the Midland Junction abattoir, whether it is justified in borrowing money when losses have been incurred. If I was to ask the Government to subsidise Borthwicks, if they ran into trouble, I think I would be in hot water. The position is, however, that Borthwicks do an admirable job. I think they have some disputes over prices, but that is their business arrangement and I can do nothing about that. The company offers a big field of employment in the Albany area, although a lot of it is only seasonal. A considerable amount of female labour is used in the packing of meat.

I agree with decentralisation, the same as the honourable member for Narrogin who is pushing for an abattoir in his area. I think he is right and there is an opening there for the treatment of pigs, too.

The honourable member for Katanning has a wonderful opportunity, in my opinion, to export pigs. I believe that rolled oats were exported from his area for the fattening of pigs in Malaya, and I see no reason why the same commodity should not be used in Western Australia, and then have the primary products exported. I believe there is no religious objection in Malaya to the killing of these beasts, and I see a market available there. I believe that decentralising abattoirs will be to the benefit of the State.

MR. SEWELL (Geraldton) [3.19 p.m.]: First of all, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the honourable member for Albany, and completely disassociate myself from the remarks of the honourable member for Swan. It seems to me that during the debate on this small Bill a lot of extraneous matter has been discussed, to which I cannot see any reference in the measure.

The Bill purports to give to the Abattoir Board more power as far as borrowing is concerned, and with that I agree. When it comes to decentralisation I would ask the honourable member for Swan if he thinks it fair to continue, as we have done in the past, to bring bullocks from the other side of Meekatharra by road to Midland Junction. There is a consequent loss in weight, and there is considerable bruising, which is a direct loss to the producer. The same thing would apply to stock transported from the Geraldton area.

As far as the districts of Narrogin and Albany are concerned, I believe that the honourable members for those districts can look after themselves. I know that we at Geraldton are set on having an abbattoir in our district and we know that we will eventually get it. It will be of benefit not only to Geraldton, but also to the State, and will encourage the production of meat to be sold on the overseas market in frozen form.

So I agree with the purport of the Bill which will give the Abattoir Board more power to borrow money from the Midland Junction abattoir. I only wish it were a Bill to give someone in the Geraldton area authority to borrow money so that an abattoir could be built there now.

MR. ROWBERRY (Warren) [3.20 p.m.]: Who would have thought that this little Bill, which has for its purpose the authority to borrow money on behalf of the Midland Junction Abattoir, would have caused such a killing discussion! I favour the Bill; and as for the question of decentralisation, and the construction of abattoirs throughout the country districts instead of their being centralised in one great big abattoir, I think there are implications that the issue of debentures, debenture stock, bonds, or mortgages, could be for the purpose of further expansion either of the abattoir at Midland or the provision of smaller abattoirs throughout the country. It could be for one or the other, or it could be for the rehabilitation, renovation and additions, or extensions of the Midland Junction abattoir.

As regards the statement that it is more economic to have a centralised killing place for stock, I cannot agree with it. In fact, no-one in the country will agree with it and, indeed, there are organisations in the south-west which are now pressing urgently for district abattoirs to be built so that stock can be killed in the area in which they are produced. I think that is a reasonable proposition. To have beasts travelling a great number of miles to the abattoir at Midland must be an uneconomic proposition because they must lose their condition with travelling.

In addition to that, there are the aesthetic and social aspects involved, because people in the vicinity of the abattoir at Midland complain about the unloading of trucks and the driving of trucks during the early hours of the morning and the late hours of the night. But it is necessary for beasts to travel under the best conditions to ensure that they do not lose the bloom of which I spoke last night. For those reasons, the travelling must be done in the cooler hours, which is the night-time. However, if abattoirs were distributed throughout the country it would prevent the cluttering up of our roads with stock trucks and that, in turn, would reduce a hazard to other road users.

I am sure farmers who have their stock brought from country districts to Midland would rather have an abattoir in their own district so that their stock would have to travel only short distances. This would cut down the distance the beast would have to travel from the farm to the killing pen and this, in turn, would reduce the farmers' costs for transport, which have a great bearing on his cost of production. I have discussed at length the fact that we in Western Australia suffer considerably because our cost of production is so high in comparison with that in the other States.

The distribution of abattoirs throughout the country would be one way of overcoming that, and we should do everything possible to assist those who want to establish abattoirs; or, if necessary, they should be established by the Government. As everybody seems to be getting on the band wagon let me say that Manjimup is ideally situated for an abattoir, being the centre of a great stock-producing district and exactly the geometric centre of that part of the State bounded by Bunbury, Albany, and the coastline. So let me put in a plug for Manjimup, which would suit your district very well, Mr. Speaker, as it is only 60 miles away.

As I said originally, this Bill gives authority to borrow money and, in this respect, the Leader of the Opposition voiced some doubts whether this was a wise thing to do. He said it appeared to be the Australian way of life to get into debt. The issue of debentures, debenture stock, bonds, or mortgages, is an ideal way of getting into debt; one mortgages the future to create something in the present. But the question arises: Is this necessary? From whom would we borrow money? To whom would we go into debt? To ourselves or to our own banks? If it were to the government-owned banks then no-one would take any exception to it. However, I think it would be interesting to see what happens in the case of going into debt to the banks.

I have a little booklet here called, "It's Time They Knew", and I think it is time we knew about the matters mentioned in this little book. I should like to quote a portion of it which states—

> How the debt system works.

I think it is appropriate to quote this section in the light of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. To continue—

> The debts owing on public undertakings are debts in perpetuity. They are never repaid. You have no doubt noticed that every Commonwealth Loan is mostly used to renew or convert—not to redeem—previous loans as they fall due. Debt is compounded on debt and interest on interest.
>
> Here is just one example of what we say, typical of all public works—
>
> A loan of £16,000,000 was raised by N.S.W. in 1888 for railway purposes. This loan fell due in 1924, and the State had then paid £25,907,726 in interest charges without repaying any of the principal.
>
> The original interest was 3½ per cent., but the conversion rate was 5 per cent. The loan was redeemed in 1955, by which time N.S.W. had paid £49,825,526 in interest, without any reduction of the principal.
>
> Including principal and interest the total payment up to 1955 amounted to £65,825,526. Nearly £50,000,000 in interest was paid on a loan of only £16,000,000.

Some people say that is fantastic, and this sort of thing should not be done. It is fantastic to think that money, which is a costless creation, should cost the community so much.

I suppose the Midland Junction Abattoir Board would receive permission from the Treasury to float loans, and to obtain loans from banks on mortgage and debentures. When it does that, the bank which issues the loan creates the money out of nothing. Some may think that is fantastic, so I shall quote some authorities to the House.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): We are discussing the Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill, and not a matter of finance. The honourable member may make passing references to finance by all means, but he should not make that subject the main point of his speech.

Mr. ROWBERRY: In my opinion the Bill deals with the powers of the Midland Junction Abattoir Board to obtain finance. I am trying to tell the House exactly what happens when that procedure of financing takes place. I said that when a borrower went to a bank for a loan, the bank created the money out of nothing. I do not want to make that statement without support.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I think the honourable member should make only passing reference. I cannot allow a debate on the subject of finance; if I did, the debate on this Bill could go on all night.

Mr. ROWBERRY: In passing, I wish to quote two authorities. The first is the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th edition, under the heading of "Banking and Credit", vol. 3, page 48, which states—

> Banks create credit. It is a mistake to suppose that bank credit is created to any important extent by the payment of money into the banks. The bank's debt is a means of payment; it is credit money. It is a clear addition to the amount of the means of payment in the community.

The next authority is Mr. R. G. Hawtrey, previously Assistant Under-Secretary to the British Treasury, who, in his *Trade Depression and the Way Out*, says: When a bank lends it creates money out of nothing. In his book, *The Art of Central Banking*, Mr. Hawtrey wrote—

> When a bank lends, it creates credit. Against the advance which it enters amongst its assets, there is a deposit entered in its liabilities. But other lenders have not this mystical power of creating the means of payment out of nothing. What they lend must be money that they have acquired through their economic activities.

I think I have produced enough evidence to support my assertion that when the Midland Junction Abattoir Board borrows money from a bank it goes through the procedure which is authorised by the Bill, and I have shown exactly what takes place.

We, as a community, will be paying interest in perpetuity on the money borrowed, long after the Midland Junction Abattoir has ceased to exist. As the references I have quoted state, it is time the people knew exactly what happened. In the circumstances, being a voice in the wilderness as regards this principle, I support the Bill, and hope that it will accomplish some good for the State of Western Australia.

MR. I. W. MANNING (Wellington) [3.34 p.m.]: My understanding of this measure is that it is the machinery for permitting the Midland Junction Abattoir Board to raise finance for undertaking certain works. Those works are important to the existing set-up of the abattoir. I believe that work to be necessary, because the demand by the purchasers of meat in these days is for an ever-increasing standard in the product; and that is also demanded by the health authorities.

If money is to be made available for extending the works I would have some misgivings, and I would join with the honourable member for Narrogin in stating that it could be most unwise for a great sum of money to be expended on extending the abattoirs; because the present trend in the meat industry is to have the meat killed in the country. This trend is very noticeable in these days, and in my view it is decentralisation of the first order.

The generally understood facts of the case are that country-killed meat can undersell meat killed at the Midland Junction Abattoir. I believe that a higher quality is brought about by the fact that stock killed at country centres do not have to undertake a long trip to Midland Junction, and it is a fact that transport of stock over great distances has a deteriorating effect on the meat. If the stock can be killed at the source of production it is readily understandable that the meat must be of a higher quality. Such meat is fresh and unbruised, because the stock is not knocked about in any way. For that reason country killing of meat should be encouraged, firstly, from the point of decentralisation. This is an industry which can be decentralised, and everyone stands to gain by the industry being decentralised, from an economic and also a quality point of view.

I have no reason to oppose the measure. I understand, and I think most honourable members do, that the standards required in the killing centres in these days by the health authorities, and by the people who purchase the meat, is that killing establishments be kept at a very high health level. I understand the money to be raised by the machinery set out in the Bill will do just that. I issue a warning that, if it is designed to extend the Midland Junction Abattoir, in the course of time that abattoir may have to be moved from there. In that event it would be most unwise to expend a great sum of money on extensions.

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [3.38 p.m.]: This has been a most refreshing debate, and honourable members have expressed their personal points of view. Thus a great deal of information has been made available to the House. Firstly, I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his support of the measure, because it is designed to make it possible for the Midland Junction Abattoir to borrow money, and thus relieve the Treasury of the responsibility of finding the finance for extensions and for meeting the requirements of the board.

The points expressed by the honourable member for Narrogin and the honourable member for Wellington will be kept well and truly in mind, because the killing establishments which are being constructed in the country will help to halt the flow of stock to the metropolitan area. That will have the effect which is desired by the two honourable members.

If no killing establishments are available in the country, it is necessary for the stock to be transported to the central abattoirs. The fact that many establishments are now being erected in the country will, I think, be the answer to the points raised by the two honourable members. I must agree with the sentiments expressed by most of the speakers with reference to the need for these establishments to be operating in the country. There is no doubt that the points raised were good ones because the animals must be treated as near the point of production as possible.

When people from the city have visited farms in the country and stayed to a meal, they have remarked on the delicious meat. This remark has been passed time and time again. The meat is delicious because the animals have not been chased, carted, and driven long distances. They have been taken out of the paddock and slaughtered on the spot, and therefore the meat must be far better for consumption than the meat which has spent almost weeks on occasions before being slaughtered. I do not think there is any argument at all against the advantages of having stock slaughtered in the areas where they are reared, fattened, and prepared for marketing.

A very happy situation is developing in Western Australia. Recommendations I have made to the Government have been accepted, and I would like to quote the remarks of a member of an abattoir board in another State. I think I have done so before in this House but they bear repeating. He came to Western Australia last year and spent some time looking into the whole of the set-up here. He has travelled overseas and all over Australia and he said to me in my office, "In my opinion you have the best set-up I have seen anywhere I have travelled", and that included every State. He said, "I recommend you continue in this way because as far as a developing State like Western Australia is concerned you will be able to cater for the stock on the spot where they are produced." That is a situation which I regard as being as near perfection as possible in the treatment of stock.

As I have said, a very happy situation is developing in Western Australia. We are encouraging private enterprise. I am very pleased that the honourable member for Albany mentioned the private enterprise situation in Albany which is doing a great deal for that part of the State. The honourable member for Wellingto has a very good set-up in his area i Waroona. Another has been establishe at Boyup Brook, and in the area of th honourable member for Northam anothe good set-up has been established. W are encouraging this in every respect, an I feel sure it is going to pay dividend as Western Australia continues to gro more stock and develop its country area It will be contributing not only to th requirements of Western Australia but t the requirements also of many countrie of the world.

I thank honourable members for the contributions to this debate. I am please they have accepted the principle whereb the Treasury will be assisted to mak money go still further and whereby als the board will be given an opportunity t borrow finance as its requirements mak this necessary.

Mr. Cornell: Is there an abattoir i Northam?

Mr. NALDER: Yes.

Mr. Cornell: Is that the fellow who going to kill Hawke at the next election

Mr. NALDER: That is another subjec altogether. I again say that I appreciat the contributions made to this debate, an I recommend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion b Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture), an transmitted to the Council.

IRON ORE (MOUNT NEWMAN) AGREEMENT BILL

Council's Amendment

Amendment made by the Council no considered.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. W. Manning) in the Chair; Mr. Cou (Minister for Industrial Development) i charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment mad by the Council is as follows:—

> Clause 4, page 2, line 36—Inse after the word "provisions" the word "of subsection (2)."

Mr. COURT: I understand that th objection of the other place to the provi sion in the Bill is that the by-laws tha are called for under the agreement whic forms the schedule would not have to b tabled in either House of Parliament.

In considering the request, we should have regard for the agreement, and I refer particularly to page 28 of the schedule to the Bill where the agreement sets out in subclause (3)—

> (3) The Governor in Executive Council may upon recommendation by the Company make alter and repeal by-laws for the purpose of enabling the Company to fulfil its obligations under paragraphs (a) and (f) of subclause (2) of this clause—

I should mention that paragraphs (a) and (f) refer to the operation of the railway and the use of the wharf and associated wharf facilities. To continue—

> —and (unless and until the port townsite is declared a townsite pursuant to section 10 of the Land Act) under paragraph (h) of subclause (2) of this clause—

Paragraph (h) refers to the protection for inhabitants where the company has in fact had to set up its own townsite. In other words, the object of the clause in the original agreement in the schedule attached to this ratifying Bill is to provide machinery where the conditions under which the railway, port, and the townsite, where it has not been declared an ordinary townsite, can be operated by the company, and other people can have access to those facilities.

The particular clause in the agreement to which I am referring on page 28 continues—

> —and under clause 10 (a) hereof upon terms and subject to conditions (including terms and conditions as to user charging and limitation of the liability of the Company) as set out in such by-laws consistent with the provisions hereof.

The vital part now follows, and I invite the attention of honourable members to it. I feel that the members of the Legislative Council, with due respect to them, have probably overlooked this part—

> Should the State at any time consider that any by-law made hereunder has as a result of altered circumstances become unreasonable or inapplicable then the Company shall recommend such alteration or repeal thereof as the State may reasonably require or (in the event of there being any dispute as to the reasonableness of such requirement) then as may be decided by arbitration hereunder.

The protection, first of all, is that if the Government finds that circumstances have changed in respect of the conditions covered in the by-laws relating to the railway, port, and township, then the Government can ask for the by-laws to be amended. If the company refuses to do this, or if agreement cannot be reached between the Government and the company as to the revised charges and conditions, then they have to be referred to arbitration.

Mr. Tonkin: What is wrong with telling Parliament about it?

Mr. COURT: We are going to, if the honourable member will bear with me for a moment. I want to deal with this particular amendment at some length because the amendments contained in the other two messages are on the sample principle. If I can convey the full information on this amendment, it might save a lot of time in respect of the other two.

Mr. Tonkin: Are you going to agree to the amendment or oppose it?

Mr. COURT: I am going to seek to amend the amendment in the form I have conveyed to your leader. It is important to consider the agreement in the schedule I have read out, and then to consider the Bill, and section 36 of the Interpretation Act. In clause 4 the Bill provides in respect of by-laws as follows:—

> 4. (1) The Governor may make by-laws, for the purposes of, and in accordance with, the Agreement.
>
> (2) By-laws made pursuant to this section—
>
> (a) shall be published in the *Government Gazette;*
>
> (b) take effect and have the force of law from the date they are so published or from such later date as is fixed by the by-laws;
>
> (c) may prescribe penalties not exceeding fifty pounds; and
>
> (d) are not subject to the provisions of section thirty-six of the Interpretation Act, 1918.

The relevant section of the Interpretation Act reads as follows:—

> 36. (1) When by any Act it is provided that regulations may or shall be made, and—
>
> (i) It is provided that such regulations may or shall be made by the Governor; or
>
> (ii) it is not provided by whom such regulations may or shall be made,
>
> any regulations made under or by virtue of, such provision—
>
> (a) shall be made by the Governor;—

that is already covered by the ratifying Bill—

> (b) shall be published in the *Gazette;*—

that is also covered by the ratifying Bill—

> (c) shall, subject to subsection (2) hereof, take effect and have the force of law from

the date of such publication, or from a later date fixed by the order making such regulation;—

that is also covered by the Bill—

(d) shall be laid before each House of Parliament within the six sitting days of such House next following such publication.

This was not thought necessary by the draftsman of the original Bill to be included.

Mr. Tonkin: Not thought necessary by the draftsman or by the Government?

Mr. COURT: A ratifying Bill of this kind is drawn up by legal people to give effect to the ratifying of the schedule.

Mr. Tonkin: I suggest this idea would not originate in the Crown Law Department.

Mr. COURT: It is strange that this identical thing has been through this House before.

Mr. Tonkin: That does not prove anything.

Mr. COURT: It proves that the honourable member did accept it, or he was not vigilant.

Mr. Tonkin: It proves we were not vigilant to pick it up.

Mr. COURT: There is no question of hiding anything. This has to be published in the *Government Gazette* and there cannot be a more public document than that.

Mr. Tonkin: Do you read it?

Mr. COURT: Probably as often as the honourable member does. He reads it to suit his convenience. In trying to explain the significance of this amendment I would point out that subsection (2) provides the machinery under which regulations or by-laws are disallowed. Subsection (2A) provides the machinery under which regulations and by-laws are amended; subsection (3) provides the machinery within the section itself, as does subsection (4). Subsection (5) is again machinery, and only says that the term "regulation" includes rule and by-law. The proposed amendment was provided by the Crown Law Department—if that helps the honourable member at all.

Mr. Tonkin: Not in the slightest.

Mr. COURT: I am not going to pit my lack of legal knowledge against theirs. I submit it as being something which to me sounds sensible and practical.

Mr. Tonkin: What were they asked to do?

Mr. COURT: The Legislative Council only asks that the provisions of section 36(2) be excluded. In other words they did not seek the power to disallow these by-laws and for good reason. I can only assume that they omitted to see the significance of subsection (2A). The amendment I propose to move to the proposal of the Legislative Council will achieve, completely, the purpose that was sought by the Legislative Council when it sent the message to this Chamber.

I move—

That the following alternative amendment be made to the amendment made by the Council:—

Page 2, line 37—Insert after the numerals "1918" the words ", but shall be laid before each House of Parliament within six sitting days of such House next following the publication of the by-laws in the *Government Gazette*."

Mr. BICKERTON: The further we go with this the more complicated it seems to become. To see what has taken place we must revert to the amendment moved by the Legislative Council in message No. 75. We find that to enable the desires of that Chamber to be carried out it has sought to amend section 36 of the Interpretation Act in a manner in which it considers the tabling of these by-laws or regulations—if and when made—will be protected without the actual disallowance or amendment of them. The amendment of the Minister for Industrial Development hopes to achieve the same object, by the addition to clause 4 of the Bill accompanying the schedule of certain words at the end of paragraph (d) and after the numerals "1918."

Whichever way we go about this, both amendments will provide the position that papers concerning by-laws or regulations made in connection with this agreement will be tabled, but that no action can be taken by either House of Parliament in connection with either their amendment or disallowance. When voting on whichever amendment is before the House honourable members must make up their minds as to whether or not this type of procedure is desired by this Chamber.

There is a lot of legislation that allows regulations and by-laws to be made, and the safeguard of Parliament is covered by section 36 of the Interpretation Act which, without the legal jargon, lays down certain procedures where regulations and Bills are concerned, the main one being that they be published in the *Government Gazette* and laid on the Table of the House. When a certain period after publication has elapsed, and the papers have been tabled in Parliament, it is competent for any honourable member to move to disallow those regulations or by-laws, or to move to have them amended. That is the purpose of section 36 of the Interpretation Act. In the Bill there is a clause to completely disallow section 36 of the Interpretation Act so far as this agreement is conerned. When dealing with this matter in the Legislative Council it was

mentioned that this denied Parliament in effect rights to which it had been accustomed for many years.

By way of explanation I would say that I cannot find any other agreements that have been ratified by Parliament at any time which include a clause equivalent to clause 4 of the Bill which accompanies this agreement. The only agreements in which it has appeared are those covering Pilbara iron ore. I looked at such agreements as the B.H.P. Kwinana agreement, the Tallering Peak agreement, and the Koolyanobbing agreement, and none of these Bills contained a clause to nullify section 36 of the Interpretation Act.

When this was raised in the Legislative Council, those opposed to the clause completely agreed to a compromise that the by-laws or regulations as made would be tabled, but the rest of section 36 of the Interpretation Act would not apply at all. In his speech the Minister said this had gone through in other agreements. That is quite so. I must admit I missed it completely, and it was obvious that others also did.

In the speeches of Ministers introducing these agreements there is no reference to this matter at all. Whether it was their desire that it should go through without Parliament being aware of it I do not know. In most cases Ministers explain their Bills when it suits them, but apparently it was better to leave out the explanation in this case. I cannot find any explanation in either the remarks of the Minister for Industrial Development or in the remarks of the Minister for Lands who introduced the Mount Goldsworthy Bill in the first place.

To give honourable members an idea of what they are up against in connection with this amendment to the proposed amendment, I would point out that when these agreements have once had by-laws and regulations made in connection with them they cannot be altered or disallowed by Parliament. Although the papers will be tabled, and we can see what we do not like, there is nothing we can do about it.

When this was raised in the Legislative Council the Minister deliberately framed his amendment with the idea of overcoming section 36 (2) but did nothing about subsection (2A). I have read his remarks since and I think he referred to the fact that the matter would be reviewed by Parliament, because subsection (2A) deals with two Houses of Parliament agreeing to certain amendments or disallowances. However, I feel from reading the matter myself that that would not be the case, because subsection (2) in section 36 no longer applies; and I think it completely nullifies subsection (2A), because that section merely details what will happen after a disallowance or amendment under subsection (2). So subsection (2) no longer applies, and the machinery in subsection (2A) cannot apply as there would be no purpose for it and no member of Parliament could utilise subsection (2A), because subsection (2) has already been nullified under this amendment.

If these papers are to be tabled, but the right of Parliament denied, then it is possible the amendment of the Minister for Industrial Development is a much tidier way of denying members of Parliament than the amendment made by the Legislative Council. So if any amendment is to be supported I would think the amendment of the Minister for Industrial Development would be the preferable of the two. But I would like to remind the Committee again that this is pilfering away the rights of members of Parliament, even though it be slowly; and it is the first time ever that section 36 has not applied in an agreement, except in those cases I have referred to and the Pilbara iron ore agreement.

The Minister's explanation could be that these are more or less "if" agreements—provisional agreements—something that will happen if certain other things happen. Therefore they cannot be hard-and-fast agreements. These particular clauses did not apply in the Tallering Peak agreement. I notice in the Tallering Peak agreement things were defined as to what duties were to be carried out by the company, and what duties were to be carried out by Parliament; but the other agreement dealing with Pilbara contains many things that are provisional and governed by whether or not certain contracts to export iron ore are obtained. As a result of that, certain negotiation must take place between the Government and the company concerned; and where negotiation takes place and it leads to disagreement, then there must be arbitration.

Therefore machinery is provided in this agreement to allow for arbitration. I take it that the Government considers that if a certain matter was before arbitration for decision and the related by-laws were tabled and disallowed, that would throw the arbitration set-up into some form of confusion. However, I repeat, it is a great pity this matter was not introduced as the measure went through the House in the first place. The first occasion was the Mount Goldsworthy iron ore agreement, although in that instance it applied only to a specific portion of that agreement. However, the Hamersley iron ore agreement, the Mount Goldsworthy amendment, and the Mount Newman iron ore agreement included this controversial clause 4 which, in effect, states that section 36 of the Interpretation Act will not apply to the agreement, in which case Parliament has no say whatsoever.

We have the choice of allowing this measure to go through in its entirety, or have these things included in the *Government Gazette;* and it is a well-known fact that not a great number of us read the

Government Gazette unless we do so for a specific purpose. By-laws or regulations that are made will appear in the *Government Gazette* and they will also be tabled, but the rest of section 36 of the Interpretation Act will not apply in any shape or form. Subsection (5) reads, "In this section the term 'regulation' includes rule and by-law," and I would like to know whether the by-laws covered by the amendment also include regulations and rules. They certainly do in the Interpretation Act, because that is covered in subsection (5). However, once the Interpretation Act no longer applies, then it does not apply to the definition of the word "by-law". It seems to me that if the amendment is passed, the by-laws would be tabled, but if they were called regulations they would not be tabled. I would like this to be clarified.

Mr. TONKIN: The honourable member for Pilbara has given us a very clear understanding of the position and I therefore do not intend to go over the same ground he has so admirably covered; but there are certain principles involved in this which I think ought to be brought clearly under the notice of members of the Committee.

The provision in the Interpretation Act with regard to by-laws and regulations is placed there in order to afford Parliament some opportunity, even though it may be remote, to retain control over legislation which has been enacted. I have heard, over the years, protests from both sides of this Chamber against the developing tendency to take away from Parliament power which it possesses and put it in the hands of the executive—and this is a further step in that direction. I refuse to believe that the Crown Law Department of its own volition would draft a Bill specifically excluding from operation section 36 of the Interpretation Act. I would say it would only do that if requested to do by the Minister in charge of the Bill, because it is a deviation from general principle.

In legislation the basic requirement is that it shall be brought before Parliament so that honourable members will know what they are doing, but in order that certain details may be attended to, almost invariably a regulation-making power is included in the Bill. By this means all matters of detail, instead of being set out in the original Bill, may be attended to by by-law or regulation, but subject to the control of Parliament. So when these by-laws or regulations are duly promulgated and published in the *Government Gazette* there is a requirement that within 14 sitting days of the opening of Parliament the by-laws shall be tabled. That gives the Parliament an opportunity to say whether or not it approves of this extension to the legislation to which it has already agreed. To take that control away from Parliament is to reduce the power of Parliament.

I accept my full responsibility for not having detected this before, the same as every other honourable member must do; but I agree with the honourable member for Pilbara that when a very vital departure from general practice and principle is indulged in, as it has been in connection with this Bill, there is an obligation upon the Minister to point it out. Otherwise, it smacks very much of a deliberate attempt to deceive. Ordinarily when the general principles of legislation are being varied there would be no need to refer to the fact that the regulation-making power is subject to section 36 of the Interpretation Act; but I do say that when a Government deliberately sets out to exclude the operation of that provision there is an obligation on the Government to point it out to Parliament, although that does not exclude any honourable member, including myself, from not properly perusing the legislation clause by clause and line by line in order to find out what is happening.

My memory is reasonably good, and I cannot remember a government of any colour introducing legislation containing this principle other than this Government. I have never known it to be done before, and that is all the more reason why I say that because this is a very wide departure from existing practice there was an obligation on the Minister in charge of the Bill, when this departure was first made, to point it out to Parliament. Of course, that was not done. Therefore it is no argument to stand up and say, "You have already allowed this to go through before, so why object to it now?" That argument does not carry any weight with me whatever. A thief who has carried out a number of burglaries might well say to a policeman, "You have allowed me to get away with this before; why apprehend me now?"

This is a very wide departure from an accepted principle and it is a bad one. Why should not Parliament be apprised of this extra legislation which is done by by-law or regulation? Why should not Parliament have the power, if it is so minded, to stop the executive from doing what it is attempting to do?

After all, the Government has its majority; and if it can put up a sound case for what it is doing, Parliament would not be able to carry any motion for disallowance of the regulation against the Government's desires. It looks to me as though the purpose behind this is to keep the Parliament in the dark as much as possible. It is all very well to say these things will be published in the *Government Gazette*. How many honourable members read the *Government Gazette* a dozen times a year? About the only time an

honourable member refers to the *Gazette* is when he is looking for something specific —when he is advised certain regulations are published in a certain gazette and he has to find out what they are all about. Ordinarily we do not read the gazette.

So these regulations could be brought into effect with very few people being aware of the circumstances outside the Executive. That is not desirable. Surely Parliament should be made aware of what is going on and should be in the position to express its opinion! There is a lot more to be done in the Parliament to get a regulation disallowed than just to say that one thinks it ought to be disallowed. One has to get a majority in the House to agree with one, and that does not happen very often. I have never seen it happen very often in 30-odd years. I have seen it occur once or twice. But a very good case has to be made out for a disallowance.

So the Government, with its majority, is in control of the situation; and no vote of mine will go, under any circumstances, to a course of action which resolves this into an abdication of Parliament in favour of the Executive. We ought to put as much as possible in the Bill before the House, leaving as little as possible to the making of regulations and by-laws. But our safeguard is that when regulations and by-laws are made Parliament has the opportunity of moving for their disallowance. But the Government would deny us that.

What justification can there be in a democratic country for that course of action? It is ridiculous to say that it would in any way interfere with the rights and obligations of persons to an agreement; because if the Government is so minded to make by-laws and regulations to meet a situation, surely it can command its majority in the Parliament to see that these by-laws and regulations are disallowed. But if it is afraid that Parliament might disallow a by-law which it desires to be made, then its position is weak and it should not be placed in that position; namely, to usurp the authority of Parliament; and that is what this proposition does.

It gives to the Executive that amount of power which properly should be reposed in Parliament. I deplore this development over the years to leave more and more to the Executive by means of regulations and by-law making power. I have seen some shocking things done under it, and this is an extension of the principle. Well, if members of this Assembly are going lightly to abdicate in favour of this sort of thing, then they have not got much sense of their responsibilities as representatives in a democracy. That is all I can say for that.

I would like to know—and I have yet to hear a single argument—why this is considered necessary; why Parliament should be told now, "We want to put you in a position so that you cannot interfere." Now what is the argument for that? I have never heard it before. The only argument I have heard in favour of leaving regulation-making power and by-law-making power to the Executive is that one cannot foresee, when one introduces legislation, all the situations which might arise, and therefore one leaves to the Executive the power to make by-laws or regulations in the knowledge that Parliament is still in control of the situation; and it can, if it disagrees with what is done, pass a motion for the disallowance.

But the Government says, "Oh No! With regard to this particular agreement, we do not want you to be in the position to be able to disallow if you can command a majority. We do not want to let you get yourselves into that position. We want to feel that whatever we do we will be free from interference." Well, there is only one more step from that, and that is to a complete dictatorship. What possible argument could be advanced against allowing a properly elected democratic body from remaining in the position which existing laws have placed it; namely, to have the final say on the action of the Executive. What is wrong with that?

That has been the law in this country for many years, deliberately placed in the Interpretation Act; and I repeat: I refuse to believe that any draftsman worthy of the name would, unless prompted, draft a Bill specifically excluding section 36 of the Interpretation Act. I therefore come to the conclusion that it was done at the express wish of the Minister or the Government. I want to know what is the reason behind it. Why must Parliament be told, "This is taken out of your region of authority and of your sphere of activity. You leave this to the Government, and we are going to ask you to agree to a situation where you knowingly leave this to the Government; where you say to us. 'We can do what we think is right and you have no power to alter it even though you are convinced it is wrong.'" That is an untenable situation, and no vote of mine will go to support it.

Mr. COURT: I am sorry the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has jumped to a conclusion without getting his premises firmly established. He has far too good a brain to have said what he did say had he studied the agreement. I know him so well. He would never have said what he did say and cast all these inferences around had he studied the implications of this agreement. He has too many brains for that.

There is no suggestion of taking power away from Parliament. There is a special set of circumstances under these agreements which have been carefully explained as each agreement has been introduced to Parliament. The situation is that the companies in these particular cases not only have to provide their own towns, schools, hospitals, and police stations, but they have also to provide their own railways and their own ports.

It was at the insistence of the Government that these agreements provided that third parties and the State can have access to these facilities on fair and reasonable terms. Although we do not pay a penny for them—not a penny—we do have access to them on fair and reasonable terms. And so as to provide the machinery to give the Government some control over the fair and reasonable terms, the Crown Law Department could devise no other system than to introduce a by-law system into these agreements.

In this particular agreement—the Mount Newman agreement—the by-law provisions are set out on page 28. They are specific powers. They are not wide. They do not go beyond the specific things that have been referred to; namely, the railway, the port, the township—until it is declared a townsite—and such things as the supply of water and power to people other than to the company itself.

Mr. Bickerton: Clause 4 of the Bill does not apply to the section that you are dealing with now; it applies to the whole agreement.

Mr. COURT: If the honourable member remains patient, I will explain. The whole of the by-law provisions in the agreement are set out in a subclause which has a marginal note, "by-laws" on page 28; and a similar provision is in all of the other agreements. With good purpose, the Government tried to have the agreements provide, as near as practicable, similar conditions so that there would be the minimum amount of disputation between the various agreements.

Subclause (3) on page 28 refers specifically to the by-law power. If honourable members read the clause they will see that those by-law powers have been given only in respect of those items I have mentioned. If the Government were providing the towns, the railways, and the ports, there would not be any need to have the by-law powers, because they would be inherent in the Government under powers contained in such Acts as the Local Government Act, the Railways Act, the Public Works Act, and the Health Act, to name but a few of the many dozens that would be involved. But because the railway, the port, and the town are being provided entirely by the company concerned, it was necessary to provide in the agreement the machinery whereby not only could the company be remunerated on a fair and reasonable basis, but to ensure that it would be obligated to make its facilities available to third parties and to the State.

Furthermore, the agreement provides that when the Government—not the company, but the Government—feels that the circumstances have changed, it can have these conditions amended; and if there is disputation between the company and the Government, then arbitration prevails. I cannot think of a fairer system. In order to make this system effective, it was necessary to provide the by-law-making power in the ratifying Bill. It is set out in clear terms, and I invite honourable members to read it.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition inferred that somebody had been remiss in not inviting the attention of honourable members to this provision. It could not be clearer. It is in each of the Bills with marginal notes. It says—

> The Governor may make by-laws, for the purpose of, and in accordance with, the Agreement.

Honourable members know that the legal interpretation of a regulation is very strict. If one can demonstrate that a regulation has been made outside of the Act giving regulation powers—and this obtains in any piece of legislation—the regulation is *ultra vires*. Therefore it is impossible for the Government or the company to go beyond the provisions in the schedule, because the ratifying power is in clause 4 and contains the words which I have just quoted.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, with his experience of these things—and he is something of a student of them—knows that one cannot step out of line with that one, because it has no force or effect. For that reason it is not a question of hiding anything from Parliament or of doing anything extraordinary. The fact is, it is the only way.

Mr. Tonkin: No it isn't!

Mr. COURT: I submit to the Committee that if the restrictive conditions were not put into clause 4, Parliament would, in effect, be abrogating an agreement made by the Government; because we could not expect people to invest the millions of pounds that are going to be involved in railways, ports and towns, and leave them up in the air—Parliament by Parliament—so far as the regulations or the by-laws are concerned. The important thing is that the government of the day, be it of one colour or another, has some power in this matter to negotiate and if necessary seek the benefits of arbitration.

Mr. Tonkin: That could leave the Government in a very weak position.

Mr. COURT: No it would not.

Mr. Tonkin: Of course it could!

Mr. COURT: Is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition suggesting that he wants to have charges which are unreasonable?; because if so, he should say so. No-one would make an agreement with his Government if that is his attitude.

Mr. Tonkin: Don't twist the matter.

Mr. COURT: We have laid down in clear terms not only the conditions for today, but the conditions for a long time to come. These agreements concern tremendous developments which will take place, and we cannot expect people to establish their railways, their ports, their towns, and their quarries, and not know the conditions under which they are going to operate. They have not sought to be restrictive with their conditions for all time. All they have sought is to be provided, as soon as possible, with machinery whereby in the passage of time these charges and conditions can be reviewed; not for the benefit of the company, but to protect the State and third parties if they should want to use the facilities.

It should also be realised that the State can obtain revenue from these facilities even while the company is operating at full capacity; because any surplus activity which can be provided from these ports makes it possible for the Government to obtain revenue additional to that which is obtained from the companies by way of tonnage charges and other charges related to the port.

The honourable member for Pilbara queried the provisions of subsection (5) of section 36. I previously queried this myself with the legal people, but they have pointed out that the only power under this Bill, and in the agreement, is a specific power to make by-laws, and the particular provision to which we refer does not mention rules. For that reason the drafting as it is now, and in regard to which the honourable member indicated he agreed with me, sets the position out more clearly and simply than the Legislative Council's amendment. I think I have covered most of the points raised by the two honourable gentlemen.

Mr. BICKERTON: I gather from the Minister's remarks that any by-laws made in connection with this matter can apply only if they come under the special section for by-laws, and headed "by-laws," on page 28. However, I would take it, after reading clause 4, that the Governor could make by-laws in connection with any portion of the agreement regardless of whether it was applicable under the section headed "by-laws" on page 28 or not.

In the original Mount Goldsworthy agreement the section dealing with by-laws was specifically referred to under the equivalent of clause 4 in this Bill. While I cannot remember the exact wording, it was to this effect: The Governor may make by-laws in accordance with section so-and-so, which was the by-law section. It then gave power to make by-laws only in connection with the specific matters mentioned in the section. My idea of this is that by-laws can be made for any portion of the agreement regardless of whether they are mentioned in the section headed "by-laws" on page 28.

Mr. TONKIN: The position is even more serious than I thought at first sight. It is bad enough to allow the Executive to take full control without being obliged to refer the matter back to Parliament; but the provision in this Bill would leave the decision of an arbitrator free from interference by Parliament. According to this clause the Governor will promulgate by-laws on the advice of the Government; and if circumstances change at any time the Government may see the need to alter the by-laws strongly feeling that such alteration is desirable in the interests of the State. But this clause puts the company in the position to object; and if the company objects, the Government cannot proceed to amend the by-law. So not only is Parliament to be denied the opportunity to amend the by-law which requires amending, because of altered circumstances, but the Government will deprive itself of the power to amend the by-law and it is then to be handed over to an arbitrator.

If he decides against the Government, that is that; and, under those circumstances neither the Government nor Parliament will have a say in what is being done. That is a tremendous departure from anything of which I have had knowledge previously, and it is a bad principle to introduce. I think there can be strong argument put forward against allowing the Executive to be in control, and without any interference from Parliament; but the strongest possible argument could be put forward against allowing the company and an arbitrator to be in the position of being able to deny the Government and Parliament the right to make any alteration to a by-law.

Let us get this clearly. I quote from page 28—

> Should the State at any time consider that any by-law made hereunder has as a result of altered circumstances become unreasonable or inapplicable then the Company shall recommend such alteration or repeal thereof as the State may reasonably require or (in the event of there being any dispute as to the reasonableness of such requirement) then as may be decided by arbitration hereunder.

So, in other words, should the company refuse to remove from what may be an advantageous position, the Government has no power to do anything about it. Then the arbitrator is appointed, and I have seen arbitrators in action before where the interests of private companies

and the Government have been in conflict. I have heard some strong opinions expressed by highly-placed men in the Government regarding the findings of arbitrators. I can recall a certain prominent member of the Country Party being very strong in his views about certain decisions of an arbitrator in an electricity matter, when it became a question of the rights of a private company as against the rights and interests of the State.

This legislation not only requires Parliament to abdicate its position, but, in certain circumstances, the executive also. We are to give the Governor-in-Council power to make by-laws with regard to specific matters; and then, if the circumstances change after those by-laws have been so made, and the company will not agree to the alteration, Parliament and the Government will be in the hands of an arbitrator. Is that any way to legislate? We are being asked now to give a blank cheque with regard to these specific matters to the company and to an arbitrator who may be appointed in the event of there being disagreement. As the interests of shareholders will be paramount to the company, when it finds itself in an advantageous position we can be sure it will insist on an arbitrator being called in, because it will have nothing to lose and everything to gain.

As I said, this is an entirely new principle and I am surprised that the Government has introduced it, because it is such a radical departure from accepted practice. Let us look at it stripped of all the embroidery that is around it. It means that Parliament is going to say, deliberately, that it will allow the Government to make by-laws; and then, if the circumstances alter after the by-laws have been made, and the Government desires to alter the by-laws, and the company will not agree, neither Parliament nor the Government can amend the by-laws unless the arbitrator agrees.

Mr. Oldfield: If Reg Ansett hears of this he will be moving into this State.

Mr. TONKIN: Surely there would be no danger in allowing the Government to have the by-law-making power under the rules which generally prevail. I would point out to the Minister that apart from the fact that there is the possibility that Parliament may alter or repeal a by-law, the operations of the company will not be interfered with for one second. The Government makes the by-laws in consultation with the company, and the scheme of things starts to operate. In due course the by-laws are laid before Parliament so that it knows what is happening, but that will not interfere with the company. The only time the company would be in difficulty would be when the majority of Parliament believed that a by-law ought to be amended, repealed, or disallowed.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. BICKERTON: I do not believe in pushing a dead horse up a hill, but the clause that is obnoxious to me is clause 4, and I suppose the same would apply to most honourable members because it robs them of their rights. But as it has already passed this Chamber there is nothing much we can do about it. The amendment of another place and the alternative put forward by the Minister only give us a little something that we did not have before. We are faced with the alternative of agreeing with the Legislative Council's amendment, agreeing with the Minister's further amendment, or disagreeing with both. And, of course, if we disagree with both, we revert to the Bill as it passed this Chamber with clause 4 operating in its entirety. So there is really little we can do as far as clause 4 is concerned. A provision of this nature should not be included in agreements made by the Government and the companies. The position could be got around in some other way. Such a provision would take away from Parliament certain of its powers.

I agree with the comment of the Minister that the companies concerned are very reputable. Even after the agreements have been ratified, the companies could be approached and told about the reaction of Parliament to clause 4, and to its effect on section 36 of the Interpretation Act. Some form of mutual arrangement could be arrived at between the Government and the companies to allow Parliament to revert to its usual right under agreements; that right of Parliament should not be usurped.

It would not be a good precedent to establish by including the provision in clause 4. Once it is used in the agreement before us it will become a precedent, and every company coming to an agreement with the Government will exert pressure to exclude the operation of section 36 of the Interpretation Act, whether or not it is the same type of agreement or some other type. These companies should be willing, even at this late stage, to have discussions with the Government with the object of amending clause 4 of the agreement. If the situation is placed before the companies in the proper way I see no reason for them to object.

As was pointed out by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition no responsible Government would move to disallow or amend a by-law, if it was a good one. If it is not a good one then it should never have been made, and it is the job of the Government to do something about the matter. If we contend that Parliament is to have no say in the amendment or in the disallowance of by-laws, then we have no faith in Parliament, and we cannot trust future Parliaments. That is not the case, because the Parliaments of this State

have gone along very well without conditions, such as the one in the agreements, being included. I would like to hear the Minister say that on this occasion and in future he is prepared to approach the companies concerned to clear up the matter.

Mr. COURT: It is important that honourable members should understand the circumstances under which these agreements are negotiated and written. Firstly, I would point out to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that the clause in its present form was drawn up by a competent draftsman on his own initiative, because it is his job to prepare the ratifying Bill to give force to the agreement. If the honourable member does not accept my word I suggest he get in touch with the Solicitor-General. I want that to be recorded.

Mr. Tonkin: The agreement would be made between the company and the Government before the Crown Law Department saw it.

Mr. COURT: Of course not! In all agreements of this magnitude, the details are discussed for weeks before finality is reached, and the Solicitor-General or his representative is available all the time, because of the importance of advising the Government's negotiators on questions of law.

Mr. Tonkin: Once a provision is in the agreement it follows that it will be included in the Bill.

Mr. COURT: Of course.

Mr. Tonkin: Does the Minister say this clause was included in the agreement entirely on the volition of the Solicitor-General?

Mr. COURT: I am not saying anything of the sort. The honourable member keeps implying that this Bill is not the work of the draftsman. I say it is.

Mr. Tonkin: I did not say that.

Mr. COURT: The honourable member said the draftsman would not insert clause 4 on his own initiative.

Mr. Tonkin: He was handed a *fait accompli*.

Mr. COURT: I turn to the second point, in answer to the comments of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Pilbara. We could not negotiate an agreement of this magnitude under these circumstances, unless the provision shown on page 28 was included. I have tried to explain that if the Government could establish towns, quarries, railways, and ports, this provision would not be necessary, and the agreement would be a very small document. It would be doubtful whether it was necessary to come to Parliament, because the companies would then be the customers of the railways and ports, and the occupiers of the towns. There is no prospect in the foreseeable future of this State being able to afford any one of those projects; but there are companies which are prepared to establish these things.

On top of that, so that the area would not become a monopoly of the company, we have negotiated into this complex agreement a provision to enable not only the State, but also third parties as yet unknown to use all these facilities. If that is not a generous way to negotiate the agreements with the companies then I do not know what is, because these areas are being opened up, and other people will be able to use the facilities that are established on prescribed conditions.

What would be the position if we had the normal provision of section 36 of the Interpretation Act included? A hostile Government, with a majority in both Houses, could amend these reasonable conditions which have been arrived at by negotiations between the companies and the Government, or which have been determined by an arbitrator. A very unfair situation could develop, which could lead to the abrogation of agreements by a back-door method. This Government would not have a bar of that.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's alternative amendment to the amendment made by the Council agreed to.

Report

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

BILLS (2): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Debt Collectors Licensing Bill.
2. Electoral Act Amendment Bill (No. 3)

Bills introduced, on motion by Mr Court (Minister for Industrial Development), and read a first time

IRON ORE (MOUNT GOLDSWORTHY) AGREEMENT BILL

Council's Amendment

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. I. W Manning) in the Chair; Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development) in charge of the Bill.

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

Clause 5, page 3, line 19—Insert after the word "provisions" the words "of subsection (2)."

Mr. COURT: For the reasons I gave while considering Legislative Council message 75 I move—

That the following alternative amendment be made to the amendment made by the Council:—

Clause 5, page 3, line 20—Insert after the numerals "1918", the passage, ", but shall be laid before each House of Parliament within six sitting days of such House next following the publication of the by-laws in the *Government Gazette*."

Question put and passed; the Assembly's alternative amendment to the amendment made by the Council agreed to.

Report

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

IRON ORE (HAMERSLEY RANGE) AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Council's Amendment

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. I. W. Manning) in the Chair; Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development) in charge of the Bill.

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

New clause.

Page 2—Insert after clause 3 a new clause to stand as clause 4 as follows:—

4. Section four of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the word "provisions" in line one of paragraph (d) of subsection (2) the words "of subsection (2)."

Mr. COURT: Although the background reasons are the same as in the cases of messages 75 and 76, the circumstances are slightly different inasmuch as we are adding a new clause to amend a Bill passed in 1963. It so happens that this Bill is now before us for the purpose of making amendments to the original agreement and the purpose of the amendment I now wish to move is to give effect to the same principles we have introduced into the previous Bills. I move—

That the following alternative amendment be made to the amendment made by the Council:—

New clause.

Page 2—Insert after clause 3 a new clause to stand as clause 4 as follows:—

S.4 of principal Act amended.

4. Section four of the principal Act is amended by inserting, immediately after the numerals, "1918", in line two of paragraph (d) of subsection (2), the passage, ", but shall be laid before each House of Parliament within six sitting days of such House next following the publication of the by-laws in the *Government Gazette*."

Question put and passed; the Assembly's alternative amendment to the amendment made by the Council agreed to.

Report

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

MINE WORKERS' RELIEF ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. BOVELL (Vasse—Minister for Lands) [5.34 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is complementary to the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill, 1964, and will bring the Mine Workers' Relief Act, 1932 into line with that Act in regard to mine workers' entitlement to workers' compensation by reason of suffering from tuberculosis with silicosis or from silicosis in the advanced stage. These provisions have until now been covered by sections 47 and 52 of the Mine Workers' Relief Act, 1932, but will become redundant with the coming into operation of the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Act, 1964. Sections 47 and 52 of the Act will be repealed.

In addition, the opportunity has been taken to include some amendments to the Mine Workers' Relief Act, 1932 which have either been agreed to between the Government and the Mine Workers' Relief Board or are necessary to bring the Act up to date in some medical terms and to remove doubt as to the interpretation of some sections.

It is necessary to introduce an interpretation of the medical officer appointed from time to time under section 7 of the Act whose title will be "Mines Medical Officer". This is the title used in that regard in the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill and will replace throughout the Mine Workers' Relief Act, 1932, the expression, "any medical officer, medical practitioner or the laboratory".

Section 13 of the Act in respect of which some doubts have arisen will be amended to ensure that the benefits arising out of that section are extended to the dependants of a deceased mineworker. The word "tubercular" will be replaced throughout the Act by the word "tuberculous" which is the present-day medical term.

The provisions regarding curative treatment are amended to continue entitlement to re-examination after a prohibited mineworker has been notified that his tuberculous condition has been arrested, and for further curative treatment and entitlement to fund benefits in the event of a recurrence of his tuberculous condition. The Act has not been previously clear on this point.

The obligation on mineworkers suffering from early silicosis who have left the industry and who are registered under section 50 of the Act to apply annually for renewal of their registration will be removed. Provision is included also for contributions by such ex-mineworkers to be made from the date they left the industry and not from the date of registration under such section as in the past.

Benefits under section 56A of the Act will be extended to persons in receipt of a service pension under the Repatriation Act, 1920, and validation will be made of any payments made by the board in that regard prior to the coming into operation of the Mine Workers' Relief Act Amendment Act, 1964.

Provision will be made for benefits under section 56A to extend to the dependants of a registered person who is in all respects entitled to benefits under the section except for the reason only that he is drawing workers' compensation but who dies while he is drawing compensation.

Finally, section 57 is amended to bring the Act into conformity with procedure which has been in operation for some years.

Debate adjourned until Tuesday, the 24th November, on motion by Mr. Moir.

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [5.39 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Before I proceed to outline the main features of the Bill I believe it would be desirable for me to refer to existing arrangements with respect to Commonwealth grants for roads.

Honourable members may recall that when the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act of 1959 was enacted, provision was made for a matching grant from the Commonwealth of one pound for every pound by which allocations for roads from the State's own resources exceed the allocations for the year 1958-59.

These matching grants up to a prescribed maximum were payable in addition to what might be described as the normal allocation to the State of Commonwealth grants for road purposes.

The normal allocation to the State—or to give it its correct title, the "Basic Grant"—is based on a formula which distributes a total prescribed sum between the States in the proportions of 5 per cent. to Tasmania and the remainder to the other five States—one-third according to population, one-third according to area, and one-third according to the number of vehicles registered in each State.

The matching grants are also divided between the States in the same proportion but require the States to spend increasing sums from their own resources if they are to attract them.

In order to ascertain whether or not the State did in fact allocate more from its own resources in each year than was allocated in the base year—1958-59—it was necessary to take account of motor vehicle license fees collected by country local authorities since they formed part of the total collections by the State from this source.

However, the 1959 Act stipulated that money allocated by the State from its own resources had to be certified by the Auditor-General. Local authorities are not subject to audit by the Auditor-General; and unless their collections in excess of the base year passed through a fund subject to his examination the requirement in the Act with respect to certification could not be met.

Accordingly arrangements were made whereby country local authorities, if they so desired, could remit their excess collections to an account called the Central Road Trust Fund. Subsequently these remittances were returned to local authorities thus permitting the Auditor-General to certify that the amounts concerned had in fact been allocated for expenditure on roads.

It was also decided to allow local authorities to participate in the benefits of the matching Commonwealth grants, and to this end it was arranged that for every £1 of excess collections remitted by them they would receive back 35s. The mechanics of the arrangement were that amounts remitted by country local authorities during a financial year to the central fund were repaid to them in July-August of the following year, plus the supplementation of 15s. for every £1 remitted.

A different arrangement was necessary for metropolitan local authorities since they do not collect motor-vehicle license fees.

Motor-vehicle license fees are collected in the metropolitan area by the Police Department and after deducting costs of collection—fixed at £120,000 per annum—the balance is divisible equally between metropolitan local authorities and the Main Roads Department.

In the case of the metropolitan area, collections in excess of the 1958-59 base year were also paid into the Central Road

Trust Fund and one-half of the amount plus a supplementation of 15s. for each £1 thereof was paid to the metropolitan local authorities.

Payments to the Central Road Trust Fund apart from vehicle license fee collections in excess of the 1958-59 base year, embrace the matching grants received from the Commonwealth and drivers' license fees collected by the Police Department. After making payments to local authorities, the balance in the fund is paid to the Main Roads Department.

Generally the scheme functioned well and we were able to attract the full Commonwealth matching grant in each of the past five years. However, in view of the provisions of the new Commonwealth Aid Roads Act which is to operate for the next five years, certain changes will be necessary,

The Commonwealth Aid Roads Act, 1964, negotiated earlier this year, makes no change in the basic formula for distribution of the grant between the States and continues the principle of matching grants.

The proportion payable to Western Australia under the distribution formula came under sharp attack from the more populous States during a conference in Canberra in March this year. We defended the formula most strongly, not only at the conference, but in a detailed submission to the Prime Minister beforehand. The basis of our argument was the growing developmental road needs throughout the vast area of this State and the impossibility of this State meeting more than a fraction of these needs from its own resources.

In the event, the Commonwealth recognised the justice of our claim and was not prepared to impose a change upon us, preferring to let the formula stand in the absence of argument between the States on an alternative.

However, I must stress to honourable members that we cannot expect this favourable treatment to continue unless we are prepared to stretch our own resources to the limit in recognition of the importance to this State of an expanding road programme, and show clearly our own determination to contribute in full to the development of Western Australia.

In this respect the distribution formula, while giving us generous help in meeting our road needs, also throws a heavy burden upon us. In the next five years this State's share of the total Commonwealth grant will be about £66.5 million of which £8 million will be subject to matching. In 1964-65 and in each subsequent year, we are required to increase our own allocation to roads by £532,000 if we are to qualify for the full grant. This is a much more onerous task than in the last five years when the required annual increase was £353,000.

Under the new Commonwealth legislation the base year for determining the State's entitlement to the matching grant is 1963-64. The Act provides that the Commonwealth will match pound for pound with State allocations to roads in excess of £2,787,000 up to a maximum of £532,000 in 1964-65 and increasing by the same amount each year for five years.

This base amount of £2,787,000 specified in the schedule to the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act is the total amount we were required to allocate to roads in 1963-64 in order to qualify for the full Commonwealth matching grant in that year.

One consequence of the changes made in the Commonwealth legislation is that the amount available by way of matching grant has fallen from £1,769,000 last year to £532,000 this year. What has really happened is that the matching grants paid under the previous Commonwealth Act have been incorporated in the basic grant and the matching arrangements have started all over again from scratch.

This posed a problem of how to avoid a reduction in the amount of the Commonwealth grant paid to local authorities. I might say that this is the reason for the Bill being later than I would have wished. They received £674,000 on account of last year and if the existing scheme were continued would qualify for considerably more on account of 1964-65. However, even if we are able to attract the full matching grant this year, only £532,000 of Commonwealth aid road money would be paid into the central Road Trust Fund to meet this obligation, and accordingly a new approach is called for.

The Bill before honourable members makes some changes in the arrangements for paying grants to local authorities to ensure continuity in the funds available to them for road works, and at the same time introduces some new features designed to ensure that we use our maximum capacity to attract the full Commonwealth grant.

It is proposed to retain the Central Road Trust Fund with the Commonwealth matching grant, vehicle license revenue in excess of the 1958-59 base year sum, and drivers' licenses paid into the fund as at present.

However, the Bill provides that in future it shall be compulsory for all vehicle license revenue collected outside the metropolitan area in excess of the 1958-59 collections to be paid into the fund. Remittances are to be made monthly after the base year sum is reached.

Because of the difficulty the State faces in qualifying for the full Commonwealth grant, it is no longer possible to allow country local authorities the option of remitting vehicle license revenue in excess of the base year to the Central Road Trust Fund. The great majority of local authorities did participate in full during the past five years, but a few elected to retain their funds in some years and forgo the grant of 15s. in the £1.

Unless collections by country local authorities in excess of the 1958-59 amount are paid into the Central Road Trust Fund and are certified as such by the Auditor-General, the State's allocation to roads would be less than it could be, and our ability to attract the full grant reduced.

The base year sum will, as in the past, be retained by local authorities, but a new provision requires that at least 75 per cent. of the amount retained must be spent on road works or road plant. The other 25 per cent. may be taken in aid of general revenue to offset the costs of collection and the costs of enforcing the Traffic Act.

The arrangements for metropolitan vehicle license revenue remain basically unchanged. After meeting the charge for costs of collection, the base year sum will be divided equally between metropolitan local authorities and the Commissioner of Main Roads. All collections in excess of the 1958-59 base year are to be paid to the Central Road Trust Fund.

The one-half of the base year sum paid direct to metropolitan authorities, which amounts to £487,000 annually, has, I understand, always been applied to road works, although there was no legal requirement that local authorities should do so. As I mentioned earlier, the matching provisions of the Commonwealth Act require that we spend the base amount of £2,687,000 on roads before additional expenditure qualified for matching grants.

Consequently it becomes mandatory for metropolitan local authorities to spend their base year sum on roads, and the Bill provides that they shall do so; although, as I have indicated, this will merely make a legal requirement of an existing practice.

Under the present scheme, local authorities remitted their excess collections in 1963-64 to the Central Road Trust Fund and had them returned in July this year with the addition of 15s. in the pound. Apart from the 1958-59 base sum, which will be paid direct to metropolitan authorities and retained in the case of country authorities, they would have received no other funds this financial year. In July of next year they could have expected the return of their 1964-65 excess collections again with the addition of 15s. in the pound.

One result of this system was that all vehicle license revenue in excess of the 1958-59 base year amount, together with the Commonwealth matching grant, was held over at the 30th June each year. Although it was all disbursed within a few weeks, very large and growing balances showed in our accounts at the end of each year. This gave ammunition to our critics in other States who claimed that we had more money for roads than we could spend. In fact, I have heard this point raised in the House. In future we propose to pay grants to local authorities from funds available in the year in which they are received, thus avoiding the build-up of balances and also getting the money to work earlier.

The Bill provides for payment of additional grants to local authorities in this financial year equal to the amount each received from the Central Road Trust Fund in July last. In total these grants amount to £1,572,000 and will be paid from vehicle and drivers' licenses paid into the Central Road Trust Fund this year plus the Commonwealth matching grant. The grants are to be paid in monthly instalments in the period January to June, 1965.

In 1965-66 the grant to country authorities will be determined as the amount paid into the Central Road Trust Fund in 1964-65 increased by 75 per cent. The grant to metropolitan authorities will be one-half of the excess metropolitan collections paid to the fund in 1964-65 also increased by 75 per cent. However, instead of the grant being paid in a lump sum at the beginning of the year, it will be made available in 12 equal monthly instalments. Succeeding years will follow the same pattern.

The change to monthly payments should present no hardship to local authorities in view of the additional grants to be paid in the period January to June of this financial year. It is important to note that the payment to local authorities of an extra £1,572,000 in this current year is additional to the amount that they could have expected to receive by the 30th June, 1969, had the existing scheme continued unchanged during these next five years.

Another change provided in the Bill deals with the payment of interest and sinking fund to the Consolidated Revenue Fund on loan funds appropriated for road works. In the past the Main Roads (Funds Appropriation) Act and the Main Roads Act authorised an anual payment of £70,000 to revenue. This payment will have to be increased as more loan funds are used for road purposes. Unless this is done, the State will receive an adverse correction at the hands of the Commonwealth Grants Commission to the extent of the impact of these increased charges on the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Such a correction would require the use of additional loan funds to make good the unrecouped deficit in the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

As matters now stand, it will not be possible to avoid the use of loan funds for road works if we are to attract the full matching grant from the Commonwealth for the simple reason that the normal growth in vehicle and drivers' license fees will be insufficient to provide the required increased allocation for road works from our own resources. Even in this current year we will need to allocate £250,000 from the General Loan Fund for this purpose, and provision has been made in the Loan Estimates accordingly.

Rather than continue the present involved accounting treatment of road funds, opportunity has been taken to simplify procedures. Provision is made in the Bill to recoup debt charges as determined by the Treasurer, direct from the Central Road Trust Fund, and also to transfer the balance of that fund and the Main Roads Department's share of the metropolitan traffic trust account direct to the main roads trust account.

This procedure will remove the necessity for the Main Roads (Funds Appropriation) Acts which are to be repealed. It will also eliminate the need for the main roads contribution trust account. Accordingly the section of the Main Roads Act dealing with that account is to be repealed. Consequential amendments are to be made to section 31 of the Main Roads Act. In short, the Bill provides for—

(1) The payment to local authorities in this current financial year of additional grants for roads totalling £1,572,000.

(2) The payment to local authorities in 1965-66 and succeeding financial years up to the 30th June, 1969, of precisely the same sums as they would have received under the existing scheme had it continued on the same basis beyond the 30th June last.

(3) Payments to local authorities in 1965-66, and succeeding years, to be made monthly in lieu of a lump sum in July-August of each year.

(4) Country local authorities to continue retaining motor vehicle license collections up to a total sum equal to their 1958-59 base year collections with a new condition that at least 75 per cent. of these collections are to be spent on road works.

(5) Metropolitan local authorities are to be required to spend the whole of their 1958-59 base year allocations on road works.

(6) The present involved system for the payment of a contribution to revenue for debt charges on loan funds spent on roads is to be simplified.

(7) The main roads contribution trust account is to be eliminated as it no longer serves any useful purpose.

I think honourable members will agree, after due consideration of the provisions of this Bill, that fair and reasonable provision has been made for grants to local authorities to assist them with their road problems.

Had the provisions of the new Commonwealth legislation for the matching grants been applied strictly to local authorities, they would have suffered a sharp fall in the funds available to them for road works; but we set out to avoid this as the Government is very much aware of the ever-increasing road needs facing local authorities, and we are anxious to ensure that the funds available to them grow with those needs.

I should also mention that the provisions contained in the Bill have been discussed in detail with the executives of the three local government associations and they are in agreement with them. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

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

House adjourned at 5.59 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 19th November, 1964

CONTENTS

	Page
BILLS—	
Abattoirs Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	2760
Com.; Report; 3r.	2762
Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment Bill—Assembly's Message	2768
Country Areas Water Supply Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	2750
Com.	2757
Recom.	2758
Further Report	2760
Fisheries Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	2764
Com.	2768
Report; 3r.	2768
Interstate Maintenance Recovery Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.; Com.; Report; 3r.	2772
Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act Amendment Bill—Assembly's Message	2763
Iron Ore (Mount Goldsworthy) Agreement Bill—Assembly's Message	2762
Iron Ore (Mount Newman) Agreement Bill—Assembly's Message	2764
Justices Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—	
2r.	2772
Com.; Report; 3r.	2773