

will make under this Bill to a group of schools which want to build a swimming pool. The honourable member suggested that in the Fremantle area some 10 schools might get together, and he thought that consideration should be given to making £10,000 available to these 10 schools, collectively, rather than £1,000 to each school.

I conveyed his thoughts to my colleague, the Minister for Education; and while I am not in a position to give the honourable member any direct undertaking at this time, the Minister has said he will have a look at the proposal. I also mentioned it to the Treasurer somewhat casually as the opportunity presented itself.

I think that Mr. Dolan might, on reflection, find that there are some difficulties attached to this. For instance, if 10 schools wanted £10,000, that £10,000 could only represent a maximum of 25 per cent. of the project. Therefore, to get the total benefit which might apply, the swimming pool would have to cost £40,000. If the pool cost £30,000, then, as the maximum benefit these 10 schools could get would be 25 per cent., they would receive only £7,500.

Additionally, I do not know how such an arrangement might pan out. It occurs to me it might be all right for the school which is lucky enough to have the pool built in its grounds. Then again there is the question of how far distant the schools would be one from the other; and, in relation to the pool, what the distance would be to each school.

However, I did undertake to make some inquiries about this, and having submitted the information to the honourable member I would ask him to think about it. In the meantime his remarks are being sent to the Minister for Education.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I thank the Minister for taking note of the points I raised. I also went a little further and I would like him to convey to the Minister that if the decision is made to build a big central pool in Fremantle those points I raised in connection with 10 schools might equally apply if the whole 50 could have a central pool; and in those circumstances some consideration could be given to making a considerable grant to the authorities responsible for it.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3: Sections 9B and 9C added—

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. Dolan raised another matter in connection with the tuition fees being paid to University students.

The Hon. J. Dolan: First degree.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. He queried the fact that there was no mention of that proposal in this Bill. No legislative action is necessary for this as it is being done now by the Treasurer.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: They are being paid?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. They are being paid from the Treasury and there is no necessity for legislative action. The payments are being made from the date proposed.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I would thank the Minister for making that reference to the Committee also. As the amount involved is something like £40,000, I felt members were entitled to the information.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

## ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) (9.9 p.m.): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 14th September.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.10 p.m.

# Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 8th September, 1965

## CONTENTS

	Page
ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL	770
BILLS—	
Albany Harbour Board Act Amendment Bill—Returned	751
Architects Act Amendment Bill—3r.	741
Bread Act Amendment Bill—3r.	741
Builders' Registration Act Amendment Bill—	
Intro.; 1r.	741
Bunbury Harbour Board Act Amendment Bill—Returned	751
Bush Fires Act Amendment Bill—	
Returned	751
Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment Bill—3r.	741
Electoral Act Amendment Bill—2r.	741
Health Act Amendment Bill—3r.	741
Local Government Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	751
Com.	759
Report	760
Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill—3r.	741
Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill—3r.	741
Spear-guns Control Act Amendment Bill—	
Returned	751
Traffic Act Amendment Bill—2r.	769

## CONTENTS—continued

	Page
<b>LOTTERIES CONDUCTED BY CHARITABLE ORGANISATIONS—</b>	
Forms : Tabling .....	734
<b>MOTIONS—</b>	
Gascoyne River : Damming .....	760
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>	
Betting—	
Totalisator Agency Board : Credit Betting—	
Agents : Indebtedness to Board	738
Deposits : Loan by Agents .....	738
Cattle Compensation Funds : Contributions and Payments .....	740
Censorship of Films—	
Classification and Compliance .....	738
Procedure in Western Australia .....	738
Responsibility and Authority .....	738
Crown Law Department File 1055/65 : Removal of Confusion .....	735
Dredge "Western Eagle" : Fire Damage	738
Education—Teachers' Salaries Increase : Arrears in Payment .....	735
Fishing—Crayfishing Licenses : Issue to Prawn Fishermen in Carnarvon-Shark Bay Area .....	737
Fuel Oil : Use in Preference to Local Coal	735
Harbour, Fremantle : New Berths—Dredging : Amount Required, and Suitability of "Sir James Mitchell" Dredge	735
Housing in Country Areas—Water Rating System : Effect on Commission Tenants, and Alleviation .....	739
<b>Mining—</b>	
Mine Workers' Relief Fund—	
Iron Ore Companies' Contributions	736
Mineworkers' Subscriptions : Deductions by Iron Ore Companies .....	737
Mines Medical Officer—	
Appointment of Replacement .....	736
Transfer from Kalgoorlie to Perth .....	736
Onions : Marketing Board Referendum—Circular Accompanying Ballot Paper	740
Inquiry into Circumstances .....	740
Notification to Organisations .....	740
Pre-referendum Meeting : Details of Refreshments Provided .....	740
Pneumoconiosis in Mineworkers—Iron Ore Companies' Liability .....	736
<b>Railways—</b>	
Railway Guards School—	
Cost .....	735
Resignations before Appointment	735
Railway Stations—	
Metropolitan Lines : Reduction of Personnel .....	739
Midland Railway Line : Closure of Sidings, and Reduction of Personnel .....	739
Swan River Reclamation : Trucks Transporting Sand—Traffic Regulations : Policing .....	739

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—continued

	Page
Town Planning—Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Act, 1963 : Compliance by Local Authorities .....	724
Transport : Taxis—	
Control Board : Charges, and Use of Funds .....	737
Drivers' Identity Discs .....	737
Workers' Compensation Act—Medical Board : Qualifications of Personnel .....	737

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—

	Page
M.T.T. Bus Depot at Morley : Siting .....	741
Railway Crossing at Market Street, Guildford—Flashing Lights : Provision .....	741

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

## LOTTERIES CONDUCTED BY CHARITABLE ORGANISATIONS

### Forms : Tabling

Mr. CRAIG (Minister for Police): As promised in my answer to the question asked by the member for Claremont yesterday, I have here for tabling copies of application forms and other relevant forms associated with day lotteries, as requested by that honourable member.

The papers were tabled.

## QUESTIONS (20) : ON NOTICE

### METROPOLITAN REGION TOWN PLANNING SCHEME ACT AMENDMENT ACT, 1963

#### Compliance by Local Authorities

1. Mr. TOMS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:
  - (1) How many local authorities have, since the coming into operation of the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Act, on the 30th October, 1963, complied with the requirement of the Act?
  - (2) Who are the authorities that have complied?
  - (3) What municipalities and shires have yet to do so?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Two
- (2) City of Nedlands  
Shire of Peppermint Grove

- (3) City of Fremantle. Town of Cottesloe. Shire of Kalamunda—minor amendments required.  
Shire of Armadale-Kelmscott. Shire of Gosnells—schemes ready for submission  
City of Perth  
City of South Perth  
City of Subiaco  
Town of Midland  
Town of Claremont  
Town of Mosman  
Town of East Fremantle  
Town of Melville  
Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale  
Shire of Canning  
Shire of Belmont  
Shire of Mundaring  
Shire of Swan-Guildford  
Shire of Bassendean  
Shire of Bayswater  
Shire of Perth  
Shire of Wanneroo  
Shire of Cockburn  
Shire of Kwinana  
Shire of Rockingham

#### FREMANTLE HARBOUR: NEW BERTHS

*Dredging: Amount Required, and Suitability of "Sir James Mitchell" Dredge*

2. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister for Works:
- (1) What quantity of dredging is required by the Fremantle Harbour Trust in connection with the proposed new berths in the river?
  - (2) Is the work of a kind which could suitably be carried out by the dredge *Sir James Mitchell*?
- Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:
- (1) Approximately 1.7 million cubic yards.
  - (2) No.

#### CROWN LAW DEPARTMENT FILE 1055/65

##### *Removal of Confusion*

3. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:
- In respect of C.L.D. File 1055/65, has the reference to another person which caused initial confusion been removed from the file?

Mr. COURT replied:

It has been arranged for the traffic record of one of the persons to be specially marked to distinguish it from the traffic record which relates to the other person of the same name.

No further confusion should result; but, if the honourable member so wishes, he may peruse the file at the Minister's office.

#### TEACHERS' SALARIES INCREASE

##### *Arrears in Payment*

4. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Education:
- (1) Have all teachers who were employed for any time since the 1st July, 1964, received arrears of salary arising from the salary review operation from that date?
  - (2) If not, how many are yet to be so paid?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Yes, as regards teachers at present employed, excepting those cases which are subject to adjustment up or down as a result of appeals to the Government School Teachers' Tribunal.

Teachers who are not still employed and whose addresses are known to the department have been paid the increase arising from the Minister's reclassification. Any adjustment arising from the appeals to the tribunal will be forwarded to them in the near future.

- (2) Any teacher who has not received arrears will be paid when he or she informs the department of his or her present address.  
It would be difficult to ascertain the number of teachers still to apply.

#### RAILWAY GUARDS SCHOOL

##### *Cost*

5. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Railways:
- (1) What was the cost of conducting the recently concluded guards school for which safe working examination results were published in the *Railway Institute Magazine*, August, 1965?

##### *Resignations before Appointment*

- (2) What has been the incidence of persons successful in such schools, who have left the service before taking up an appointment, during recent years?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) £7,736.
- (2) One only.

#### FUEL OIL

##### *Use in Preference to Local Coal*

6. Mr. HAWKE asked the Premier:
- How does he justify the Government's policy of increasing the State's expenditure of money on the purchase of large quantities of imported oil as against using locally-produced coal, especially as Western Australia is a claimant

State and in view of the bad effect the Government's policy in this matter has on Australia's overseas trading operations?

Mr. BRAND replied:

The use of fuel oil in power stations has no effect on the importation of crude oil. The amount of crude oil imported depends on the demand on refineries for aviation and motor spirit, and for automotive distillate and diesel oils for transport, rural, and secondary industry. In the refining process which is a large and important industry and employer in Western Australia, fuel oil is produced as a by-product. It also must be remembered that, as more natural gas and crude oil are being discovered in Australia and Western Australia, the greater is the prospect of sufficient local supplies being available for our own domestic power production.

## PNEUMOCONIOSIS IN MINeworkERS

### *Iron Ore Companies' Liability*

7. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Has every company which is operating on leases held for the mining of iron ore in the State complied with the provisions of section 14, subsection (2) (a) of the Workers' Compensation Act in respect of its obligations against liability in respect of pneumoconiosis contracted by a mineworker in its employment?
- (2) If some have not complied, will he state what companies and what is the reason?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) and (2) Section 14 (2) (a) of the Workers' Compensation Act, 1912-1964, does not require compliance by employers, but by approved insurance offices.

Section 13 (1) of the Act makes it obligatory for every employer to obtain from an incorporated insurance office approved by the Minister a policy of insurance for the full amount of the liability to pay compensation under the Act to all workers employed by him. It also provides that the Governor may, by Order-in-Council, in certain circumstances, exempt an employer or group of employers from the operation of the section.

I understand that the following companies have effected a necessary policy of insurance—

- (a) Mount Goldsworthy Mining Associates.

(b) Western Mining Corporation, whilst Australian Iron & Steel Ltd. and Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. have obtained exemptions.

Information given by the Mines Department indicates that there are other iron ore companies, but these hold temporary reserves only and are still exploring. With regard to Hamersley Iron Pty. Ltd., this company has applied for iron leases which have not yet been granted and they are not yet in production.

## MINES MEDICAL OFFICER

### *Transfer from Kalgoorlie to Perth*

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

- (1) Is it a fact that the Mines Medical Officer has been transferred from Kalgoorlie to Perth?
- (2) If this is correct, is the transfer to be permanent or of limited duration?

### *Appointment of Replacement*

- (3) Will he state if another appointee is to be made as a replacement in Kalgoorlie?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) There are two medical officers at Kalgoorlie appointed as mines medical officers under the Mine Workers' Relief Act (Dr. Maguire and Dr. Karczub). Under normal circumstances, Dr. Maguire does most of the mines work (about half of which originates in and around Kalgoorlie).

Dr. Maguire has been transferred temporarily to Perth in order to relieve another medical officer who is sick. Some of Dr. Maguire's work is being carried out by Dr. Karczub; the rest is continuing to be dealt with by Dr. Maguire who will visit Kalgoorlie frequently.

- (2) It is intended that this arrangement should be of limited duration.
- (3) Not applicable.

## MINE WORKERS' RELIEF FUND

### *Iron Ore Companies' Contributions*

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

- (1) Will he enumerate the companies that are operating on iron ore leases in the State?
- (2) Are any of these companies contributing to the Mine Workers' Relief Fund in accordance with the provisions of that Act?

*Mineworkers' Subscriptions:  
Deductions by Iron Ore Companies*

- (3) Are any of these companies deducting subscriptions from workers, according to the provisions of subsection (2) of section 19 of the Act?
- (4) If not, what is the reason?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) Leases or claims are held by Australian Iron & Steel Ltd., The Broken Hill Proprietary Company Ltd., Mt. Goldsworthy Mining Associates, and Western Mining Corporation Ltd.

In addition, the following companies have been granted rights of occupancy over temporary reserves for the purpose of investigating iron ore deposits:

Hammersley Iron Pty. Ltd.  
Mt. Newman Iron Ore Company Ltd.

Basic Materials Pty. Ltd.  
Iron Hill Pty. Ltd.

Bell Bros. Pty. Ltd.  
Mineral Mining & Exports (W.A.) Pty. Ltd.

- (2) Australian Iron & Steel Ltd., Sentinel Mining Company Inc., which holds an option from Messrs. Rhodes and Sims, and Western Mining Corporation Ltd. are contributing to the Mine Workers' Relief Fund.
- (3) Those listed in (2).
- (4) The Mine Workers' Relief Board and the Mines Department are currently in communication with the companies which are not contributing to the fund with the view to determining whether they are now liable to do so.

## WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

*Medical Board: Qualifications of Personnel*

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

Will he state what special medical qualifications are held by the three departmental medical officers appointed to the medical board constituted according to the provisions of section 8 (1D) of the Workers' Compensation Act, other than those required by (a), (b), and (c) of subsection (1D) of the section, which would enable them to give a specialised assessment of any disablement for work suffered by a claimant and which would be attributable to non-industrial causes?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The three departmental medical officers involved were appointed to the board because of their special experience in connection with industrial chest disease, with which the board is largely concerned. So far as non-industrial aspects are concerned, the board has access to reports and opinions from other appropriate specialists and can seek these at its discretion.

## CRAYFISHING LICENSES

*Issue to Prawn Fishermen in Carnarvon-Shark Bay Area*

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

- (1) Has any new crayfishing license been granted to boats having exclusive rights to prawn fishing in the Carnarvon-Shark Bay area?
- (2) If not, is it contemplated that licenses will be issued to any of these boats in the forthcoming season?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) In February, 1965, Nor'-West Whaling Co. Ltd. was advised that four of its vessels which were licensed for crayfishing on the 1st March, 1963, the date on which the ban on additional boats was introduced, were legally entitled to fish for crayfish during the current year.
- (2) See answer to (1).

## TAXIS

*Drivers' Identity Discs*

12. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Why is it necessary for a taxi driver to pay 10s. per year for an identity disc?
- (2) To what purpose is the sum obtained by the Taxi Control Board applied?

*Control Board: Charges, and Use of Funds*

- (3) What other charges, if any, are required to be paid by taxi drivers to the Taxi Control Board?
- (4) What service is available from the Taxi Control Board for drivers paying the 10s. identity disc fee?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) To protect the driver's interests and to enable passengers, inspectors, or police officers to identify the driver of the taxi and to assist inspectors to detect persons who are not authorised to drive a taxi.

- (2) To offset the cost of manufacture and the clerical work involved in issuing, recording, and recovery of badges.
- (3) None by drivers, but owners of taxis are required to pay £10 per annum license fee, 5s. for a duplicate license fee, £1 for a transfer fee, £1 for plate fee.
- (4) Answered by No. (1).

#### **TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD: CREDIT BETTING**

##### *Deposits: Loan by Agents*

13. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) Are agents of the T.A.B. still being allowed to keep telephone bettors' credit accounts in credit by lending them the necessary sums from time to time to enable them to make bets by telephone?

##### *Agents: Indebtedness to Board*

- (2) Are any agents indebted to the board?
- (3) Has it been necessary for the board to call on agents' cash deposits or securities to meet any deficiencies in payments due to the board?
- (4) If "Yes," in how many instances was this necessary during the last 12 months and what was the total sum involved?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) Yes. Subject to a proper credit account being established and the Act and regulations being properly complied with, an agent is permitted to maintain a backer's account in credit.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Two. The respective amounts were £498 11s. 6d. and £508 1s. 6d. but in neither case was the default in any way due to telephone betting. Both agents were promptly dismissed by the board, and settlements in full were obtained.

#### **DREDGE "WESTERN EAGLE"**

##### *Fire Damage*

14. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Did a fire recently occur on the dredge *Western Eagle* occasioning substantial damage?
- (2) Was it necessary to run a fire hose from the *Western Pueblo* to quench the fire because the *Western Eagle* did not have a hose on deck?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) The senior engineer surveyor to the Harbour and Light Department returned from King Bay in connection with an inspection of the dredge *Western Eagle* on the 3rd September. He heard talk of a fire on board when he was on shore, but was informed that there had been no fire and he could see no indication of a fire having occurred.

The *Western Eagle* has ample fire-fighting equipment on board, even more than is required by the Western Australian Marine Act.

#### **CENSORSHIP OF FILMS**

##### *Responsibility and Authority*

15. Mr. DAVIES asked the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Who is responsible for the censorship of films for public screening in this State?
- (2) Under what authority does the censor act?

##### *Procedure in Western Australia*

- (3) Does censorship of films in this State differ from other States?  
*Classification and Compliance*
- (4) In what manner are the public required to be advised of censorship classification?
- (5) What censorship classifications are given to films?
- (6) What action is taken to ensure that films sometimes advertised as "Strictly Adults Only" are only screened before adult audiences?
- (7) What is considered to be adult age in regard to the screening of films?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) and (2) Commonwealth film censor by agreement between the Commonwealth and the State as provided for in the State Censorship of Films Act, 1947.
- (3) No.
- (4) By appropriate advertising of the film classifications on screening and by newspaper, bill posters, and other means of advertising.
- (5) "G"—Suitable for general exhibition.  
"A"—Not suitable for children.  
"AO"—Suitable for adults only.  
"H"—Horror film.
- (6) This is the responsibility of parents.
- (7) Sixteen years.

**RAILWAY STATIONS***Midland Railway Line: Closure of Sidings, and Reduction of Personnel*

16. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) What number of sidings on the old Midland Railway line have been, or will be closed before Christmas 1965?
- (2) What stations have had personnel reduced on the Midland railway line?

*Metropolitan Lines: Reduction of Personnel*

- (3) What metropolitan stations are to have personnel reduced before Christmas 1965?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) One (Bullsbrook).
- (2) Mingenew.
- (3) West Midland.

**SWAN RIVER RECLAMATION: TRUCKS TRANSPORTING SAND***Traffic Regulations: Policing*

17. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Traffic:

In view of the impression that some of the trucks carting sand from Bayswater to the Perth Water reclamation work via Beaufort Street, Inglewood, are—

- (a) exceeding the permissible maximum speed;
  - (b) failing to give way to pedestrians at crosswalks; and
  - (c) failing to have their loads sheeted, even when heaped above the level of the sides,
- will he undertake to have the route adequately policed in order to ensure conformity with the regulations?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

The route is being policed and this matter is receiving special attention.

**HOUSING IN COUNTRY AREAS***Water Rating System: Effect on Commission Tenants, and Alleviation*

18. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is it a fact that widows, pensioners, and other persons and families living in State Housing Commission accommodation in country areas and paying rebated rentals, have virtually had their rents increased and simultaneously the financial obligations of the commission have been reduced by comparison with the previously prevailing position where

the commission paid rates to the Water Supply Department for which an allowance of water was available without cost to the tenant (other than if excess water were used), whereas the current procedure is for a token water rate payment to be made by the commission, whilst the tenant must pay for every gallon of water he uses?

- (2) Does he propose to do anything to rectify the situation?
- (3) Would he be prepared to institute a system under which the commission would pay the existing rate plus at least an amount for water used to make up the difference between such existing rate and that previously imposed?
- (4) If so, when is such likely to commence?
- (5) If not, why not, as under such a proposal tenants on rebated rentals would not be called upon to meet added costs, and the commission would not be involved in any more outlay than previously?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

- (1) There has been no increase in rents. It is accepted that there is an increased financial obligation upon such tenants because of the new system of water rating and charges in country areas. Low-income families who are not commission tenants are equally affected by these charges, but do not enjoy rental rebates as granted by the commission. The commission pays rates in accordance with the Country Areas Water Supply Act in the same manner as any other owner. These are not token payments.
- (2) and (3) No.
- (4) Answered by (2) and (3).
- (5) The rents charged are in accordance with the Commonwealth-State housing agreements. The commission in assessing rents includes only rates charged to the commission. Should payment be made for water used, such amounts would be set off by the Commonwealth in any claim made for losses in respect of houses built under the No. 1 agreement. In the case of houses built under the No. 2 agreement, the loss would have to be borne by the commission to the detriment of funds available for further housing.

## ONIONS: MARKETING BOARD REFERENDUM

### *Circular Accompanying Ballot Paper*

19. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is it a fact that in the referendum of onion growers held in August last year and which was carried by only seven votes, a document containing the partisan viewpoint of the Onion Marketing Board was enclosed in the same envelope as the ballot paper?

### *Notification to Organisations*

- (2) Is it a fact that organisations with members who are onion growers were not advised of the intention to hold a referendum, and were therefore unable to refute the board's propaganda?

### *Pre-referendum Meeting: Details of Refreshments Provided*

- (3) Is it a fact that prior to the referendum being held, a meeting of growers was convened at Spearwood by the board at which a quantity of liquor was provided?
- (4) What quantity was provided?
- (5) What was the total cost of the refreshments at this meeting?
- (6) Who supplied and paid for the refreshments?
- (7) If paid by the board, what is the authority for the outlay, and by what section of the Act is it covered?
- (8) What was the purpose or objective in supplying liquor to the growers just prior to the holding of the referendum?

### *Inquiry into Circumstances*

- (9) In view of all the circumstances, is he prepared to say that the referendum was fairly conducted, and notwithstanding those circumstances that a bare majority of seven votes in a ballot participated in by less than half of those eligible, is sufficient for members of this Parliament to accept the result of the referendum as a warrant to support the proposed amendments to the Act?
- (10) Further, in view of the circumstances, does he consider an inquiry should be instituted?

Mr. LEWIS (for Mr. Nalder) replied:

- (1) The referendum was conducted by the State Electoral Department. A circular was enclosed with each voting paper setting out the existing provisions, the proposed amendments, and the Onion Marketing Board's reasons for seeking such amendments.

- (2) No organisations were formally advised of the referendum. The proposals were posted direct to growers on the 7th August, 1964, and returnable on the 20th August. The board took no part in canvassing a "Yes" vote.
- (3) to (8) No pre-referendum meeting was convened by the board. At the request of the Spearwood Fruit Growers and Market Gardeners' Assn. Inc., the board was present at a meeting held on the 12th May, 1964, which was attended by 140 growers. I would ask members to note the dates: On the 12th May the meeting was held, and on the 20th August the ballot papers were returnable. Refreshments costing £15 5s. for sandwiches and hire of crockery, and £13 0s. 6d. for drinks, including soft drinks and hire of glassware, were provided at the end of the meeting by the board from its administrative account, authorised by section 15 (4) of the Act. These meetings, concluded with refreshments, have been an annual event for a number of years.
- (9) The referendum was fairly conducted with a majority of those voting favouring the proposed amendments.
- (10) No.

## CATTLE COMPENSATION FUNDS

### *Contributions and Payments*

20. Mr. I. W. MANNING asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) During the year 1964-65 what sum of money was contributed to—
  - (a) the Beef Cattle Industry Compensation Act Fund;
  - (b) the Dairy Cattle Industry Compensation Act Fund;
  - (c) the Milk Act Dairy Cattle Compensation Fund
 respectively by the following:—
  - (i) Cattle owners;
  - (ii) the Treasury;
  - (iii) by returns from sale of condemned cattle?
- (2) What sums of money were paid out of the above three funds by way of compensation during the year 1964-65?
- (3) What sum of money is held in each of the three funds as at the 30th June, 1965?
- (4) Did dairy farmers who contributed under the provisions of the Milk Act and the Dairy Cattle Industry Compensation Act also contribute under the Beef Cattle Industry Compensation Act?



Mr. LEWIS (for Mr. Nalder) replied:

(1) Contributions to Compensation Funds 1964-65:—

	(a) Beef Cattle			(b) Dairy Cattle			(c) Milk Act		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
(i) Cattle owners ..	47,058	4	7	1,374	9	0	264	2	2
(ii) C.R.F. (Treasury) ..	47,058	4	7	1,374	9	0	264	2	2
(iii) Returns from sales ..	4,314	6	8	5,043	7	11	1,139	0	8

(2) The amounts were—

	£	s.	d.
Beef Cattle Industry Compensation Fund ..	21,026	15	4
Dairy Cattle Industry Compensation Fund ..	8,065	0	0
Milk Act Compensation Fund ..	2,205	0	0

(3) The amounts were—

	£	s.	d.
Beef Cattle Industry Compensation Fund ..	73,776	4	2
Dairy Cattle Industry Compensation Fund ..	48,293	6	5
Dairy Cattle Industry Compensation Fund Reserve ..	20,000	0	0
Milk Act Compensation Fund ..	38,237	0	0

(4) Yes, by way of stamp duty when sales of cattle are made.

**QUESTIONS (2): WITHOUT NOTICE**

**M.T.T. BUS DEPOT AT MORLEY**

*Sitting*

1. Mr. TOMS asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has he seen the report in today's *Daily News* on page 2, dealing with a protest by residents of the Morley area against the proposed M.T.T. bus depot in Camboon Road?
- (2) Will the Minister discuss the matter with the trust, in an endeavour to have this depot resited on industrial land to the north in the area occupied by the S.E.C.?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Action has already been taken in this regard, and as soon as the full details are to hand I shall pass them on to the honourable member.

**RAILWAY CROSSING AT MARKET STREET, GUILDFORD**

*Flashing Lights: Provision*

2. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

Has the Minister obtained replies to the three questions which I asked yesterday afternoon?

Mr. COURT replied:

As promised I did make inquiries, finding, as I expected I would, that there was an accident at that crossing in which a person was injured and taken to hospital. The exact cause of it and any suggestion as to the party responsible for the accident have yet to be advised to me. These accidents are always the subject of careful and

detailed study by all the authorities concerned, both in the interests of public safety and of the employees involved.

I have not got the details of the findings in this matter, nor do I think the inquiry is complete. So far as the circumstances surrounding this particular crossing are concerned, they are unchanged from the letter sent to the honourable member, I think on the 19th January, 1965, which summarises the position. However, the matter is still under consideration by the Flashing Lights Committee. As to whether the papers are available for sighting by the honourable member, I have still to study them to see whether they are suitable for release.

**BUILDERS' REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

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

**BILLS (6): THIRD READING**

1. Architects Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Works), and transmitted to the Council.

2. Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Bovell (Minister for Lands), and returned to the Council with an amendment.

3. Bread Act Amendment Bill.

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

4. Health Act Amendment Bill.

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

5. Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Bovell (Minister for Lands), and passed.

6. Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Lewis (Minister for Education), and passed.

**ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed, from the 25th August, on the following motion by Mr. Bickerton:—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**MR. COURT** (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [4.55 p.m.]: The member for Pilbara, when introducing this Bill, explained its objects, which are three-fold: Firstly, the prohibition of the distribution of any type of political propaganda, including how-to-vote cards, on election day; secondly, party designations to be placed on the ballot paper alongside the names of candidates; and, thirdly, the registration of political parties to give practical effect to the first and second of these proposals.

He made it clear during his introduction of the Bill that the third of these points—namely, the registration of political parties—was necessary before the first and second would be effective; and with this I do not disagree.

The Government, I should say early in my comments on this Bill, is opposed without any reservation to the second and third of these points; namely, the party designation on the ballot paper alongside the name of the candidates, and the registration of political parties. There may be some Government supporters who feel, in the light of their experience, that the restriction or prohibition of propaganda distribution on election days may be worth further consideration; but before the Government would be prepared to introduce legislation to give effect to this, or support legislation along those lines, it would need to give a lot more thought and study to the matter. This is not a subject which can be taken lightly, and I give an undertaking to the honourable member and this House that the Government will conduct a study of this particular matter to see whether there is a case to be made out for changing the procedure on election day in respect of the distribution of political propaganda including how-to-vote cards.

**Mr. Graham:** Would you also give consideration to the other points at the same time?

**Mr. COURT:** I thought I made it clear that the Government, without reservation, does not agree to the other two points—

**Mr. Graham:** At this stage.

**Mr. COURT:**—and I will explain briefly why we are opposed without reservation at this juncture to these two particular points. Both time and circumstances change things, of course; and it may be that, in the light of study, some future Government might change its view on these particular points. At this stage the Government is not prepared to entertain the two points—and I refer specifically to the question of party designations on the ballot papers alongside the names of candidates, and the registration of political parties.

To give practical effect to what the honourable member proposes we agree that if a system of this kind is to be introduced,

a method of registration would have to be adopted, or otherwise there would be complete and utter chaos with ballot papers.

**Mr. Graham:** We will have to wait for more Country Party conferences.

**Mr. COURT:** If the honourable member studies that point, he will see that that particular resolution is, of course, no embarrassment to the Government at all—to either the Liberal Party or the Country Party members; and the fact is that the Government will give further consideration to this question of political propaganda on election day as distinct from the other two points included in the Bill. I think that is as far as the Government can be expected to go at this point of time. In view of this, I oppose the Bill in its entirety, because the honourable member will agree that without items Nos. 2 and 3, item No. 1 becomes almost impracticable, if not impossible.

I will make some brief remarks on the three points. Dealing with the question of the distribution of political propaganda on election day, as I see it this has become part of the way of life, almost, of this community of ours in a free country; and I think it is to the credit of our system that people freely and voluntarily, and honorably in most cases, come forward and demonstrate their political allegiance and loyalties by distributing how-to-vote cards and other propaganda on election day.

It would be a very poor show and a very poor outlook for us if they were not prepared to come and do this. It is to the credit of our community that people, by the thousands, do this on election day—in respect of both the State and the Federal elections—without any reprisal, which is a great change to what was the position many years ago.

On election day the party supporters rally around, and I think that is a good healthy sign in a community such as we have. Some of them work almost with a fanaticism which has to be experienced to be believed. I know from past experience, as does the honourable member who introduced the Bill, that some of them have, through over-enthusiasm, gone to excess; but I think the number of cases where that occurs is not terribly serious in the overall picture.

We all get annoyed from time to time when we find someone manning a booth with more vigour than our own people; but, on the other hand, we can go to another booth and find the reverse position; and, as with all these matters, it has a habit of balancing itself up.

The various political organisations, too, have, I think, gained in prestige, vigour, and vitality because of the fact that they have mustered large bodies of workers on

election day to assist in spreading propaganda in support of their various candidates. In fact, that has become a very important part of the life of political organisations, although I know some of those who have to organise campaigns from time to time—particularly State members—wish they did not have to go to all this bother. But it is something of which we have to take a much broader view.

I also feel that those who are responsible for the conduct of elections and who have over the years held the scales with great impartiality in this State would have a much more difficult job in policing a complete prohibition than they have in dealing with the present state of affairs. This is only my personal opinion; but I have a conviction that under the present system, where all this campaigning propaganda, including how-to-vote cards and everything else that occurs on election day, is quite open, it is much safer and easier to police than if we had prohibitions or restrictions, because once these things are prohibited they have a habit of going underground, and there is the possibility of insidious types of propaganda which might be dangerous. That is the great disadvantage and danger here; namely, that we would not know about it until it was too late; the election would have been decided. It would be almost impossible to prove these things; and it is hard to say what might be the result of such activities.

Mr. Jamieson: Underground signs within a few hundred yards of a polling booth would be a great help on the day of an election!

Mr. COURT: The honourable member tries to make fun of what I say; but I ask him to think of this in an entirely different form; and the honourable member—

Mr. Jamieson: To think about the Liberal cars stacked in front of polling booths!

Mr. COURT: —has had a lot of experience in electioneering.

Mr. Jamieson: More than you have had.

Mr. COURT: He is a vigorous campaigner and has probably done more work at polling booths than I have. Whilst he might instance one case where somebody has stretched the regulations a little, another person could instance cases on the other side. That is part of the election fever that develops; but I suggest it balances itself out fairly well. The honourable member has never been slow in getting off the mark in order to register a complaint when he has seen a breach; and people on our side have been equally quick to register complaints.

Mr. Jamieson: You breached your own Railway Act, too.

Mr. COURT: There are Governments of different colours from time to time, and I suppose we could stand up here and complain about the conduct of a Labor

Government and say it would not take action about this or that. I think in all fairness that if we look at the impact of electoral affairs over the years, the present system has not worked out too badly as evidenced by the Governments we have had in the State and the changes that have taken place.

Mr. Jamieson: I do not understand about the insidious propaganda.

Mr. COURT: The member for Beeloo is trying to imply that the underground propaganda would be nonsense and is treating it facetiously; but insidious propaganda by word of mouth can be very dangerous indeed. I have known of troubles in connection with municipal elections where there has been a complaint about a telephone campaign of this type; and that was not so long ago; and it concerns someone very well known to members opposite.

This, of course, is propaganda, and we would only encourage people with this twisted type of mind who want to get around the laws to do this sort of thing. Propaganda is now done openly, with whatever faults there are. The present system is far from perfect, but at least we see things done publicly and openly without anybody being affected as a result.

Mr. Rowberry: Are you implying you are going to drop the communist smear in future?

Mr. COURT: I do not know what the honourable member is getting at. If that matter is worrying him I will leave it with him.

Mr. Rowberry: I will see you outside.

Mr. COURT: It seems to be worrying the honourable member. I submit in all sincerity that if propaganda is prohibited there will be more difficulty in policing the complaints regarding election breaches than there is under the present system where everything is done openly and with a certain amount of vigour. I think there are some advantages in the present system, and it does give some life and colour to our elections. It is not like the position in many countries where they do not have this sort of thing. Look at the results where these things are done in a different way and there is no openness!

A member: Would you like to give an example?

Mr. COURT: The question of registration of political parties is the key to the whole of the honourable member's proposition, and this is so fraught with difficulties and dangers that it could not be seriously contemplated by a responsible political party. The practical problems of the registration of political parties in this ever-changing political scene are enormous. Politics are characterised by the fact that they are ever-changing; and whilst we might think a political party is going to make up the political life of

this country in the future, we know from past history that it is only a matter of time before a change will take place.

Splits occur in this party and that party and competing factions come about, and inevitably the question arises about the names of the parties; and we have seen this in the last few years. For instance, there is the situation that exists between the A.L.P. and the D.L.P.

Is it a fair thing to put the registrar in the position of having to decide in a case like that? Is it a fair thing to put a magistrate in that position? We would be putting him right into the political whirlpool if he had to decide such an issue, and that is not a fair thing, particularly as the magistrate's decision is to be final. There is to be no appeal; and I do not suggest there should be any appeal, because it would be only going from one court to another.

Mr. Jamieson: What is the issue there?

A member: How do you know?

Mr. COURT: I think that would be so. The point I am making, however, is that politics are ever-changing and splinter groups break away from this party and that party. Our side is not immune, and neither is the honourable member's. Then somebody tries to get registration. That may occur 10 years from now and, of course, the existing party will try to seek immunity for itself; it will appeal to the magistrate.

It is impossible for us at this point of time to know the conditions that will exist then; and is it fair to put the registrar or the magistrate in this position? Just imagine a magistrate trying to handle the situation at the time the big split arose between the A.L.P. and the D.L.P. with all the heat and fever that existed then in Australia! Just imagine a magistrate having to decide an objection from the A.L.P.! And this could happen on our side just as easily.

Mr. Toms: But we would not hear much about it.

Mr. Rowberry interjected.

Mr. COURT: The honourable member has made my point. They could decide at a later stage to change their name to something else, and then the magistrate would have to consider an appeal from our party; or from any other party for that matter.

A member: From your speech, the L.C.L. is going to change its name again.

Mr. COURT: I have made no such implication at all. I am pointing out that in this party-political world in which we live nothing is static.

Mr. Bickerton: The magistrates have to make much greater decisions.

Mr. COURT: I would suggest that a magistrate would never have to make a decision with a more far-reaching effect on the life of the nation than deciding an argument between two very contentious political parties.

Mr. Bickerton: He would take it in his stride.

Mr. Curran: You are trying to cultivate something out of a very meagre speech.

Mr. COURT: I am not suggesting this is a great oration, because it is not a matter on which one can orate. I am trying to state simply and clearly the situation as the Government sees it in respect of these three points.

Mr. Rhatigan: I hope you put up a better case for the Ord River.

Mr. Brand: We have done so.

Mr. COURT: It is no good our saying this situation will not arise; because, politics being what they are, there will be somebody who will, in the years that lie ahead, endeavour to take advantage of this procedure, and who will go to the registrar and try to use a name which is intended to impress. Let us face it: It will be the objective of such person to get a name that will impress, and then we will have the inevitable situation of an appeal and of the registrar being put in the undesirable position of having to decide whether it can be registered or not.

I agree with the honourable member who introduced the Bill that if the existing party has registration there will be little difficulty over the matter. But this is not just for today; and the present political parties, in a country such as we live in, cannot expect to legislate themselves into immunity. They have to expose themselves to the normal come and go of our political life.

Mr. Toms: You do not think the Country Party would object, do you?

Mr. COURT: The question of party designations and ballot papers is the only remaining point on which I have to make any comment. It is obvious that unless there was some system of registration, this would be completely unmanageable. There could be such long names used by some parties, if there was not registration, as to be almost unmanageable on the ballot paper; and if we accept that principle at all we accept the need for registration and that the party designations will be used, accordingly, on the ballot paper. We do not accept this principle. We consider it would be completely unmanageable to use the designation and it could be distinctly dangerous.

With the observation I have made, that the Government intends further to study the question of political propaganda on polling days—that is, on the actual election days—I oppose the Bill.

**MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo)** [5.16 p.m.]: I think the Minister's remarks on this Bill deserve some comment. On behalf of the Government he talked about the future, and the effects of the Bill on the future. I think this House, and Parliament generally, has more to do than gaze into crystal balls; because all legislation, eventually, has to be altered as time and tide proves it necessary, and to say that we cannot commit the future is too ridiculous. Everybody in this House will agree that there is not one piece of legislation on our Statute book which we could guarantee would be workable and justifiable in 50 years' time.

That is why Parliament meets every year—to amend legislation as necessary, and to introduce new legislation as it is warranted. It is the right and prerogative of Parliament to alter its mind from time to time if it is felt that the law should be altered. Therefore I do not think that point made by the Minister was a very good one. As the Minister well knows, legislation that was on the Statute book of this State 10 years ago did not cover the development of the State in recent years, and it is ludicrous to say that we should not alter the law because of the amendments that have been made to the Act in the past few years. That is no argument at all.

My main objection to the present system—and the Minister did not touch on this aspect at all—is that we are not making things easy for the people who vote. If the Minister had said that he did not agree with the party designation being placed on ballot papers, but the information could be made available by the presiding officers, there might have been some sense in his argument. But he did not do that.

Take the position of a person from the north-west who is on holidays at Albany on polling day. If that person wishes to cast a vote as an absent voter, surely he is entitled to be given information as to party designations at the polling booth so that he will know whether he is voting for the Labor Party, the Liberal Party, or the Country Party candidate. But the Minister does not think that is important.

**Mr. Court:** Isn't it the job of the parties to let them know? They do.

**Mr. JAMIESON:** That is not always easy to do. As a matter of fact I called for some statistics regarding some of the small polling booths, where only 15 or 20 votes are recorded on polling day. In those circumstances it is difficult for any party to have a representative constantly at the polling booth. It would drive the person concerned mad; and the member for Murchison would know of polling booths in his electorate where only that number of votes would be cast, as would many other members who have a thousand and one polling booths in their electorates on polling day. In the metropolitan area, where

the Minister would have gained most of his experience, the position is not so difficult; however, it is hard enough even in the metropolitan area for party canvassers or representatives to be conversant with all the details of candidates in other districts.

We could have the position where a Liberal Party candidate for an electorate in the southern portion of the State—

**Mr. Hall:** Break it down a bit!

**Mr. JAMIESON:** —would have a Labor opponent in an election—

**Mr. Williams:** The member for Albany knows who would come first.

**Mr. JAMIESON:** The member for Albany can have his say later on, if he has anything at all to say on the matter. If in the southern part of the State there should happen to be a Liberal and a Labor candidate contesting an election, and in some neighbouring electorate there was a Country Party, a Labor Party, and a Liberal Party candidate contesting the election, should not a Country Party supporter, if he is visiting the first electorate to which I have referred, be entitled to know who the Country Party candidate is who is contesting the election in his district?

Members cannot tell me that the Liberal Party canvasser would tell him who it was, or that the Labor Party canvasser would tell him. So from where does he get his information? The same thing would apply if we turned the argument the other way around. In many cases voters cannot get their information from the canvassers in electorates other than those in which the canvassers are particularly interested, because they would not know.

**Mr. W. A. Manning:** The provision in the Bill would not make any difference if he was in another district.

**Mr. Bickerton:** You haven't read the Bill.

**Mr. JAMIESON:** Yes it would, because in those circumstances the polling clerks would have made available to them a list of the other electorates with the candidates and the party designations alongside the names. In those circumstances the voter would be able to find out the name of the party to which each candidate belonged; and I think it is important that he should. People do not vote for Abrahams or Bloggs simply because, as a rule, people with names starting with "A" or "B" are on top of the ballot paper; but if the information as to party designations is not supplied there is a tendency for people, if they are making an absentee vote, to say, "I have to vote anyway, and as I do not know who my man is I will just have to put down what I think."

If a person normally votes Labor, Country Party, or Liberal, he should be given the opportunity of knowing for whom he is voting, and this is a procedure which

I think we should all follow. It is true that at many polling booths, particularly in places like the Kimberley, there would not be representatives of all the parties at polling booths—this would apply particularly to the missions and some of the other places in the north where polling booths are situated. I should imagine it would be almost impossible for the respective political parties to have their representatives at those places. However, irrespective of that, anybody who goes to those polling booths to vote should surely be given an opportunity of knowing the party which each candidate represents. If they are dogmatic party voters they are entitled to know, even if they are given the information by the presiding officer.

Of course, under the law as it exists, the presiding officer cannot do that; if he does he is liable for a penalty. I had an experience myself where a voter from the Beeloo electorate was in the Gascoyne area on polling day. This person complained bitterly because the presiding officer at the polling booth which he attended, when he was asked who the Labor man for Beeloo was, said "I cannot tell you that, but I will tell you the name of the Liberal candidate." This was my first election and so the presiding officer cleared himself in that way; but the voter was rather irate because he said he had not been able to get the information.

The presiding officer gave it to him in a roundabout way, but the voter got the impression that this person was canvassing for the Liberal candidate. A subsequent check with a colleague of mine indicated that this was not so. The fellow discussed the incident with the member for Gascoyne who told him quite frankly that the presiding officer had no right to tell him who the Labor candidate for Beeloo was but he had given him the information by advising him who was the other candidate.

Mr. Hawke: What a dreadful alternative!

Mr. JAMIESON: It is a stupid set of circumstances when a person has to resort to that sort of thing to give information which he should be entitled to give without any penalty. It is ludicrous when the law does not permit a person to obtain information which he should be able to obtain quite freely at the polling booth.

The Minister made some comment about the magistrate's final decision and so on. Good God! Magistrates are making final decisions on all sorts of things, and it would not be a world-shattering decision for him to make in regard to this legislation when a person applied for registration. It is up to the magistrate to decide, and surely that is not too much to ask. We have only to examine a magistrate's duties at present to see that he makes decisions on all sorts of questions; and no doubt the

member for Pilbara, and others who have had a close association with magistrates' decisions, would be able to tell us how vital and far-reaching some of those decisions are and what vast sums of money are involved in many cases.

The Minister claimed that all sorts of surreptitious practices would be indulged in on election day if this legislation were agreed to. As far as I am able to ascertain, nothing like that has occurred in Tasmania over the years that the same prohibition as is covered by this Bill has been in force. Of course, in Tasmania they have the brain-washing system of elections—known as the Hare-Clark method, which causes no end of confusion for everybody from start to finish—to contend with as well as everything else. In that State the political parties are shown in a list of names and they are all listed alphabetically on the ballot paper. Everything is mixed up quite nicely, but somehow or other the electors eventually find those for whom they are looking and they vary their support for political parties from time to time.

The Minister said he opposed the proposition of the member for Pilbara without reservation; but I think there should be a lot of reservation on the part of the Government. It should not discount a private member's Bill just because it is a private member's Bill. Had this proposition been put forward by the Government it would have been good; there would have been nothing wrong with it, even in regard to registrations, magistrates' decisions, and all the rest of it; and the Government should not reject it simply because the proposition has been put forward by a private member.

It is high time information was made available to the public regarding the candidates for whom they are voting. Those who do not know the candidates for the different political parties are entitled to know for whom they are voting, and the parties they represent.

As regards the other activities on election days, which have already been mentioned, and the prohibition of those activities within a certain distance of polling booths, as is proposed in the Bill—particularly in regard to the production of signs, and large signs at that, and the placing of them here, there, and everywhere—it would be far easier if such activities were prohibited. The Minister should know, even if he does not know, that there is usually a good deal of controversy between canvassers, and sometimes it almost leads to fistcuffs, over the production of boxes or signs near the booths.

There have been occasions when caravans and cars have been parked right in the main entrance of polling booths. There was a flagrant instance of that at a by-election in Bunbury some years ago. People could not get into one of the booths

without deviating. I visited all the polling booths, and in most instances advertisements regarding one candidate were placed in such a position that they hindered anybody from getting into the booths. That sort of conduct is completely wrong, and surely voters should not have to put up with it.

In my view tactics of this type make no difference on polling day. I have had opponents who have gone along the streets placing stickers at various points, annoying my canvassers and supporters no end. However, I do not think it has done any good, or any harm, for that matter; but it is an objectionable feature and we should conduct elections without that sort of procedure.

The Minister also made reference to insidious happenings in other countries where this sort of legislation operates. But to my interjection on the matter he was silent. He could not give one example, because not one example exists. Therefore, in those circumstances, I suggest that we give this legislation a trial because it is attempting to clean up the position. If it were not a success we could correct it as we correct other legislation which is not operating successfully. We have introduced experimental legislation on other occasions; and, if necessary, we have tidied it up. Surely that is the correct procedure!

There is nothing wrong with giving something like this a trial. This legislation could be of great benefit to this State because of the considerable distances between the Kimberley and the Esperance areas. As I have indicated, this is a problem peculiar to this State. When there are three parties in fair strength contesting many of the seats it is far more difficult to co-ordinate and disseminate the information for the benefit of the people who require it at the polling booth. This Bill can do no possible harm and members should give it a second reading. If there are certain obnoxious features, such as the question of registration, that need to be tidied up that can be done; or if the member for Subiaco wishes the magistrate to have some specific instructions, it will be within his province, or that of any member, to move in that direction.

After hearing the member for Pilbara introduce the Bill, I am quite sure he would be willing to accept any ideas that would correct the position if he feels it requires some correction by the Legislature.

**MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin)** (5.31 p.m.): There is no doubt that at some time all members have felt they would like to get rid of how-to-vote cards, because of the responsibility they entail, and because of the expense involved on occasions. We have all had ideas of that kind, and no doubt the member for Pilbara has also

thought along these lines. So far as I know, he is the first member to introduce a Bill to bring this about. No doubt the honourable member has put quite a lot of time and thought into the preparation of his measure. But if this Bill is the best that can be offered for the abolition of how-to-vote cards on polling day, then I feel we must give a lot more thought to this matter before we can accomplish our desire.

There are many features contained in the Bill which would not work satisfactorily at all, and which would be of no benefit to us. The purpose of handing out how-to-vote cards is to help party supporters distinguish their candidates; and if this means is taken away and we are deprived of that avenue of inducing people to vote as we want them to vote, it is obvious that we will have to discover another means to accomplish our end. That is the logical conclusion. I wonder what would happen in connection with the 100 yards limit from the polling booth. There are far too many angles to be considered. It might be necessary for us to bring on a band, or something of that nature, in order to induce our electors to vote as we wish them to.

**Mr. Crommelin:** We could have marching girls.

**Mr. W. A. MANNING:** We would need something exciting to draw the people out and indicate to them how to vote. So if we cut out one means of indicating to them how to vote we must find a substitute.

**Mr. Jamieson:** The Bill merely prohibits certain things.

**Mr. W. A. MANNING:** One could still canvass votes outside 100 yards.

**Mr. Jamieson:** No.

**Mr. W. A. MANNING:** There is no doubt that it will be necessary for us to seek a substitute for the handing out of how-to-vote cards on polling day. I do not think the Bill is at all satisfactory from that point of view.

The main argument I have against it is that electors have become used to both Federal and State elections; and if this Bill were passed it would mean that during State elections there would be no how-to-vote cards, whereas such cards would be available during the Federal elections. It would merely mean adding confusion to confusion.

**Mr. Hawke:** You would have the green card on election day for the Federal election.

**Mr. Jamieson:** How do they get on in Tasmania?

**Mr. W. A. MANNING:** The method of voting in Tasmania may not be quite satisfactory, as there has been a Labor Government there for many years.

Mr. Jamieson: On legislative boundaries drawn up by the Commonwealth.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: The principle is the same. During the Commonwealth elections how-to-vote cards would be issued, while there would be no such cards passed around during the State elections. How would any of us like to vote for a Senate election without a how-to-vote card as a guide? No normal person would appreciate having to do this.

Mr. Hall: Do away with the Senate.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: It is obvious from the remarks of various members that the abolition of how-to-vote cards on polling days would not be satisfactory, unless we could provide a suitable substitute for it. I think we should give a lot more thought to the matter before we agree to a Bill such as this.

MR. DUNN (Darling Range) [5.36 p.m.]: I rise to speak against the measure, and to support the remarks of the Minister for Industrial Development and the member for Narrogin.

Mr. Moir: You'll get on!

Mr. DUNN: I am trying to, and the honourable member should do likewise. After reading the speech of the member for Pilbara when he introduced the Bill, I wondered what he was really trying to get at. His opening remarks were—

This Bill seeks to amend the Electoral Act. The two main objects are, firstly, to prohibit the distribution of any type of political propaganda on election day, including how-to-vote cards; and, secondly, to have the party designations placed on the ballot paper alongside the names of the candidates.

I think I am right in saying that most of the remainder of his speech described the machinery by which this could be effected. The honourable member went to great lengths to explain that he had discussed the matter with the Crown Law Department, and that the department had proved to him that it would be quite a long, tedious, and arduous job to arrive at that objective.

One of the main points made by the member for Beeloo was that the provisions of this Bill would enable an elector to get information when he went to a polling booth which, under the present Act, he could not obtain from the presiding officer or the clerks associated with the polling booth. This, of course, would represent only a very small number, and I know that in actual practice the problem does arise. But for every one of those people there are many who seize the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the names of both the candidate and the party he represents before they go to the polls.

I think it rather unjust to assume that electors as a whole are not sufficiently interested when they go to the poll to acquaint themselves with the names of those they wish to support. I also feel that on polling day an opportunity is given to party supporters to put their shoulders to the wheel and to do their bit in support of the party and its platform. One would be led to believe after some experience in this matter that the major parties concerned are mostly assured of supporters or of help in this regard. We should also be cognisant of the fact that it is a very difficult job indeed for even the major parties to get over their story to all the electors to the point where they can at least be persuaded; and if they cannot persuade the hard core they at least want to persuade the swinging voter in their favour on election day.

Mr. Toms: Your party has not had much trouble with the Press, TV, and everything else.

Mr. DUNN: I have no doubt the honourable member would also like these facilities, and I suggest he continue to try to secure them.

Mr. Toms: It's all right if you can afford them.

Mr. DUNN: The Bill treads on very dangerous ground in seeking to open up an avenue for, shall we say, the misguided people whom we might call crackpots to indulge in registering as a political party which would, to use an expression used by the member for Narrogin, add confusion to confusion. There could be many parties, because it is only necessary to have 20 as a minimum number. There could be parties springing up all over the countryside.

Mr. Rowberry: You just need one person.

Mr. DUNN: One could see the problem arising where it would definitely be necessary to have the names of the parties designated on the ballot paper. I do not feel there is any justification for extending the limits that exist at the moment under the Electoral Act in regard to this procedure. I feel we should steer clear, as much as possible, and for the benefit of electors as a whole, from anything which will create more confusion than exists at the moment.

I was rather surprised to hear some of the remarks made by the member for Pilbara in regard to what goes on during an election. I am quite sure he was only speaking in a jocular manner. He would not be strictly correct in his selection of terms, particularly when he says that people are molested outside polling booths. I wonder in what form are they molested.

Mr. J. Hegney: It does not happen in Darling Range.



Mr. DUNN: No. The member for Pilbara said that election material is thrown at electors. I was associated with a very heated contest on one occasion and I do not recall seeing any such material thrown at the electors.

Mr. Bickerton: In your election the candidates were thrown at one another.

Mr. DUNN: I raise these points because it could be construed by those who are not aware of the facts that the situation on polling day is such that it would be safer to stay at home than go to the polling booth.

I agree with the Minister for Industrial Development when he says that any attempt to reverse the situation where how-to-vote material is available on polling day could lend itself to some very surreptitious activity. The whole thing would be wide open and be much harder to police.

Mr. Jamieson: What are some of these activities?

Mr. DUNN: I can suggest some to the honourable member, too, if he promises not to use them if the Bill passes.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. DUNN: I suggest it would be quite possible for people to surreptitiously have cards.

Mr. Jamieson: They can be put in the letter box the night before.

Mr. DUNN: Yes; and given out when people are being driven to the poll.

Mr. Toms: Have you read the Bill?

Mr. DUNN: At the moment I feel it is safer to retain the system which operates now and under which the parties themselves create their own police force, if I may use that term. They check one against the other and do not, in the overall result, produce a state of affairs in which anybody is cheated; and the general rules and regulations laid down in the Electoral Act are observed.

I would still like to know why the Electoral Act, as it operates today, should be changed. I have listened to both the honourable member who introduced the Bill and the member for Beeloo, but they have not convinced me the Act should be changed. For that reason, and the other reasons I have stated, I believe the Act as it stands at present is quite satisfactory; and if there is going to be any amendment to it, this Bill is not the answer. Therefore I oppose the Bill.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [5.47 p.m.]: I thank the members concerned for their contribution to this debate. I was rather sorry that the majority of speakers who opposed the Bill did not touch on the reasons why it was introduced. They found reasons for opposing the measure which,

to my way of thinking, were, in the main, quite outside its scope. With all due respect to the Minister—he is an able fellow—I have never known him to make such heavy weather of anything as he did in this particular case.

This Bill contains quite a few matters in connection with polling day, but the only reason the Minister could find for apparently not agreeing to the Bill was the difficulties that might be created by the registration of parties. To me that seemed to be the main point he made. It is like a lot of other things: it is always easy to look ahead and create problems that may never occur. Surely it does not concern us at this stage whether there are going to be any more splits in political parties in the future; and if any of the matters mentioned by the Minister could create difficulties, I have no doubt the legislative machinery of the country would soon take care of them.

I feel sure the Minister must realise that the argument he put forward to give his supporters some cause for not voting for this Bill was, to say the least, not exactly a strong one. He left out the advantage which the Bill would confer—the advantage of having party designations on the ballot paper, which was stressed in the first place.

No matter how members vote on this Bill, there is no doubt that party designations on ballot papers would be of great assistance to voters. Let us face that fact. There are a great number of absentee voters; and members who have had any experience of polling booths would, I think, agree when I say that there are few absentee voters who arrive at a booth who do not inquire either from the canvassers on that booth or from the returning officer as to just who is the Liberal, Labor, Country Party, or other candidate standing for election in the particular area for which the absentee voter is casting his vote.

I would go so far as to say that most absentee voters would make those inquiries and check with the returning officer. I have found there have been quite a number of inquiries from people when they are voting who have not received a how-to-vote card. They make inquiries of the returning officer. Surely it must be an advantage if we prevent, in any way at all, confusion in the minds of electors.

The Minister mainly dwelt on the matter of registration and agreed that this would be necessary if we were to have the party designations on the ballot paper. The registration of parties is not a complicated procedure. There are safeguards included in the measure, but that does not make registration complicated. If this is the most complicated piece of legislation that has ever come before this House, we should give up being a Parliament; and if it is complicated to any member, or appears so, I suggest the member

concerned give up being a member of Parliament because, to my way of thinking, this is quite a logical piece of legislation to achieve the object which is intended—the abolition of political propaganda on election day and the inclusion of party designations on the ballot paper.

I do not know from where this was dug up, but I think both the member for Darling Range and the Minister said that if we were to prohibit the issue of political propaganda sinister underground organisations would go to work. One would have to have a nightmare to dream that one up. Surely an open prohibition of something would be easier to police than the present method where someone has to be on the job to ascertain that a fellow is at least 20 yards away from the booth, and whether the entrance to the booth is the door or the box where a person votes. All these things would have to be taken into consideration in policing the present Act. However, this measure simply says, "No issue of political propaganda." Surely that would be easy enough to police. I cannot see sinister organisations racing around and coming up from under the ground somewhere—as someone said—and popping into the hands or into the minds of electors just how they should vote when they go into the polling booth.

In any case, if a person did go into a polling booth, he would be issued with a card showing the party designations; and if someone were to use a sinister method and say, "Vote for Smith" or ask, "What party do you vote for?" and on being told "Labor" tell the fellow to vote for Smith who was a Liberal, it would not matter because the party designation would be on the ballot paper. This would be the very thing that would prevent such a sinister method from operating.

The Minister, and I think other members, too, mentioned enthusiastic workers. I know all parties have enthusiastic workers who are made more enthusiastic by the remuneration they receive. I know of workers on polling booths who have done this work as a result of donations made to some organisation. Many workers, even individuals, have told me they have received remuneration.

Mr. Fletcher: They told me in Fremantle.

Mr. BICKERTON: Perhaps the time will come when the party that will have the most enthusiastic workers will be the one that can pay for them.

Mr. Jamieson: They were even sent from the employment office in the last election.

Mr. BICKERTON: The Minister for Industrial Development did not give any reason at all why the designation should not appear on the ballot paper. He gave

only the reasons why a party should not be registered; and, as I said before, I was rather disappointed with the reasons he gave why this Bill should not pass a second reading. I had expected his reasons to be much stronger than they were. If this Bill is defeated, I believe it will be because the Government has decided that at this particular stage it does not want the measure to become law; not because it is not a good measure and that it will not work, but purely because the Government, in its wisdom or otherwise, has decided that it will give a lead to its supporters to push the measure out of the window until it can bring in the same principles in a Government measure.

It is regrettable—it has been going on for some time, but it is still regrettable—that private members' business, particularly if one is a member of the Opposition, seems to be ill-fated before it is introduced, regardless of whether it is a good measure or not, on the ground that Governments in these times seem to believe it is not right for matters to be taken out of their hands and that when the Government is ready to do so and so it will take action. I think it is becoming more evident that this applies, because opinions stated outside differ considerably from those stated inside; and I am sure there are members who will vote against this measure but who, in their own minds, believe it is a good measure. I do not think many would contradict me on that.

I will not dwell on the matter any more, except to say I consider the arguments put forward for the adoption of this Bill have not been refuted in any shape or form. I believe that in the not too distant future—provided it does not become law at this stage—it will become law, and the sooner it does the better it will be for the conduct of elections and for the electors themselves. It will be a move which will make the job of the elector less confusing than it is under the present system.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—19

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. J. Hegney
Mr. Brady	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Moir
Mr. Curran	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Davies	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Evans	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Toms
Mr. Graham	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Hall	Mr. Norton
Mr. Hawke	

Noes—25

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Brand	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Burt	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Craig	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Durack	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Elliott	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Williams
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. I. W. Manning
Dr. Henn	

(Teller)

(Teller)

	Pairs	
Ayes		Noes
Mr. May		Mr. Nalder
Mr. Kelly		Mr. Hart

Majority against—6.

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

### BILLS (4): RETURNED

1. Bush Fires Act Amendment Bill.
2. Bunbury Harbour Board Act Amendment Bill.
3. Albany Harbour Board Act Amendment Bill.
4. Spear-guns Control Act Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed, from the 25th August, on the following motion by Mr. Graham:—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. CRAIG (Toodyay—Chief Secretary) [6.1 p.m.]: This Bill, introduced by the member for Balcatta, seeks to amend sections 522 and 523 of the Local Government Act, and to add new section 525.

The sections referred to deal with the revenue received by a municipality or shire. One part of one of the sections—I think it is section 523—more or less gives the local authority the power to undertake trading interests in some form or other and the revenue therefrom can be disposed of in a manner thought fit by the particular shire which indulges in this form of revenue.

When introducing the Bill, the honourable member drew attention to the fact that the City of Fremantle is shortly to install parking meters, and the revenue from them, in accordance with the Local Government Act as it now stands, can be absorbed into the general funds of the City of Fremantle. The honourable member also drew attention to the fact that a similar position exists in the City of Perth regarding revenue from parking meters and parking facilities; but there revenue is treated differently from the way it should be under the Local Government Act. In other words, parking activity of the City of Perth is controlled by a separate Act of Parliament known as the City of Perth Parking Facilities Act.

Under that Act the City of Perth is obliged to spend surplus revenue derived from parking meters and other parking facilities on the extension of parking facilities within the City of Perth. Members

might recall that last evening I tabled the report of the last twelve months' operations of that particular fund.

This amending Bill seeks to apply similar conditions to the City of Fremantle, and to any other local authority for that matter—whether a municipality or a shire. If such conditions do not apply, the honourable member contends that the surplus revenue derived from this source could be used to meet the cost of constructing swimming pools, new town halls, and the like.

The same attitude could be adopted by any other local authority which decided to install parking meters in the near future. Might I point out that the circumstances associated with the two cities concerned are entirely different. In the case of the City of Perth the Government did advance an amount of £400,000 some years ago in order that the capital cost could be met to provide the facilities. That sum was to be repaid over a certain number of years, and I think the final payment is to be made in 1968. The City of Perth is covered by the normal agreement, of course; I suppose the City of Perth parking facilities fund could be looked at as a direct arrangement covered by an Act of Parliament. But in the case of the City of Fremantle there is no obligation to repay a loan advanced by the Government because no such loan has been made.

In Fremantle, the expenditure for the installation of parking meters and also for the construction of a £200,000 multi-storey car park—which I believe is now under construction—is being made by arrangement with the ratepayers. Therefore the council is answerable to its ratepayers. It is also suggested that the City of Fremantle will not be overburdened with any surplus revenue from parking for many years to come, because it has commitments in repaying the loans that have been arranged to meet the initial cost of providing the parking facilities.

The City of Fremantle, along with some other authorities, has voiced objection to this Bill. I am in receipt of a letter from the City of Fremantle dated the 27th August, 1965, and addressed to me as the Minister for Transport. That of course, is incorrect. I think I should read this letter, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, because it will give members an appreciation of the views of the City of Fremantle and other local authorities whose opinions coincide with those of the City of Fremantle. I quote—

Dear Mr. Minister,

It is understood that a Private Member's Bill has been introduced to Parliament by the Hon. H. E. Graham, M.L.A., that will provide for all surplus revenue from parking facilities to be expended in the provision of further parking facilities.

This Council is concerned at the restrictions that will be imposed on the use of Local Government revenue if this Bill is passed by Parliament.

As you are no doubt aware, Local Government is finding it increasingly difficult to finance the works and undertakings they are now required to undertake. Works such as road widening and the redevelopment of central city areas which can very largely be attributed to the increasing influence of the motor vehicle, are beyond the present financial resources of Local Government and the Commonwealth road grants are quite inadequate for such purposes.

It is the opinion of the Council that the provision of wider vehicular roads is of particular importance to present day vehicular traffic movements, and in Fremantle there are many narrow streets in the central city area that permit only one-way vehicular traffic with restricted street parking. Unless these streets are widened there will have to be greater restriction in the matter of street parking and also off-street parking in and around these narrow streets, in order to alleviate the congestion and hazards of vehicular traffic. It would only add to the present congestion and hazards to provide off-street parking in the central city area of Fremantle without first providing for road widening.

While power for Local Authorities to provide street meter parking and off-street parking is provided in the Local Government Act, the matter of off-street parking is also an avenue for private enterprise investment.

If the Bill now before Parliament is passed, surely private enterprise will not be required to use all the profits of their enterprise in providing additional parking facilities, and in the opinion of this Council the profit, if any, that should be applied to the provision of additional parking facilities is that derived from street meter parking, and that Local Authorities should not be restricted in the manner in which they apply any profit that might accrue from their investment and enterprise in the provision of off-street parking facilities.

At the present time, the City of Fremantle is constructing a multi-storey car park estimated to cost almost £200,000, and if the Bill now before Parliament is passed, the rate-payers will receive no direct benefit from this enterprise.

My Council have requested me to bring their opinions to your attention and for your support. However, if in your opinion there should be an Act

of Parliament covering the matter of parking facilities, that you give consideration to the Council's opinion that no restriction be placed on the use of surplus revenue from off-street parking facilities or at the minimum that such surplus be permitted to be used in connection with road widening, as well as the provision of additional parking facilities.

That is the letter I received from the City of Fremantle; and I must, to a degree anyhow, agree with the views expressed therein. I can see no reason to prohibit the use of parking funds for road widening to provide street parking as against off-street parking. I think the conditions in Fremantle are well known to most members. We all know there are many narrow streets in Fremantle, and the authorities are most anxious to widen them; but the cost has to be met. The revenue, like that of other local authorities, is restricted to a certain extent, and the authority seeks to be in a position whereby it can use revenue derived from parking facilities for the purpose of street widening.

The provision of embayed areas at shopping centres is, to my way of thinking, a parking facility and this is connected with the widening of roads. Whilst I understand money for this type of work normally comes from general revenue, surely it is not wrong to provide money from parking funds if it is available from that source.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. CRAIG: Prior to the tea suspension I referred to the objections raised by the City of Fremantle to this measure in the course of which it drew attention to the fact that it would be required to widen a certain number of narrow streets within its boundaries. Further, in widening some of these narrow streets they could be streets in which parking is banned and, with the widening, the council could provide parking bay zones. Therefore that, surely, would come under the interpretation of "parking facilities." As the position stands at present, when the council performs this kind of work it has to provide the funds from its general revenue. As a result, I cannot see anything wrong in allowing the council to spend parking fund moneys on such improvements.

I also consider that members of the motoring public who contribute to the parking fund are not likely to object to the expenditure of such moneys either on providing parking facilities on roads, or off-street car parks. The term "parking facilities", as applied to defining how the money received into the parking fund shall be spent, is one of interpretation and I think it is wide enough, at first glance, to ensure that the money so received will not

be channelled into works not associated with vehicular parking. However, I agree in principle that local authorities should use revenue from this source towards the provision of parking facilities.

Possibly some obligation should be placed upon local authorities to ensure that they do so. On the other hand, we do not want to be in a position that we have to dictate to an authority how it shall spend the revenue it receives, irrespective of the source; otherwise some local authorities may say, "What is the use of there being a local authority if it is to be told how to spend its revenue?" Surely any local authority, for that matter, is answerable to its ratepayers; and I feel certain that if it were spending money unwisely the ratepayers would soon make the local authority aware of the fact.

So in consequence of the opinion I have expressed, I am going to support the second reading of the Bill in order that I can submit some amendments in Committee, if the Bill reaches that stage. My object in so doing is to overcome some of the objections raised by the City of Fremantle, and objections that could be anticipated from any other local authority which is going to adopt a system of parking meters or provision of parking facilities from which revenue can be obtained.

I am of the opinion, too, that it could be that some authorities might want to take advantage of the situation that exists in that there might be very restricted parking space available in, say, a shopping centre within the boundaries of a particular local authority, and so it becomes essential to install parking meters for no other purpose than to gain some revenue with which it has no intention of improving parking facilities for motorists.

The amendments I propose to move in Committee will allow revenue derived from parking facilities to be used for the purchase or acquisition of land, buildings, and other structures; for the provision, by means of street widening, of parking facilities, metered zones, and metered spaces; and for the regulation and control, by that means, of the parking and standing of vehicles in accordance with the provisions of the by-laws. I think that is a reasonable attitude to adopt, because we must appreciate that the widening of some of these narrow roads will be the means of improving access to an established car-parking area or other car-parking facilities as will exist in Fremantle with the construction of its multi-storeyed car park.

In addition, I propose to move other amendments to the Bill which will seek to delete from the measure any reference to revenue derived from fines and penalties, as it is considered that revenue derived from this source should be used at the discretion of the authority, and no

restriction should be placed on the authority as to how money obtained by this means should be spent.

Mr. Jamieson: Is it intended to alter the City of Perth Parking Facilities Act?

Mr. CRAIG: No; I am dealing with this Bill at the moment.

Mr. Jamieson: Yes; but I am just wondering if that is what is intended.

Mr. CRAIG: That is up to the City of Perth if it feels so inclined. As I said earlier, the City of Perth has raised no objection to the present obligations placed upon it. It has met those obligations and fulfilled them in a manner that meets with our approval. I read in the Press only today that the council is budgeting for an expenditure of £250,000 next year towards the acquisition of additional land to provide further car parks.

So I am prepared to support the second reading on that understanding. Summed up, it means that the honourable member who has introduced the Bill desires that the provisions in the City of Perth Parking Facilities Act should also be applicable to the City of Fremantle or any other local authority. I support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. FLETCHER (Fremantle) [7.38 p.m.]: I also support the second reading of the Bill; and since the Minister has mentioned the attitude of the Fremantle City Council, I consider it incumbent upon me to say something on the measure. This House might wonder were I to remain silent on this issue, particularly in view of the assertions that I am vocal on all other matters in this House—which, of course, is not true.

Mr. Toms: Not quite.

Mr. FLETCHER: However, if I have anything to say here or within my own party room, I will say it.

Mr. Graham: You can say that again!

Mr. Brand: I would be very interested to hear what you said at your own party meeting.

Mr. Rowberry: You always like to hear everything that goes on!

Mr. FLETCHER: It is strange that even if I get up to speak on a non-controversial issue, I still seem to attract interjections from members on the other side of the House, despite my good intentions. If I cannot be responsible for gaining more than half of the votes among these present in the House or elsewhere, I will accept the result as I did in my own party room when I made known the attitude of those in Fremantle in regard to the Bill. Because of this attitude, tonight I could find myself voting with the member for Balcatta, even though my personal attitude might be the same as that of the Fremantle City Council on this Bill.

Mr. Hall: You look like winning this one!

Mr. FLETCHER: As the member for Fremantle, I consider it is my responsibility to read to the House correspondence that was addressed to me even though that correspondence might almost be a facsimile of that which has been read to the House by the Minister. I will also read a letter I addressed to my own party on this matter, copies of which were sent to the Fremantle City Council.

However, having in mind that Fremantle is only one locality—although a very important one in a very large State—and the fact that the member for Balcatta publicised his intention to introduce this Bill prior to the reservations expressed by Fremantle, I might see the Government introducing amendments to the Bill which will be satisfactory to Fremantle and myself even if I have to vote against such amendments for the reasons I have stated. With the indulgence of the House, I wish to put on record the correspondence which the Fremantle City Council addressed to me. This letter reads as follows:—

Mr. H. A. Fletcher, M.L.A.,  
28 Minilya Avenue,  
Hilton Park.

Dear Mr. Fletcher,

It is understood that a Private Member's Bill has been introduced to Parliament by the Hon. H. E. Graham, M.L.A., that will provide for all surplus revenue from parking facilities to be expended in the provision of further parking facilities.

This Council is concerned at the restrictions that will be imposed on the use of Local Government revenue if this Bill is passed by Parliament.

As you are no doubt aware, Local Government is finding it increasingly difficult to finance the works and undertakings they are now required to undertake. Works such as road widening and the re-development of central city areas which can very largely be attributed to the increasing influence of the motor vehicle, are beyond the present financial resources of Local Government and the Commonwealth road grants are quite inadequate for such purposes.

It is the opinion of the Council that the provision of wider vehicular roads is of particular importance to present day vehicular traffic movements, and in Fremantle there are many narrow streets in the central city area that permit only one-way vehicular traffic with restricted street parking. Unless these streets are widened there will have to be greater restriction in the matter of street parking and also off-street parking in and around these narrow streets, in order to alleviate the congestion and hazards of vehicular traffic. It would only add to the

present congestion and hazards to provide off-street parking in the central city area of Fremantle without first providing for road widening.

While power for Local Authorities to provide street meter parking and off-street parking is provided in the Local Government Act, the matter of off-street parking is also an avenue for private enterprise investment.

Owing to the background chatter I would be very surprised if anyone in the House could hear what I am reading.

Mr. Rowberry: Hear, hear!

Mr. FLETCHER: The letter continues—

If the Bill now before Parliament is passed, surely private enterprise will not be required to use all the profits of their enterprise in providing additional parking facilities, and in the opinion of this Council the profit, if any, that should be applied to the provision of additional parking facilities is that derived from street meter parking, and that Local Authorities should not be restricted in the manner in which they apply any profit that might accrue from their investment and enterprise in the provision of off-street parking facilities.

At the present time, the City of Fremantle is constructing a multi-storey car park estimated to cost almost £200,000, and if the Bill now before Parliament is passed, the ratepayers will receive no direct benefit from this enterprise.

My Council have requested me to bring their opinions to your attention and for your support. However, if in your opinion there should be an Act of Parliament covering the matter of parking facilities, that you give consideration to the Council's opinion that no restriction be placed on the use of surplus revenue from off-street parking facilities or at the minimum that such surplus be permitted to be used in connection with road widening, as well as the provision of additional parking facilities.

Yours sincerely,  
N. J. C. McCOMBE,  
Town Clerk.

I received that letter, which requests my support of the attitude of Fremantle. As a consequence I feel it incumbent on me to make it known to the House. I also felt it incumbent on me to make it known to my own party which I did. But, as I said earlier, the Bill had been widely publicised, and our Party's attitude is that Fremantle should have made known earlier its reservations, which I expressed previously.

I have heard the foreshadowed amendments of the Minister, but I still feel it incumbent on me to express some opinion this evening, because Fremantle was so

frequently mentioned by the Minister. As I said earlier, it would appear peculiar if the member for that district did not have something to say on the subject.

Mr. Brand: That is the subject of the Bill.

Mr. Jamieson: That is not quite right.

Mr. Brand: Isn't it?

Mr. Jamieson: No; it could be Subiaco.

Mr. FLETCHER: As a consequence, I wrote the following letter to the Secretary of the State Parliamentary Labor Party, dated the 30th August, 1965:—

Dear Sir,

Please find attached a communication expressing reservations regarding Hon. H. E. Graham's Private Member's Bill in regard to the application of Parking fees by Local Government.

I refer our Executive's attention to the last paragraph of the attached, wherein I am requested to give consideration to Fremantle City Council opinion—"that no restriction be placed on the use of surplus revenue from off-street parking facilities or, at the minimum, that such surplus be permitted to be used in connection with road widening as well as the provision of additional parking facilities".

While I accept that road finance is, and should be made available from another source, I am of the opinion that in certain areas of Fremantle, and possibly other localities, a percentage of Parking fee finance could be used for street, lane and other area widening to the advantage of vehicle owners using the parking facilities thus created.

In view of the above, and the attached, I should be grateful if S.P.L.P. Executive would permit an amendment to the satisfaction of Fremantle City Council at the appropriate time and place in Committee.

Yours faithfully,

Harry A. Fletcher,  
M.L.A., FREMANTLE.

I was a bit late in catching the bus, and so was Fremantle, because the member for Balcatta had given wide publicity to the purpose of his Bill. Not only he, but at least the majority of the members of our party, supported the attitude that we should not amend the Bill in conformity with the wishes of Fremantle. As a democrat I accepted that decision.

Mr. Brand: You must have been very much a democrat.

Mr. FLETCHER: That is the way we run our party, right from the roots to the branches and so to the top. If more than one-half of the members in the room adopts a certain attitude, then we democratically

accept that decision—whether it be a meeting of a branch, the executive, State conference, or Federal conference. Having that attitude in mind, I accepted it as a majority decision of our party, and my party was democratic enough to say to me, despite my attitude, "We give you authority to make known the attitude of Fremantle." I have done that.

Even though I am sympathetic to the attitude of Fremantle, if I find the amendments are unacceptable to the member for Balcatta and to our party as a whole, then I shall vote with our party, though I regret my vote will be detrimental to Fremantle. It seems the Government has the numbers in this House, and if it adopts the attitude of Fremantle I shall on this occasion not regret the fact. I support the second reading at this stage.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [7.51 p.m.]: I would like to make a few brief comments on this Bill. When the Local Government Bill was first introduced in this House I, together with other members, was somewhat remiss in allowing the particular section to escape the scrutiny that it deserved. If members were to refer to the relevant *Hansard*, when the City of Perth Parking Facilities Bill was introduced they would find that I made my position very clear, by pointing out that it was wrong to legislate in respect of one local authority. I indicated the measure before Parliament should be applied to all local authorities which desired to participate in parking schemes, by the installation of parking meters and by other means, so as to obtain funds to establish parking facilities. On every occasion since that time I have voiced the opinion that it was a mistake to legislate in that manner, and thus prevent the City of Subiaco, the Shire of Perth, or any other local authority from having the right to participate in parking schemes under the same conditions as the City of Perth.

The present move by the member for Balcatta proposes to overcome that anomaly. However, the proposal of the Minister is, more or less, a compromise, so as to get over the objections of certain local authorities. It is not a world-shattering amendment which he has proposed, and possibly at this stage that is the best solution that can be arrived at. I suggest that sooner or later all local authorities must be given the right to participate on a similar basis to that of the City of Perth.

Whether the owner of a vehicle parks it in the City of Perth, in Fremantle, or in Bunbury, the funds derived from the parking fees should be applied in the manner specified in the Act. To compel one local authority to set aside parking fees for specific purposes, and not compel another local authority to do so is wrong

in principle, even if it is right in law. It is right in principle to place all local authorities on the same footing, and they should all be given equal opportunity.

The Bill before us has a balancing effect. If it is the desire of the majority of members that the proposed amendment of the Minister become part and parcel of the final draft of the Bill, it will go part of the way to achieving what I have pointed out to this House: that the Government of the day should have introduced a measure that was all-embracing. If in the future Kalgoorlie decides to introduce parking schemes and install parking meters it will be up to the Minister to make provision in the Act for that local authority to be proclaimed. With those comments I support the Bill.

**MR. GRAHAM** (Balcatta) [7.55 p.m.]: It was typical of the Minister, as the spokesman for his Government, that his address should be so full of inconsistencies, because that is a familiar pattern of this Government. All I need do is remind members of the "Yes-No" policy of the Government in respect of issues such as adult franchise for the Legislative Council, which it opposed then supported; native citizenship, which it opposed then supported; the five-day week for bank officers, which it opposed then supported; the "to-and-from" travelling clause in the Workers' Compensation Act, which it opposed then supported.

**Mr. Tonkin:** And the registration of chiropractors.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** I am reminded of that one too. In addition, there was the three weeks' annual leave for Government employees, which it opposed then supported; the restriction in the hours during which pensioners could use travel concessions, which it subsequently removed after those restrictions had been imposed by it; and so on.

It is certainly and definitely typical of this Government that its members only a few short years ago almost unanimously in this Chamber, and certainly unanimously in the Legislative Council, supported the principle that all surplus funds which are paid by motorists for the parking of vehicles should be used for no other purpose than the promotion of additional parking facilities; and that cardinal principle, on the grounds of expediency, is now to be thrown overboard.

**Mr. Craig:** The circumstances are different, as you know full well.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** I know nothing of the sort. Merely because a local authority—or a small number of them—which, quite understandably, desires any and every source of revenue available to it to be used in any direction of its choosing, the Minister and this Government feel that is

sufficient warrant for this cardinal principle to be broken. In view of that—regardless of how much I might disagree—I shall not tolerate, if I can avoid it, the situation where this Parliament adopts a discriminatory role against the City of Perth or any other local authority.

I indicate now that if this facility is to be provided in the Local Government Act, in which road-widening schemes can be undertaken with the surplus money derived from parking facilities, then I shall consult my party and seek its leave to introduce legislation to apply exactly the same provisions to the City of Perth, as would apply to other local authorities. In those circumstances I would expect the unanimous support of members whose seats are opposite to mine in this Chamber. There is no warrant, there is no justice, and there is no argument which can be submitted for establishing and enforcing a code in respect of one local authority, while all the other 120-odd should be permitted a greater degree of latitude.

When I introduced the measure I indicated the ridiculous state of affairs that could prevail as the law is, and as the law will be, if the Government's proposition is accepted. Where there is a common boundary between two local authorities, such as Walcott Street, which divides the City of Perth from the Shire of Perth, on one side of the road the surplus revenue from parking facilities are used for no purpose other than for the provision of further parking facilities; while on the other side of the road—in the same shopping centre—the moneys can be used for other purposes. Surely that should appeal to everyone as being ridiculous in the extreme.

I might indicate to the Minister, and through him to the Government, that I have sought legal advice with regard to the set-up at the moment. Just to show how ridiculous this Act is. If you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, I will draw a parallel to show how this Government, in its desire to frustrate private members on the Opposition side of the House will allow the law of this land to become a farce. Under the Criminal Code, as members are aware, a person who is found guilty of the offence of murder is sentenced to imprisonment for life, but the minimum sentence is 15 years—15 years' incarceration. However, for the more serious offence of wilful murder the term can be a week, a fortnight, a couple of years, or something of that nature.

All members are aware that recently someone was found guilty of the offence of wilful murder and his term of imprisonment will be approximately a half of what any other person's term would be if he committed the lesser offence of murder and was so adjudged by the court.

I repeat that I have sought legal advice, and I am informed that the Perth City Council is bound by the City of Perth



Parking Facilities Act up to this time; but if the Perth City Council cares hereafter to proceed under the provisions of the Local Government Act, then we have the extraordinary situation in which the moneys from Hay Street and Murray Street central will be required under law to go into a parking fund, but moneys which are derived from parking facility charges in, say, Bulwer and Lincoln Streets, can be used for other purposes.

Mr. Craig: For parking.

Mr. GRAHAM: No. For road-widening purposes if the Minister has his way.

Mr. Craig: Read my amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have read the amendment, and I am not going to be taken in by it, because I am not so naive that I have not had some experience of people who have a will to do something. If I were a representative of a local authority and there were funds such as are being obtained by the City of Perth—which, let me remind the Minister, repaid nearly £400,000 in about eight years and acquired properties for use for its parking facilities and so on, just to show how lucrative it is—I would know that all that was necessary for that local authority to do if it wanted to widen a street would be to say that the intention was to provide some parking facilities along one side or the other. That would only be necessary for a period of a week, three months, or whatever period the local authority felt disposed to allow, and then a ban could be put on the parking if the local authority wished. There is nothing in the amendment to prevent that from happening.

Mr. Craig: But the Minister has to give approval for the parking ban.

Mr. GRAHAM: Of course he has.

Mr. Craig: But you are implying that the City of Perth could go and do this when it suited it.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is so.

Mr. Craig: It is not.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister himself has indicated on many occasions, as have his colleagues—and quite understandably—that a Minister cannot in the nature of things be expected to be familiar with every detail of his administration, and in very many cases there are pages and pages of regulations and by-laws that are not even hastily scanned by the Minister.

Mr. Craig: You are speaking of yourself.

Mr. GRAHAM: No. I am speaking of admissions made by Ministers. As I said earlier, that is understandably the position. If the Blackwood local authority wants to amend, for instance, its cemetery by-laws—

Mr. Craig: We are talking about Perth.

Mr. GRAHAM: —is the Minister likely to study—not just read, but study—those by-laws to gather the full significance of them? Of course not!

Mr. Craig: Why not?

Mr. GRAHAM: For physical limitation reasons, if for no other reason. For the same reason, several feet high of papers laid on the Table of this House are perused even roughly by only very much a minority of the members of this Parliament. Ministers have—at least when I was one I had—something more to do than run through all the details of so many Statutes, Bills, and regulations that come forward.

The Minister jumped from one proposition to another endeavouring to gather inspiration to see if he could supply one good reason for opposing the Bill in the form in which it is before us at present. He considered, for instance, that there was something pertinent in the fact that in the City of Perth parking facilities legislation there is provision for a loan to be made to the City of Perth with certain Government guarantees.

I have already indicated that the City of Perth is in the position where it could extinguish that paltry amount of approximately £30,000 tomorrow morning if it wanted to and therefore it would be completely free of any involvement. However, you, Mr. Speaker, and I know that has no relevancy at all; otherwise Parliament would have provided a limitation and said that after the loan moneys had been paid off then the City of Perth would be free to do as it wished, as is the position with other local authorities at present, or to go a certain distance as the Minister proposes at the present moment.

All I can say of the Minister's proposition is that whilst it weakens—indeed it destroys—a principle which I desired to see retained, it at least makes some slight improvement in the position that obtains under the Local Government Act at present.

Mr. Craig: That was the purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am prepared to accept just a little if it is impossible for me to get all I feel I am justly entitled to receive. Here I might say that there is in South Australia of comparatively recent date an enlightened Government which has introduced legislation on parking revenue. The following appeared in the *Adelaide Advertiser* on the 26th August this year, which is about a week ago:—

#### Bill to Control Use of Parking Revenue.

Municipal councils may be compelled to spend the whole of their parking meter revenue, less authorised deductions, on providing parking stations and other car parks under a Bill introduced in Parliament yesterday.

The Bill, which amends the Local Government Act, was introduced by the Minister of Local Government (Mr. Bevan) in the Legislative Council.

They say "Minister of" over there and not "Minister for".

He said the Act at present empowered a council to spend all or part of its parking meter revenue on establishing reserve funds for the purpose of providing car parks and parking stations.

The Bill would make it mandatory for a council to spend all its parking meter revenue for this purpose.

Mr. Craig: The authorised deductions referred to in that article could include road widening for all you know.

Mr. GRAHAM: I hope and trust the Minister agrees with me that as the law stands at present—and that is what I am amending—there is nothing to stop local authorities building fish ponds or swimming pools, or spraying-fountains from the proceeds of parking meters and parking stations.

Mr. Craig: That is so. Your Bill would tighten things to a certain extent.

Mr. GRAHAM: But they are subsequently weakened by the amendment.

Mr. Craig: But still there are obligations placed on these authorities.

Mr. GRAHAM: The local authority will still be in the position of being able to use, for the purposes of road-widening, the impositions levied on motorists for parking. With the sort of revenue that is flowing in and out of the special fund of the City of Perth I can almost at this stage visualise King Street, for example, being the width of, say, St. George's Terrace.

Mr. Craig: That would not be a bad idea.

Mr. GRAHAM: I agree wholeheartedly—but not from that source. If it were under the metropolitan region plan or through loan moneys funded by the ordinary revenues of the local authority, then that would be quite in order; but not when they are charges for parking, particularly when those charges are levied on the Queen's highway. After all, it was something novel in Western Australia to have parking bays and parking meters and I venture to suggest it was only acceptable to this Parliament because of not only what was written in the Bill then before us in 1956, but also the very definite assurances by the Government of the day and the City of Perth that the moneys would be used for a single purpose only; and that proposition was accepted by the great majority of members in this House, and unanimously in the Legislative Council.

Having admitted defeat, and emphasised the point that I will probably be getting about 5 per cent. or 10 per cent. of what I sought to achieve, I feel that that much is at least something saved, even if it does break through the cardinal principle which

was previously laid down and which still remains unassailed; because the Minister has not produced—and I challenge any other member in this House to produce—valid argument as to why parking moneys should be used for what, right through the years, has been regarded as the normal activities of a local authority to be financed by them in the ordinary way. I feel it is culpably and definitely wrong that there should be money-making schemes and what I might term highway robberies, because these are charges on the highway, and that that money should be able to be used for any other purpose than for the provision of parking.

Mr. Brand: Is not the condition which brings about the need for meters on the highway the same situation that creates the need for Fremantle to widen these roads to cope with the increasing traffic? Is it not almost a contribution to the solution of the very problem of parking? Does it not belong to this era?

Mr. GRAHAM: Apart from the ordinary revenue available to a local authority, as the Premier would be aware, motorists pay a very heavy contribution in the fees for the licensing of their vehicles.

Mr. Brand: You know that does not go very far towards the solution of this problem in the short time you have to do it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I know it costs a tidy sum each year for me to license my vehicle. In addition to that, every motorist pays a considerable sum in the excise on his fuel, a great amount of which is returned for road purposes.

Mr. Brand: It is still not enough to cope in a concentrated area.

Mr. GRAHAM: The main source of revenue for local authorities is their ability to rate.

Mr. Hawke: And raise loans.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, and then rate to service those loans. However, for some reason it seems that Governments—Commonwealth and State—and now local authorities, are using motorists as a convenient form of raising revenue. It is true that the advent of motor vehicles in their tens of thousands has created additional problems; but, simultaneously, very many problems have been resolved because of the speed and facility with which people and goods can be transported from one part to another.

Mr. Brand: No traffic problems or parking problems have been resolved in this way.

Mr. GRAHAM: No; but it has made it far easier for people in business to conduct their business. But getting back to the problem at issue—that of providing parking—the only difference between the Premier and myself concerns the source of revenue to deal with this problem. I

am saying that whilst motor vehicles have an impact on local authorities and Governments, inasmuch as they call for all sorts of requirements—roads, parking stations, and the rest of it—there is another side to the story; namely, that motor vehicles assist the economy and assist the business people—indeed they assist every section of the community—in so many different ways that all sections should be paying a tribute in order to provide the facilities that are necessary; and the fairest way in which that can be done, I suggest, is by the levying of rates. Here let me point out that the levying of rates is a taxation deduction, whereas the paying of sixpences into parking meters is not. So there is some solace to the citizen in that fact.

I think we can go to excesses in this matter of attaching too many imposts to the motorist; because if ever there was a country where there are long distances and where transport means so much, it is Australia; and if ever there was a State in Australia where that situation exists *in excelsis* then that State is Western Australia. Because of that fact we should resist the temptation of hitting the motorist on every conceivable occasion.

I know that Governments must have additional revenue, so they hit the motorist; and local authorities must have extra revenue, and that is why motor vehicle licenses have gone up. But I think we must make a stand somewhere, and we must lay down some basic principles. In the matter of parking, these principles or standards were laid down by Parliament in 1956.

I feel, however, that through inadvertence—and we have had a part admission from the Minister for Traffic this evening because he agrees with me, in part at least—a mistake was made in 1960. What I seek to do in my Bill is to bring us back to the basic principle. It appears that numbers are against me in this respect, for which reason I am thankful for small mercies. I say no more than that, and I await with interest the moving of the amendments indicated by the Minister for Traffic.

**Question put and passed.**

**Bill read a second time.**

*In Committee, etc.*

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. W. A. Manning) in the Chair; Mr. Graham in charge of the Bill.

**Clauses 1 to 3 put and passed.**

**Clause 4: Section 525A added—**

Mr. CRAIG: I stated my intention to submit certain amendments to this clause. The first ones are in reference to the revenue derived from fines and penalties. I do not like the Government to be in a

position to direct any authority, unnecessarily, as to how it is to spend its revenue, no matter from what source it is derived.

I did say I agreed that some obligation should be placed on them inasmuch as a certain amount of the income should be spent on parking facilities or improving them. I feel that the spending of revenue derived from fines and penalties is a matter for their own discretion or judgment. I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 24—Delete the passage  
“, fines and other penalties”.

Mr. GRAHAM: I remind the Minister that I have taken very much to heart his words that we should not dictate to local authorities the manner in which they are to spend their moneys.

Mr. Craig: I said “unnecessarily.”

Mr. GRAHAM: Very well. If my figures are correct, there are 120 local authorities, and I take it this is not to apply to 119 of them, with one being omitted.

Mr. Craig: I suggest the honourable member place his own interpretation on that.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister made no exclusion or exception, so I take it that is the cardinal point in the Government's policy. I hope to have an opportunity to test that some time shortly.

I just point out to the Minister that, taking the only local authority of which we have experience, in the last 12 months the amount, under this heading alone, of £45,000, which now goes for the provision of further parking facilities, will be available to the City of Perth to use for any other purposes—entertainment or anything else; because moneys from fines and other penalties are to go into the ordinary revenue of the local authority and may be used for any purpose whatsoever. I merely mention that so that members will be aware of what it is they are doing and what the impact will be.

Mr. TONKIN: There is a principle involved here that I do not like at all. I will agree that when a local authority which is given the power by law to fine people has to police that law, it is entitled to have repaid to it the costs involved in doing the policing. But I think any surplus should go to the State; otherwise we would get a situation in which the local authority would be encouraged to go after this source of revenue in such a way as to inflict considerable hardship upon a section of the community which is providing the revenue.

Fines, generally, are imposed not as a source of revenue but as a punishment; and fines imposed as a punishment should be so arranged as to be a fair punishment for the breach of the law that takes place. To put any person or body in the position of being able to derive considerable revenue

from that source, and to use that revenue for any purpose whatever, seems to me to be all wrong.

Basically the policing and the enforcement of laws is the obligation of the State; and if a breach of the Traffic Act occurs it is similar to a breach of the parking law. Why then should a traffic authority be placed in the position that it will derive substantial profit from a breach of the law? That is not its function at all. If we place upon the local authority the responsibility of policing its parking laws, the local authority is entitled to be reimbursed the costs involved; but, to my way of thinking, no more.

There is, however, an argument if the money is to be used for parking, because the persons from whom the money is derived by way of fines will get some benefit from the expenditure of the surplus money. But if we are to have a situation where a section of the community is called upon to make an extra contribution by means of fines and penalties and that money can be used to relieve ratepayers of obligations which are surely theirs, then I say it is all wrong.

In such circumstances I would not agree to give to the local authority, from the fines and penalties, any more than a reimbursement of the cost of obtaining that money. The balance should go to general revenue. Otherwise, as I have said, it is an encouragement for them to go out after this source of revenue rather than to derive it through parking meters. They will be more interested in fining people for breaches of parking than they will be in obtaining revenue for parking. I think that is a bad situation, so I must vote against the amendment on principle.

**Amendment put and passed.**

The clause was further amended, on motions by Mr. Craig, as follows:—

Page 2, lines 30 and 31—Delete the passage “, fines or other penalties”.

Page 2, line 35—Delete the passage “, fines and other penalties”.

**Mr. CRAIG:** I move an amendment—

Page 3—Insert after paragraph (b) in lines 14 to 25 the following new paragraph to stand as paragraph (c):—

- (c) for the purchase or acquisition of land, buildings and other structures, for the provision, by means of street widening, of parking facilities, metered zones and metered spaces and for the regulation and control, by that means, of the parking and standing of vehicles in accordance with the provisions of the by-laws;

I advanced the reasons why I was going to submit this amendment; namely, because in the case of the City of Fremantle—and other local authorities, if they decide to go ahead with providing parking facilities on the lines that Fremantle is going to do, and as the City of Perth already has in existence—it will enable the authority to meet the cost of widening some of the roads, particularly those that will provide access to the parking facilities that will be made available for the people using them.

It also allows of a means of revenue to the City of Fremantle to enable it to carry out widening to provide embayed parking facilities; and I think that is quite a reasonable request. After all it is to provide additional parking facilities. The acceptance of this amendment will enable the City of Fremantle to do that work.

**Amendment put and passed.**

**Mr. CRAIG:** I move an amendment—

Page 3, line 38—Delete the passage “, fines and penalties”.

**Amendment put and passed.**

**Clause, as amended, put and passed.**

**Title put and passed.**

**Bill reported with amendments.**

## **GASCOYNE RIVER: DAMMING**

### *Amendment to Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 1st September, on the following motion by Mr. Norton:—

That the damming of the Gascoyne River for the stabilising, developing, and expanding of intensive agriculture on the Gascoyne Delta and along the Gascoyne River is of such State and national importance as to require urgent action by the State Government to proceed at an early date with the construction of the necessary head works.

*To which Mr. Court (Minister for the North-West) had moved the following amendment:—*

That all words after the words “Gascoyne River” in line 5 down to and including the word “works” in line 9 be deleted and the following words substituted:—

may be feasible and the State Government is requested to continue the research into both the engineering and agricultural problems and potential in conjunction with the Northern Division of the Commonwealth Department of National Development; and make further approaches to the Commonwealth Government for any proposal proved desirable to be accepted as a Commonwealth-State Northern Development project.

**MR. NORTON** (Gascoyne) [8.33 p.m.]: I intend to oppose the amendment. The removal of the words, as proposed by the Minister for the North-West, actually takes everything that is worth while out of the motion, and even with his proposition to add certain words it will not have any substance.

It is rather interesting to look at the reasons the Minister advanced for the deletion of the words. In the first instance he said that the motion moved by me was a pious one, and I am wondering what he meant by the word "pious"; because from the dictionary I find it means "godly". Does he mean that the motion I moved is too good for Carnarvon, and so must be completely altered? The meaning of "pious"; as far as I can gather from Blackie's dictionary, is "having due respect and affection for parents or other relatives," and more commonly "duly reverencing the Supreme Being, being godly, devoted, dictated by reverence to God" and so on. I wonder what the Minister meant by a pious motion?

**Mr. Court:** It was used in a sense you well understood. It is incapable of fulfilment.

**MR. NORTON:** One of the Minister's other remarks was that the Government had no money to do these things, and this project should be submitted to the Northern Division of the National Development Department at Canberra. If one looks at an article which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 22nd August, and one which appeared in today's issue of the *Daily News*, one will find that this department is practically non-existent. The two principal departmental officers have resigned, and it is interesting to note from these articles the reasons given for their resignations. The first officer who resigned was Dr. R. A. Patterson, a man who has the north of Australia well and truly at heart and who has spent a lifetime in its development. One portion of the article in *The West Australian* of the 22nd August, which was written by M. C. Uren from Canberra, says, in reference to Dr. Patterson—

He knows precisely the way the Cabinet lined up on the Ord River proposition. Dr. Patterson's uncle is Primary Industry Minister Adermann, Deputy Leader of the Country Party.

So members can be sure that Dr. Patterson had advance information regarding what was likely to happen to northern development, and particularly the Ord River scheme; and it does not appear likely, if anything were put up regarding the Gascoyne project, that the department would take the proposition much further. Earlier in the same article there is an interesting paragraph which reads—

Since that sweeping victory at the poll the Federal government has not allocated a single penny to a new

northern development project, save a repayable loan of £1,635,000 to Queensland for Weipa development in the £2,667,030,000 budget brought down this week.

From that paragraph members can see that Dr. Patterson would have been very disappointed because none of the projects he had been supporting and fostering were getting any support. According to this evening's edition of the *Daily News* we read "Patterson's No. 2 in Shock Bid to Quit", and from the article under that heading we find that the second senior officer in the Northern Division of the National Development Department has applied for a transfer from the department. The job he has applied for will not mean an increase in salary and probably will not be nearly as interesting to him as his present position.

Therefore, if this motion as amended is to be submitted to that department, I do not see much hope of its getting anywhere. The Government says it has no money to carry out projects such as I have envisaged. I ask: How have Governments in the past built dams in the south-west and around Perth? How did they finance the Camballin project and other big undertakings? Did not the money for these works come from loan funds? Is not the Government at present financing the comprehensive water scheme? When it started this work did not the Commonwealth Government fall into line and provide certain funds?

If the Government accepted my motion, and started to build the headworks on the Gascoyne River, there is no doubt that the Commonwealth Government would provide assistance. Another reason the Minister gave for not agreeing to the motion as moved was that he felt the amendment would be in conformity with something that is practical. I agree that is so; but this is something that has been dragging on for years. The Minister also indicated that the Government intends to continue investigations into the development of agriculture and the engineering proposals involved in the damming of the Gascoyne River. But the amendment will mean that nothing more will be done than has been done in the past, and is being done now, without much progress being made.

I think the fourth and final reason given by the Minister for altering the motion was really a winner and I shall quote his own words. He said—

If the amendment which I have moved is adopted it will satisfy the people of Carnarvon . . .

I think that is an insult to the people of Carnarvon; because no matter what has been done in the past, or what is being done at present, they have no guaranteed water supply, and so I can say on their behalf that the amendment which

the Minister has moved would not meet with their approval. Therefore I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Hawke: It is a very pious amendment.

**MR. TONKIN** (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [8.41 p.m.]: The Minister for Industrial Development characterised the motion moved by the member for Gascoyne as a pious motion; and in explanation of his use of that adjective he said it meant a motion incapable of fulfilment. Let us have a look at the motion which in the opinion of the Minister for Industrial Development is incapable of fulfilment. It reads—

That the damming of the Gascoyne River for the stabilising, developing, and expanding of intensive agriculture on the Gascoyne Delta and along the Gascoyne River is of such State and national importance as to require urgent action by the State Government—

Is urgent action on the part of this Government incapable of fulfilment? Maybe it is. The motion continues—

—to proceed at an early date with the construction of the necessary head works.

Is that incapable of fulfilment by anybody with the heart to do the job?

Mr. Court: From present funds it is incapable of fulfilment as you know.

Mr. TONKIN: I do not know that at all.

Mr. Court: Where are we going to get £6,000,000?

Mr. Hawke: That should be easy for the Minister for Industrial Development.

Mr. Court: I know you have a tremendous admiration for my capacity to produce money out of the air.

Mr. TONKIN: If the motion moved by the member for Gascoyne is a pious one, and incapable of fulfilment, what adjective would one apply to the amendment moved by the Minister for Industrial Development which reads—

That the damming of the Gascoyne River for the stabilising, developing, and expanding of intensive agriculture on the Gascoyne delta and along the Gascoyne River may be feasible . . .

I would not call that pious; I would say that is platitudinous.

Mr. Court: It is being realistic in the light of the—

Mr. TONKIN: It may be feasible!

Mr. Court—best professional advice.

Mr. TONKIN: Just imagine asking this Assembly to make a determination on something that may be feasible! What does that amount to?

Mr. Court: What it says.

Mr. TONKIN: What does it mean when we say it may be feasible? Of course it may or it may not be feasible; but how far does that advance us by this deliberative Assembly saying that? If the motion moved by the member for Gascoyne is a pious one I leave it to members to describe the amendment.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Prophetic.

Mr. TONKIN: May be feasible!

Mr. Court: Of course we have some regard for professional advice.

Mr. TONKIN: It reminds me of the statement made by the Premier with regard to the deepening of the Geraldton Harbour, when he said, "It cannot be done." When I said in Geraldton that we would do it, the local paper took me to task for making such a statement; but it was not very long before the Premier announced that it would be done. That is on record.

Are we to waste the time of this Assembly in saying that putting a dam on the Gascoyne may be feasible? I think the member for Gascoyne is to be complimented on the amount of study and research he has put into this question, and upon the presentation of the case he made to the Assembly in support of the proposal for urgent action on the part of this Government.

To sum up, let us see what we have in Carnarvon. We have at least three weeks' advantage in season. In other parts of the world, they have had sufficient initiative to capitalise upon such an advantage. Covent Garden market in England gets its early supplies from the Channel Islands which were originally infertile and barren. They spent hundreds of thousands of pounds on importing bones from Plevna, and in using seaweed to build up the fertility of the soil in order to take advantage of the early sunshine and catch the early market. Here in Carnarvon, we have a fertile soil already; we have the climate which gives us at least a three weeks' advantage. What we need is water.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: And some money.

Mr. TONKIN: This Government finds plenty of money for other purposes when it suits it.

Mr. Brand: To what other purposes are you referring?

Mr. TONKIN: It finds £72,000 a year to make up the losses incurred by the sale of the State Building Supplies to Hawker Siddeley.

Mr. Brand: We save more than that by replacing the mills.

Mr. TONKIN: Oh no; the Government does not!

Mr. Brand: You are getting schools and hospitals as a result of it.

Mr. Hawke: We are getting some infertile and barren interjections from the front bench opposite.

Mr. TONKIN: What is required to take advantage of these wonderful facilities is water.

Mr. Court: What did you do for six solid years?

Mr. TONKIN: All the Government is offering us is the opportunity to say it is feasible.

Mr. Court: Production went down during your time; it is now at a record. What did you do?

Mr. TONKIN: We built a clay barrier in the river—

Mr. Court: Our pilot scheme is more important than that.

Mr. TONKIN: —for the purpose of testing out whether we can conserve water from the underground flow.

Mr. Court: We put in a pilot scheme to produce more water.

Mr. TONKIN: I thought the Government was short of money.

Mr. Court: We have already done it.

Mr. TONKIN: We do not want a declaration from this House that this may be feasible. We want some urgent action in order to bring it about. It is just as important, and it in no way derogates from the importance of Kununurra; and the natural advantages which are at Carnarvon should be developed at least as rapidly as those facilities which are being developed in the north of the State.

Mr. Court: What did you do about the Kennedy Range and these other things when you were there? I cannot find any record of your taking any positive action to improve their water supply other than these clay barriers.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister would not have remembered that had I not reminded him.

Mr. Court: We have actually created more water.

Mr. Hawke: You have created more wind.

Mr. TONKIN: What the amendment of the Minister for Industrial Development seeks to do is to take the urgency out of the motion.

Mr. Court: You are generating a lot of wind over there at the moment.

Mr. TONKIN: The amendment seeks to remove the statement that it is urgent to have steps taken at Carnarvon and to insert instead that the Government shall continue its research. Having made a statement that this is feasible, the Government shall, in its leisurely fashion, continue its research in the engineering and agricultural problems and potential. We already know the potential; it has already

been proved. There is no need for research into that. That area will grow cotton, it will grow citrus, it will grow dates, and it will grow beans. These things can be grown to catch the early markets in the Eastern States, as well as the early market in this State; and the opportunity is being wasted, because what we want is urgent action.

The Minister says his amendment would satisfy the people of Carnarvon. Will it satisfy the people of Carnarvon to know that the reason the Government wants to take the urgency out of this motion is that it has no money for Carnarvon? That is what we were told was the reason; that there was no money for Carnarvon.

We have the advantages there which have been proved—advantages which some countries would pay hundreds of thousands of pounds to have—but we cannot take advantage of them because the Government cannot find the money.

Mr. Court: You tell us what we should curtail to do this.

Mr. Hawke: Somebody should curtail the Minister for a start.

Mr. Court: That may be so; but we would still like to know what we should curtail to give Carnarvon a £6,000,000 project.

Mr. TONKIN: It was five years ago that the Government engaged Scott and Furphy for the purpose of making a report. That seems to be quite a line with the Government: to engage somebody from overseas to make a report. I would like to know what it has cost us to have these reports on the tidal possibilities of the north-west ports. There was money for that. Five years ago—in 1960—these two men were obtained to make a report. What has been done with it?

Mr. Court: Plenty.

Mr. TONKIN: That was research. There was a report emphasising the possibilities of this region; but the Government wants to take out of the motion the urgency to do something. All the Government wants is more research, more investigation; it wants to proceed in its leisurely fashion; and this is supposed to satisfy the people of Carnarvon. It would not satisfy the people of Nedlands.

Mr. Hawke: I don't know; they are easily satisfied.

Mr. Court: They have not been terribly satisfied with a couple of your candidates.

Mr. TONKIN: Boiled down, the proposition is a substitution of a platitude for a motion which is calling upon the House to tell the Government that this should be regarded as an urgent matter, and that the Government should make a commencement with some headworks on the Gascoyne River.

Is there anything so great in that as to present an insurmountable obstacle? I am of the firm opinion that it is possible to

build a dam on the Gascoyne which will provide the water required by this district; and let us remember that it is already served with the basic facilities such as lights, schools, and hospitals. All these must be provided in the newer areas we are now developing. The district has been proved, the fertility of its soil has been proved; its climate is right; and all that is lacking is water.

Mr. Court: And the money.

Mr. TONKIN: I would recommend to the Government that it study what has been done in Israel with regard to the provision of water to turn barren soil into garden country; and what would have happened had that nation said, "We cannot find the money." But the Government says, "Let us have more research; let us have a further look into the engineering possibilities and the potential," in order to waste more time. That is what the amendment seeks to do. It seeks to lift from the motion any suggestion that the House feels that this matter is of urgency; any suggestion that we feel the Government ought to shake itself up and do something for Carnarvon.

Mr. Court: The Government has done plenty for Carnarvon and gets no credit from the member for the district. He whinges all the time.

Mr. TONKIN: Instead of the motion being accepted we are asked to make a statement which is a platitude: that to do this may be feasible. Where will that get us? Where will that get the people of Carnarvon?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Read it in context.

Mr. TONKIN: I suggest it is being hypocritical to pass the amendment in place of the motion. The motion was a definite indication to the Government that the House feels Carnarvon is entitled to urgent consideration of this question; that it should not be pushed aside while emphasis is placed elsewhere.

If we carry the motion as it stands it will not be a motion which is incapable of fulfilment at all. On the contrary, it should result in some action being taken. But because the Government wants to avoid being placed in that position; because it does not want to take urgent action, we are to make a statement that it may be feasible, and allow the Government to proceed along its leisurely way for some inquiry. Does that mean the appointment of another group of persons to make another report which, in due course, will receive consideration and be put aside because there is no money for Carnarvon? Is that to be the answer to that question? I hope not.

I therefore propose to move to amend the amendment. I want to insert after the word "continue" in the Minister's amendment—

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! I do not think we have decided whether we are going to accept the amendment to the motion.

Mr. TONKIN: I am not moving my amendment. I am merely saying what I propose to move. I will move it in due course. But I think it is important to indicate what I am going to move on this amendment. If the amendment is carried I propose to insert after the word "continue" the words "and give first priority to." So after making this platitudinous statement that it may be feasible, the motion will then read, "and the State Government is requested to continue and give first priority to the research into both the engineering and agricultural problems and potential in conjunction with the Northern Division of the Commonwealth Department of National Development."

That will not give us as much as the motion does as it stands, but it will still be an indication on the part of the Assembly that it believes this is an urgent matter and should not be treated on a *laissez faire* basis—go as you please—but it should be given an early priority. I am opposed to the amendment.

MR. BOVELL (Vasse—Minister for Lands) [9.1 p.m.]: I have listened with some amazement to the utterances of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition; and I would like to remind the House that only a few weeks had elapsed when the Government changed and I was requested by the members from North-West Province and the north-west districts to receive a deputation because of the chaotic state of the water position on the Gascoyne River. Included in that deputation were several Ministers of the former Government. This was within weeks of the retirement of the former Government.

I received the deputation and listened with equal amazement to the plight of the people of Carnarvon that the former Government was not able to relieve them of. The member for Gascoyne knows that I visited the area with him and toured it; and since then this Government has taken action, and I believe the position is better than it has ever been. The last person who should speak in the terms in which he has spoken tonight is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, because prior to that deputation he had been Minister for Works and Water Supplies for six years. I think the House should be in possession of this information that the Labor Government, when it went out of office, left the water position in a chaotic state, so much so—

Mr. Norton: Due to a drought.



Mr. BOVELL:—that a deputation comprising several former Ministers waited on me as Minister for Lands to ask me to endeavour to do something to alleviate the position—

Mr. Hawke: Following a drought.

Mr. BOVELL:—which the previous Labor Government could not do.

Mr. Hawke: Why don't you tell the whole story?

**Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—**

**Ayes—25**

Mr. Bovell	Dr. Henn
Mr. Brand	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Burt	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Cornell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Craig	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Durack	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Elliott	Mr. Rushton
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Williams
Mr. Grayden	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Guthrie	

(Teller)

**Noes—17**

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Davies	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Evans	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Graham	Mr. Toms
Mr. Hall	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Norton
Mr. J. Hegney	

(Teller)

**Pairs**

<b>Ayes</b>	<b>Noes</b>
Mr. Nalder	Mr. May
Mr. Hart	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Nimmo	Mr. W. Hegney

**Majority for—8.**

**Amendment thus passed.**

**MR. COURT** (Nedlands—Minister for the North-West) [9.6 p.m.]: I move an amendment—

That the following be substituted for the words deleted:—

“may be feasible and the State Government is requested to continue the research into both the engineering and agricultural problems and potential in conjunction with the Northern Division of the Commonwealth Department of National Development; and make further approaches to the Commonwealth Government for any proposal proved desirable to be accepted as a Commonwealth-State Northern Development project.”

I understand I cannot speak on the insertion of the words.

**Amendment (to insert words) put and passed.**

*Motion, as amended*

**MR. TONKIN** (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [9.8 p.m.]: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman) Order! I have not a copy of the honourable member's amendment so I do not know where

he intends to fit in the words, or whether they can be tacked on to the end of the present words.

*Point of Order*

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, I indicated to yourself and the House that I proposed to move an amendment. I stated exactly where I proposed to move it and I read the amendment. I was of the opinion that I should have moved before the matter was actually put to the House. I looked at you, but you made no move and I thought you would give me the indication if that were so. As you did not, I made no attempt to move and I let the amendment go before the House.

I appreciate that Standing Orders may now make it impossible for me to move, but I made my position clear and left nothing at all to chance, and stated exactly where I proposed to make the amendment. As a matter of fact, you will appreciate I misused my words because I said I proposed to move and then altered that to saying I proposed to move later on. I think that under the circumstances it would be a travesty if I were denied the opportunity of testing the House on this question; and if there is any difficulty with the Chair I suggest the Government should be magnanimous and give me an opportunity of moving what I intended to move. Whilst I suppose in the final analysis I am expected to know, and it is my fault if I miss out, I think under the circumstances it would have been reasonable for the position to have been pointed out to me before it became irrevocable. On that point of order I would ask that some means be found to enable me to test the feeling of the House.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): The position is, I think, quite clear. The Minister in the first place moved to delete certain words with the intention of inserting other words. The move to delete was carried and the Minister then moved the words which appear on the notice paper. I think the proper opportunity for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was to oppose the move to insert the words.

Mr. Tonkin: No, Sir.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): You did not want these words inserted; you wanted to amend them.

Mr. Tonkin: That's not it, Sir.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): The only motion I could put was the one the Minister moved.

Mr. TONKIN: In my experience of this House it has always been possible to amend an amendment. It has been done many times. I was prepared to accept all the words that the Minister moved. I am not attempting to delete any of them; but I want a few words in addition. There

is no constitutional bar to that being done so long as it is done in the right place. When could that have been achieved? Certainly not before the Minister moved his amendment.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): It could have been achieved at the time the Minister moved to insert certain words. You could have amended that motion by including your words as well as those proposed by the Minister.

Mr. COURT: Since the honourable member is determined to have this tested by the House, might I respectfully suggest that it would be competent for him to move an amendment adding words to the motion. I am not quite sure of the procedure to be adopted. I know my words were inserted and assumed the honourable member had abandoned interest when he did not move his amendment at that time. If the motion in the amended form has not yet been put, it may be competent for the honourable member to move words to effect what he was suggesting at the end of the motion. He could move something along these lines, "and this be given high priority" or something of that nature? I am not sure where you, Mr. Speaker, have got as regards the real position of the motion.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I think the position at the moment is that we have added words and I have put the question, "That the motion, as amended, be agreed to." I think it would be competent, as I stated earlier, for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to add additional words. Is that clear to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition? I am now putting formally the question that the motion, as amended, be agreed to.

Mr. TONKIN: I am thankful for the suggestion, but I have no intention of mutilating the Queen's English.

Mr. Court: I am only trying to be helpful.

Mr. TONKIN: I am not going to tack the proposal I have in mind on to the end of this motion because it would then be almost meaningless jargon. I will have to accept the situation, but will not be caught again.

*Debate (on amendment to motion)  
Resumed*

MR. NORTON (Gascoyne) [9.14 p.m.]: Before the motion is finally put, I wish to make a few comments on the speech of the Minister when he spoke to the motion. It would have been noticed by members that the major part of his speech dealt with rivers other than the Gascoyne River. I confined my remarks entirely to the development of the Gascoyne. I have no quarrel with the Minister that he should have included other rivers, because

he was using the Gascoyne River—its problems and development—as an example to get other rivers further north of the Gascoyne and south of the 20th parallel to become subjects of a presentation to the National Development Department to obtain money for their damming and development.

He used as his reason for northern river development the expansion of industry and the urgent requirements of the population for water for domestic use. He said earlier in his speech that the problems on the Gascoyne were not new. I think I pointed that out very clearly when I introduced this subject. Throughout the whole history of the Gascoyne we have had these problems, and my motion was to try to get something done to overcome them. The only way to overcome them is to supply more water.

The Minister said he was going to give us some history of the Gascoyne, and that was as far as he went. Actually, there was no need for him to give us the history because I had followed it right back to the end of World War I when the Gascoyne area started, and I traced that history right up to the present time. There was no need for the Minister to give it, and he could have devoted his time to other things in regard to the damming of the river.

The Minister said that some people were casting doubts on the Ord River. I do not know whether he was referring to me at that time or not, but he certainly did make that statement. Here I will quote what the Minister said. It is as follows:—

I want to make one observation at this point, and that is in regard to the tendency of some people in the Gascoyne district to try to achieve their object with the Gascoyne River by casting some doubts on the Ord project. I want to say in all sincerity that they will get nowhere doing this sort of thing. One does not get a project to the fore by damning another.

I did not in any way criticise the Ord project. In putting my case forward I used comparisons. When putting forward a case in debate one must use comparisons wherever applicable. I used a comparison with respect to cotton growing in New South Wales, the Ord River, Texas, California, and so on. I think it is only right that a member should be able to use such points in making up a case, if he has one. I think I had a good case to build on the point I produced at the time.

The Minister also said that I quoted some figures, but did not say what they related to. I presume they were figures concerning the experimental growing of cotton at the Gascoyne Research Station. His words were as follows:—

As a result of efforts in the past we have come to the conclusion that a lot more research will be necessary

and will have to be undertaken both on the engineering side and on the agricultural side. There is one grave danger on the agricultural side: namely, that too much significance can be placed on research station experience. The honourable member quoted some figures; and it is important when considering them to realise that the research station is a comparatively small place.

Now the Minister must be fair. When I quoted those figures I did say they were not figures which could be expected to be obtained when cotton was grown commercially. I said it was recognised that experimental planting was usually about 50 per cent. in excess of normal growing. I said that cotton grown commercially would be about two-thirds of the figures from the research station.

Mr. Court: Did you mention the acreage of the research station?

Mr. NORTON: No; I did not. Nor did I mention the block on which it was grown.

Mr. Court: Do you remember whether it was a half-acre or a quarter-acre?

Mr. NORTON: It would be about one acre, I think, from memory.

Mr. Court: I was out there the other day and it seemed to be about a quarter of an acre.

Mr. NORTON: It might have been in respect of each variety. Three or four rows of each variety were grown. Only one row in the centre of each variety was harvested, so that the growing was controlled. The Gascoyne research experiment was carried out on exactly the same lines as the Kimberley Research Station so that the experiments can be compared one with the other quite simply.

Later on in his speech the Minister said that the Government had got Scott and Furphy to come to Carnarvon to make an examination and report on the Gascoyne River. He went on to say that it was on the recommendation of the officers of the department. That might have been so; but this is one of the few election promises that the Government has carried out so far as Carnarvon is concerned. The late Sir Ross McLarty said that the investigation would take place and it was one of the few promises carried out. So one can hardly say that it was on the recommendation of the department that Scott and Furphy were brought over in 1961 to make a survey.

Further on in his speech the Minister set out to show that the production of the Gascoyne River had greatly increased as a result of water conservation, or water restrictions. The Minister has mentioned this on many occasions. He has claimed that water restrictions, or water control, has greatly increased the production; and

here I totally disagree with him, and I disagree from my own personal and practical experience in the area.

Mr. Court: It is getting better use now than ever before.

Mr. NORTON: The reason that production has increased is that at the same time water restrictions came in—or water control, whichever the Minister likes to term it—the various chemical companies brought out a fumigant to control the boring eel worm. Prior to the fumigant being introduced the plants in the summertime had at least 75 per cent. of their roots destroyed by this boring eel worm and for a long time it was not known what was causing the trouble in the plants. It was attacking the bananas, pumpkins, beans, and so on.

The old method to control the eel worm was for the fumigant to be put into the soil when the soil was ploughed. The fumigant was allowed to remain in the soil for approximately six weeks before planting. However, this treatment lasted only six months. Now it is possible to put the new fumigant in the soil every two or three months by adding it to the water which is released into the irrigation drain. In this way it is carried throughout the plantation area and the eel worm is brought under control.

Prior to the control of water, no matter how much of it was used on the plantations in the summertime the bananas went yellow and became very sick looking during the extensive hot period; but now there is no wilting or yellowing of the plants in any way. They are virile right throughout the season. What is more, tomatoes which could not be grown during the summer, before the introduction of this chemical, can now be grown all the year around and beans and pumpkins—and in fact crops of all vegetables—have greatly increased and can be grown now with 50 per cent. of the water that was required before the use of this chemical. So the Minister cannot claim that water controls have been the main factor in increased production.

Mr. Court: Agriculturalists say it has. They say that less water is being used than was the position before controls were imposed, and the growers are getting higher production. It is a combination of the chemicals and better husbandry.

Mr. NORTON: If the Minister were to go to Carnarvon and get out among the growers he would find that the main reason for the increased production is the introduction of the chemical to which I have referred.

Further on in his speech the Minister dealt with the increased population at Carnarvon and tried to ally that with the water restrictions, or controls, and the better crops being grown. He did say that some of the increased population was

due to the erection of the tracking station at Carnarvon and the figures he gave were correct. In June, 1954, there were 1,457 people in the town of Carnarvon and 10 years later there were 2,050, which is an increase of 593. The tracking station employs 114 people permanently, most of whom are married, which would mean a total of 228 people who have been brought to Carnarvon because of the tracking station.

It is estimated by the Education Department that there is an average of 1.7 children to each family, so if we add that percentage to the other figures we find that there are not many more people to be accounted for other than those concerned with the tracking station. Also, the fishing industry has meant an increase in population, and I do not think the Minister can claim that the control of water has meant an increase in the population of the district to any extent.

Mr. Court: No-one claimed that. I was pointing out that the town has never been so prosperous.

Mr. NORTON: The Minister then said that the Minister for Education had informed him that a three-year high school would be built at Carnarvon next year. I do not know whether he misheard the Minister for Education, but we have had a high school there for years. What the Minister may have heard was a reference to three extra classrooms being added to the primary school.

Mr. Court: That is what was intended.

Mr. NORTON: Perhaps the Minister did not quite hear what his colleague said at the time.

Mr. Hawke: I think the Minister was being pious.

Mr. NORTON: The school has been there for a number of years and it was built by a Labor Government.

Mr. Court: One would think the town had never been so depressed instead of the other way around.

Mr. NORTON: The Minister said that I did not give the Government any credit for the pilot scheme. I have mentioned this on several occasions, and it certainly helps a number of growers on the south side of the river; in fact, I think it is assisting about 36 of them at present. However, the pilot scheme will be of no use during a drought; it will go the same way as all the other wells on the river.

Mr. Court: Doleful Dan!

Mr. NORTON: In fact, it was getting a little bit short before the river ran this year and those in charge were having some difficulty in keeping up the quantity of water required.

Mr. Court: After all the Minister for Lands had done for them.

Mr. Bovell: Mr. Speaker, the position was that there was an illegal use of Crown land and that is how I came into it. They were draining the limited water resources there and I had to adjust the matter.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! The member for Gascoyne.

Mr. Court: They were doing that with the knowledge of the Labor Government, too.

Mr. NORTON: The Minister mentioned there were three places which could be dammed on the Gascoyne, the first one being in the Kennedy Range, which would hold 850,000 acre-feet of water—a very sizeable quantity—and which would be considerably more than would be required for the plantations and also for the development of the 25,000 acres which are suitable for long staple cotton, so we are told.

The next proposition was the Lyons River site and the third was the Chalby-Chalby site, which is a long way from Carnarvon. The Lyons River homestead is not quite so far away but it is still a considerable distance. The Minister omitted to mention Rocky Pool which could be dammed, and the work could be done more cheaply than the dam in the Kennedy Range. This project would not hold as much water—only 32,000-acre-feet—but it would be a means of stabilising the industry and allowing it to develop to what is required in the very near future. It would also provide sufficient water for the experimental growing of cotton. The Minister then went on to say that soil surveys had been made in the area by the C.S.I.R.O. and these showed that there were approximately 25,000 acres similar to those at present being irrigated.

The Minister did not mention that in the report it was stated that the 3,500 acres of freehold land which was held by the plantation owners in and around Carnarvon was not being used and this would mean a total of 28,500 acres. In addition there is a large area in the commonage and the soil there is of the same type as in the plantation areas and it could be used at any time for the growing of vegetables or cotton, provided sufficient water was made available. This is a large area of land and there is no reason why it should not be put under production because at the present time it is used for the running of a few sheep and is not producing a great deal of income.

In addition, the Minister said that if a dam was to be built in the Kennedy Ranges, and cotton and dates were grown, it would mean an increase of £2,000,000 to the income of the district. If one adds that to the present £1,000,000 income that is produced it means a total of £3,000,000 for the area. However, the £2,000,000 mentioned by the Minister does not allow for the increase in production which will take place

between now and 1975, and surely Carnarvon will be called upon to produce more because of the out-of-season demand for vegetables by both Perth and Adelaide. Also there is a demand for bananas and this could mean at least another £500,000 a year which would mean £3,500,000 per annum for only a small area, and at a relatively low cost.

During his speech the Minister did not in any way contradict or criticise any of the statements I made and therefore he must have accepted them as being correct. That being so he must have agreed with the case I put up and as far as the damming of the river is concerned must have felt that it is almost watertight and one that is worth proceeding with.

All the Minister has done is to play down the urgency of the project, and that is evident from the amendment which has been moved. More water must be made available at an early date if Carnarvon is to hold its State and interstate trade; because if we do not keep up supplies we will allow the other States to come in and take over the market which we have at present and which, as far as Adelaide is concerned, we won from Queensland.

Finally, I am satisfied that my action in moving this motion was justified; and although the amendment moved by the Minister was agreed to, apparently he considered the motion was worth while, and therefore top priority should be given to improving facilities on the Gascoyne River and its associated projects.

**Question (motion, as amended) put and passed.**

## TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

**MR. GRAHAM** (Balcatta) [9.37 p.m.]:  
I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In 1963 the Traffic Act was amended in several particulars, and one of the amendments embodied two definitions—one defining the word "driver" and the other defining the word "road." In respect of the definition of "road" an omission was made, and consequently there is a serious weakness in our Traffic Act. When introducing the Government Bill the Minister indicated that the primary purpose of his amendment was to make the Act conform with the National Traffic Code on the ground that it was desirable that there should, as far as possible, be uniformity in traffic control legislation throughout the Commonwealth of Australia, and that this was a step in that direction.

One might agree with the objective in view, and whilst the Minister tells us that these words conform with the procedure in vogue in the majority of the

Australian States, I feel there must be other provisions that have been introduced there to remedy the weakness that has been indicated to me and which this small Bill seeks to resolve.

In the Traffic Act, prior to the amendment that was agreed to in 1963, the definition of "road" read as follows:—

"road" means and includes any street, road, lane, thoroughfare, footpath, or place open to, or used by the public, . . .

**Mr. Craig:** That amendment was in reference to drive-in theatres.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** That is so—drive-in theatres, public car parks, privately operated car parks, and so on. The Minister felt it was necessary for two sections of the Act to be amended, and Parliament agreed with him; namely, that the broader definition should remain in those cases. So in addition to the word "road," we inserted the words "or in any place commonly used by the public or to which the public is permitted to have access." In two sections in the Act those words were inserted to cover the situation that was created by a person negligently or recklessly driving his vehicle in a manner which caused damage in a car park or other similar place. If a driver of a vehicle acted in this way he committed an offence.

In the second instance, if a person were under the influence of liquor in one of these car parks, drive-in theatres, or similar place, he would be committing an offence. With that provision one has no objection.

However, there are two sections in which it is necessary to insert the words as proposed in the Bill, because, as the law stands at present, there is no requirement on the driver of a vehicle who crashes into another in a car park to report that accident or happening to the nearest police station. I think all members will agree that that is a definite weakness in the Act.

So it is proposed by this Bill that in section 30 the words, "or in any place commonly used by the public or to which the public is permitted to have access" shall be inserted so that in the event of any vehicle being used in such a place and an accident occurring and causing damage to any property, the driver in charge of such vehicle shall be required to report the accident forthwith to the officer in charge of the nearest police station, and so on.

Similarly, in section 30A, the provision should be that where in the course of the use of a vehicle on a road or any other place, such as a public car park, an accident occurs whereby bodily injury is caused to any person, then a report of the

accident shall be made forthwith to the nearest police station. This will mean that sections 30 and 30A, together with sections 31 and 32 where amendments have already been made will have those operative words inserted to make it a requirement to report an accident—

Mr. Craig: That will mean that any minor accident that occurs in a car park or a drive-in theatre should be reported, in accordance with the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not say a minor accident. I would say any accident which occurs on the roadway and is reportable—

Mr. Craig: Every accident which occurs on the roadway is reportable.

Mr. GRAHAM: No; it is not. One vehicle could bump into another only slightly without any visible or appreciable damage being caused, and as a result both vehicles go on their way. If it is a requirement of the Act that an accident which occurs on the road should be reported, I suggest that if an accident occurs in another public place there should be an equal requirement on those involved to report the accident. Here, let me say that this weakness in the Act was brought to my attention by the daughter of a member of Parliament whose next-door neighbour's car happened to be in a public car park—in my electorate, as it so happened—and another vehicle was driven into the side of this person's car whilst he was absent from it. It was only because of the quick thinking of a newspaper boy that the number of the offending car was taken.

Subsequently, the person who owned the car that had been damaged went to the police and they said, "This has nothing to do with us. All we can do is to supply the name and address of the driver who damaged your car." This meant that the owner of the car that had been damaged had to approach this person at his front door with the risk of going through the process of having the door slammed in his face, and so on.

So when an accident occurs resulting in bodily injury, I suggest that the requirement to report the accident should apply to all places to which the public has access. If the door of my vehicle is pushed in by another vehicle on the road or in a car park, what is the difference? There should be an obligation on the person responsible for the damage to report that accident to the police.

If the Minister feels that there are too many minor circumstances which would involve the Act being cluttered up for the police in the administration of it, then I suggest the same could be said in regard to a good deal of other minor damage which occurs to vehicles on public roads. I

draw the Minister's attention to the fact that in section 29 of the Act there is a provision which states that—

Where any vehicle or animal which is in the course of being driven or ridden is in the course of any action whereby any person is injured or the property of any person is damaged, the person driving or riding or otherwise for the time being having the care of such vehicle or animal shall stop immediately after the occurrence of such accident,—

Here I interpolate that this is the position wherever it occurs. But we find that this is the only requirement,—

and if required shall produce his license and give his name and address, etc.

But there is no need for him to make a report of it. If nobody asks him for his name and address then he is under no obligation to do anything. I was about 10 per cent. successful with an earlier Bill.

Mr. Craig: You might be 5 per cent. with this one.

Mr. GRAHAM: I feel that when the Minister has had time to reflect, and after he consults the Act, he will please the House, and nobody more than myself, by indicating that the Government agrees with this proposition. I do not think there is any question whatsoever as to the necessity for it.

An accident involving damage to a person or a vehicle wherever it occurs should be reportable; but if the Minister feels there is a warrant for excluding certain types of minor mishaps, then they should be excluded whenever they might occur—whether they occur on the roads or in the car parks. As the Minister will be aware, the great majority of crashes of a major and minor nature take place on the roads rather than in car parks. I think I have said sufficient to indicate the object of the Bill, and I commend it to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Craig (Minister for Traffic).

## ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier)  
[9.47 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 14th September.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 9.48 p.m.*