The amendment now proposed merely extends this provision to bills of sale in respect of the spraying of crops, and materials for spraying. The thirteenth schedule to the principal Act contains the list of fees. Clause 6 of the Bill provides for the insertion in the thirteenth schedule of a fee of $4 payable on the lodging of an application to the registrar under section 13A, which is the new section being introduced into this Act by this amending Bill. This fee includes the affidavit in support of the application.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee (Leader of the Opposition).

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [6.5 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 30th August.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.6 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 24th August, 1966

CONTENTS

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

QUESTIONS (17): ON NOTICE

GOVERNMENT BOARDS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES

Rights of Appeal by Officers: Introduction of Legislation

1. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Premier:

   (1) Is legislation likely this session which will afford right of appeal to salaried officers of boards and State instrumentalities on a similar basis to that applying to the Civil Service?

   (2) If not, when can such legislation be anticipated?

   Mr. LEWIS (for Mr. Brand) replied:

   (1) and (2) This matter is receiving consideration. I am unable to state, at this stage, whether such legislation will be introduced.

2. to 4. *These questions were postponed.*

FLOODING

Collie: Compensation for Damage

5. Mr. MAY asked the Premier:

   (1) Did the Government make representation to the Commissioner of Taxation and the Prime Minister to have compensation payments to banana growers for cyclone damage made exempt from income tax?

   (2) If so, will he make similar representations for income tax exemption on flood loss compensation paid to the business people and residents of Collie?

   Mr. LEWIS (for Mr. Brand) replied:

   (1) Yes. Exemption was granted on the grounds that payments were made to enable growers to restore personal effects and provide sustenance for their families.

   (2) It is considered that representations would serve little purpose since—

   (a) any compensation payments which may have been included in the assessable income of persons carrying on business have been so treated because they represent a reimbursement of business losses which are themselves allowable deductions.

   (b) payments made to private residents in respect of losses of personal effects do not represent assessable income and have not been treated as such.

WANDANA FLATS

Maintenance: Receipts and Expenditure

6. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Housing:

   Respecting the Wandana flat project—

   (a) What is the total amount received from tenants in their

rental payments under the heading "maintenance"?

(b) What is the total amount that has been spent on maintenance?

Mr. O'NEIL replied:

(a) $121,850.

(b) $69,913.

LIQUOR

Australian Wine Licenses: Number in Goldfields

7. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

(1) How many Australian wine licenses under the present licensing Act are situate in the goldfields district?

(2) Where are these licensed premises situated?

Mr. O'CONNOR replied:

(1) Three.

(2) One in Boulder and two in Kalgoorlie.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Main Street-Scarborough Beach Road: Right-hand Turn

8. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Police:

In connection with the installation of traffic lights at the junction of Main Street and Scarborough Beach Road, will vehicles travelling east along Scarborough Beach Road be permitted to make a right-hand turn at the eastern end of the median strip located immediately west of the above junction?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

Yes. Right turns will be permitted, but "U" turns to proceed in the opposite direction are prohibited at all traffic light controlled intersections in accordance with Traffic Code regulation 805.

SEWERAGE: HILLS AREA

Discharge into Swan River: Concern

9. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

(1) Has he read in *The West Australian*, of the 22nd and the 23rd August of a proposal to permit a town planning scheme in the hills area which will envisage a discharge from the sewerage scheme into the Swan River?

(2) Is he aware many residents in the eastern suburbs are alarmed at the proposal?

(3) Is not the solution to the sewerage problem the building of a new scheme for the northern suburbs to discharge—

(a) into the Indian Ocean; or

(b) being treated on an area set aside for the purpose and financed by all sewerage and potential sewerage served landowners?

(4) Is he aware many people use the Swan River for recreational purposes in flood period as well as in summer season?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

(1) The proposal is for the local authority to prepare a town planning scheme to enable deep sewerage to be available to a specified area. This scheme, if adopted by the local authority, will require ministerial approval.

(2) No, but any such residents would have an opportunity to object when the scheme is advertised.

(3) Technical questions concerning sewerage scheme and effluent disposal are matters within the province of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board. The questioner may therefore wish to redirect his question to the Minister for Works.

(4) Yes.

RAILWAYS

Quarterly Tickets: Greenmount-Koongamia Area

10. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is it a fact that quarterly combined bus and train tickets are not available to passengers living in the Greenmount-Koongamia area travelling to and from Perth?

(2) Is it a fact that tickets for combined bus and train travel are available for weekly, fortnightly and monthly periods?

(3) Is there any reason for not making quarterly tickets available and will he state the reason?

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

(1) Yes.

(2) No. Periodical tickets are available for weekly and 28-day periods only.

(3) Yes. The Metropolitan Transport Trust does not issue quarterly tickets and this service is provided conjointly by the Railways Commission and the Metropolitan Transport Trust.

11. *This question was postponed.*

ALBANY CENTRAL PRIMARY SCHOOL

Plans for Resiting

12. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Education:

As the resiting of the Albany Central Primary School is essential because of traffic density, commercial growth, and noise factor, what plans has the Government for the resiting of the school; and when is it contemplated that action will take place?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

No firm decision has yet been reached on an alternative site. The difficult loan fund position makes it impossible for the Education Department to consider the resiting of schools for many years to come.

13. *This question was postponed.*

ALBANY REGIONAL HOSPITAL

Geriatric Wards: Provision

14. Mr. HALL ased the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

(1) As there is a growing need for hospital accommodation in the Albany Regional Hospital, brought about by the increased population of Albany and districts, what plans has the Government in hand to alleviate the problem by way of extensions and the establishing of geriatric wards?

(2) If the Government has plans in hand for the extension of the Albany Regional Hospital, when will they be implemented?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) and (2) The commencement of construction of a geriatric ward is included in the loan programme for this financial year and private architects, Messrs. Hobbs, Winning and Leighton, have been commissioned to prepare the plans.

15. *This question was postponed.*

POTATO GROWERS' LICENSES

Termination and Appeal

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

(1) For the period the 1st January, 1965, to the 30th June, 1966, how many potato growers have had their grower's license terminated because of offences under the Potato Marketing Act?

(2) What total acreage is involved in the licenses which were not renewed?

(3) Can it be anticipated that any of the terminated licenses will be renewed; if so, when?

(4) Is the Government satisfied that in all instances the penalties imposed on growers by the Potato Marketing Board were just and equitable?

(5) In cases in which growers consider an injustice has been done them by the action of the board, to whom should they appeal?

Mr. LEWIS (for Mr. Nalder) replied:

(1) 18.

(2) 274 acres.

(3) No.

(4) Yes.

(5) There are no formal channels of appeal, but delicensed growers can continue to apply for a license on the due date.

LAND

Application by W.A. Development Corporation: Tabling of Report

17. Mr. KELLY asked the Premier:

(1) Will he table the report by the majority and the minority of the Government sub-committee which considered the application for very large areas of land in the south-east of Western Australia, as made to the Government by the W.A. Development Corporation?

(2) If not, will he lay upon the Table of the House a typewritten summary of the reasons given in favour of the application by the minority and the reasons against the application as given by the majority?

Mr. LEWIS (for Mr. Brand) replied:

(1) and (2) The question of the report of the committee of our joint Government parties is purely a domestic matter.

Mr. Kelly: That's an easy way of getting out of it.

Mr. Hawke: You don't want the public to know.

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

BILLS (5): THIRD READING

1. Rural and Industries Bank Act Amendment Bill.

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

2. Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement Bill.

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

3. Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund Act Amendment Bill.
4. Potato Growing Industry Trust Fund Act Amendment Bill.
5. Brands Act Amendment Bill.

Bills read a third time, on motions by Mr. Lewis (Minister for Education), and transmitted to the Council.

TRAFFIC ACT

Disallowance of Regulation 1613(2): Motion

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [4.43 p.m.]: I move—

> That clause (2) of regulation 1613, part XVI—Miscellaneous, made under the Traffic Act, 1919-1965 (cited as the Road Traffic Code, 1965), as published in the *Government Gazette* on the 30th December, 1965, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 2nd August, 1966, be and is hereby disallowed.

I do not intend to delay the House very long in moving the motion standing in my name. It has often been said that the law is an ass, and I suggest that rather than extend this saying, we, as legislators—we do claim to be legislators during the elections—should endeavour to minimise the degree of harassment of the general public when we agree to regulations which have the effect of law.

My notice was drawn to this particular regulation which, among others, was proclaimed when the Road Traffic Code was regazetted in the early part of this year. Up until the regazettal of the Road Traffic Code in this State, and until the inclusion of this particular provision, there was no requirement on the part of a driver-teacher to indicate in any way on his vehicle, while he was instructing a pupil, that he was, in fact, teaching someone to drive.

It is true that the other States have for a number of years, provided for an "L" to be displayed both at the front and at the rear of a vehicle being so used. This, however, was not the case in Western Australia; and I do not know of any great incidence of accidents as a result of this lack of information to other road users. There could, however, conceivably have been some, and to that extent I agree it is, possibly, desirable that there should be an indication to other road users that the person in the car is under instruction. Such an indication would, of course, make the other road users a little more cautious of such a driver than would otherwise be the case.

Strange as it may seem, however, on this occasion the authorities seem to have excelled themselves, by including a regulation which clearly gives a good coverage in respect of what shall be done with vehicles used to train drivers. The regulation to which I refer is regulation 1613 (1) of the *Road Traffic Code*, which reads as follows:—

> A person who is learning to drive a motor vehicle shall not drive it on a road, and the person in charge of a motor vehicle in which a person is learning to drive shall not permit or suffer it to be driven on a road, unless there is conspicuously displayed on the front and the rear of the motor vehicle a plate measuring not less than 10 inches by 10 inches and bearing a black letter "L" clearly marked on a yellow background.

I have no objection to that regulation. I think it is quite sound. Whether it will avoid accidents is debatable. As I have already indicated, it would be impossible to know the number of accidents in which trainee-drivers have been involved. However, I do think the regulation in question is for the good of the public, or that there is nothing wrong with it.

The authorities which proposed the previous provision, however, continued with another—subregulation (2) of regulation 1613—which, on the surface, might also appear to be all right. I will try to indicate to the House, however, that this provision is not quite so good. Subregulation (2) reads—

> A person shall not drive a motor vehicle displaying a plate bearing a letter "L", unless he is learning to drive the motor vehicle or unless the person sitting beside him is learning to drive it.

It is on this subsection that I move into the picture. A person drew my attention to the fact that he had been out on Sunday training his daughter to drive a motor vehicle on which was displayed the letter "L" on both the front and the rear. On returning home for dinner that day his wife indicated that there was a shortage of butter, or something to that effect, and asked him to slip down to the local store to replenish the supply. On the way to the store he was apprehended for a breach of the regulations.

This seems to me to be a case of the powers that be taking things a bit too far in regard to the provisions contained in the regulations. I hasten to add, however, that the patrolman who apprehended the person concerned was only doing what the law required of him. If a lone person is driving a motor vehicle he must have a license. If there is an "L" on the motor vehicle, and it is being driven by a lone person then that person is breaking the law. The man in question was duly taken to task by the patrol officer.

This, however, does not stop at the private individual who is driving and who is being unduly harassed because he has left the letter "L" showing on his vehicle;

in the case of a driving school it becomes more complicated. Members may have noticed in recent times that the "L" on some motor vehicles is covered by a piece of material or by a board.

The procedure in a normal driving school providing a service around the metropolitan area is to go from its depot to a client, maybe give the client one hour's instruction, return him to his home, and then proceed half a mile or two miles to the next person waiting for a lesson, and so on. The procedure under this regulation requires a rather comical action on the part of the instructor. In the first place, before leaving his depot, he must make sure there are covered "Ls" on his car, otherwise he will be in trouble. When he gets out of his vehicle to pick up the person he intends to instruct, he must make sure the "Ls" are uncovered; and when he finishes with that customer and returns him to his home, before he drives off to pick up his next customer he must cover the "Ls" up again.

Mr. Evans: He could get in an "L" of a mess!

Mr. JAMIESON: As the honourable member says, he could get in an "L" of a mess before the day was out through having to jump in and out of a vehicle to make sure the law was observed. I am sure that was not intended and that the regulation goes too far and unnecessarily harasses the public. I am not sure what the displaying of an "L" on a motor vehicle does in the public interest, except perhaps make another driver a bit more cautious when approaching such a vehicle.

We have enough carnage on our roads already without encouraging people to be careless; and, if the displaying of an "L" on another vehicle acts as a caution then it could be a good idea for the displaying of this letter to be compulsory. But that would defeat the purpose at which the regulation is aimed. If the letter "L" is permanently displayed on a driving-school vehicle, or on a private vehicle in between times of instruction, I cannot see that any damage is done. To my mind, no person would affix one to his vehicle just for the sake of doing so. In the first place, it draws attention to the vehicle; and these are the vehicles that come under the notice of the powers that be.

I have noticed that a lot of young bloods around the town have all manner of things displayed on their cars, and such display attracts attention. Perhaps they are doing no more harm than any other fellow with an attachment on his car; but, because they are stranger attachments than those on other vehicles, they attract the attention of the traffic police and others. As a consequence, I cannot see why a private person would want to run his car indefinitely with the letter "L" openly displayed on the vehicle.

As I indicated before, I think it is more than an unjust requirement. Usually these signs are on a metal plate and have to be screwed on, or fixed on with wire or some other material, and it is unnecessary and unjust to extend the regulation to the degree that it has been extended by this revision of the Road Traffic Code. So, under the circumstances, I suggest that now we have introduced a requirement, all members of the House give this matter their earnest consideration, and let it be sufficient for the letter "L" to be displayed fore and aft. If this does not meet the case, something could be done about it at a later date.

I do not think it is necessary to harass private individuals or those engaged in driver-training as a livelihood.

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

MITCHELL FREEWAY

Re-examination of Proposed Cutting: Motion

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.56 p.m.]: I move—

> It is the considered opinion of this House that the section of the Mitchell Freeway which is to pass in front of Parliament House should not be in cutting as is at present proposed, but in tunnel, and accordingly the Government is requested to have the proposal re-examined with a view to its alteration.

The matter which is the subject of this motion is, I believe, of considerable importance not only to every member of Parliament but to every person in Western Australia. I gave a good deal of thought to this question before I decided to have it placed upon the notice paper; because, from long experience in this House, I realise that once a question is raised here, it runs the serious risk of being treated as a party matter and may be doomed from the outset if the numbers are against one.

Although I would regard it as my duty to my party to take any political advantage which it may be possible for me to take, generally speaking, that is not the position with regard to this motion; and I hastily disclaim any intention of putting any member or Minister in difficulty over this question. I say, without the slightest hesitation, that there is no attempt on my part to gain any credit for myself, my party, or anybody else if, as the result of the motion, a reconsideration of this question is brought about.

When the Hawke Government felt it desirable to send me abroad in 1958, I had the opportunity of visiting a number of Houses of Parliament. It is the common practice for a visitor to be shown very early the House of Parliament of the town he is visiting, and the people set

themselves out to show what a wonderful House of Parliament they have and how beautifully it is situated.

I was particularly struck with the surroundings of the House of Parliament in Washington and, again, in Ottawa. So, when I came to consider what it was proposed to do in front of our House of Parliament here, I was appalled at the thought that we were going to destroy a potential which could be developed in a way which would be comparable with the surroundings of Houses of Parliament I had seen abroad.

Questions have been asked in the House as to the dimensions of this proposed cutting which is to be put in front of Parliament House to carry the freeway. Without going into precise detail, it is going to be a cutting about 100 yards wide at the top and about half that width at the bottom, and have a mean depth of some 30-odd feet, requiring in one section, a wall, I understand, some 40 feet high. That will be a permanent eyesore and scar, in my opinion, and if it can be avoided it should be; and I do not think the cost should enter into this. I believe it is far more important, taking the long-range view, than would be the saving of some dollars, maybe $1,000,000 or $2,000,000.

I regard Western Australia as being worth the investment which is necessary to provide that in this part of the city we shall not have what my colleague, the member for Balcatta, described as a chasm. It should be roofed over, and we would then have a lovely vista presented to the people as they look up St. George's Terrace.

I believe that upon further and more mature consideration the desirability of effecting this alteration will be more thoroughly appreciated. In 1957, I think it was, when the then Commissioner for Main Roads and myself discussed the possibilities of what would happen with regard to the freeway, I expressed the opinion—unfortunately I had no occasion to put it in writing; it was an informal discussion between us as to what might happen—that the freeway would go past Parliament House in tunnel.

Even then, without giving the thought to it which I have since, I felt it ought to be out of sight. Now we are told by the Minister—and of course we know—that it is going to be an area of intense traffic activity. We are going to have an almost continuous stream of traffic racing past, within a few yards of Parliament House, with an interminable roar. The noise will be funnelled up and we will have this stream of traffic roaring past for most of the 24 hours of the day and night.

If we can put that traffic underground I think we should do so. The Minister, in his letter to me, raised some difficulty about the cost of lighting and ventilation. I do not think that comes into it at all. There are tunnels elsewhere in the world—and very big ones. There is a shortish tunnel between Sydney and King's Cross; a number of members might have driven through it. It is beautifully lit, and I do not hear of any great traffic difficulty occurring in it. I have never heard of anyone being overcome by fumes because it is not properly ventilated. I do not think the ventilation or lighting have proved to be difficult at all.

I do not think a tunnel in front of Parliament House would be as long as the one to which I have referred. A few days after I communicated with the Minister on this question, I saw that an agreement had been reached for the construction of a tunnel from Calais to Dover. If a tunnel in front of Parliament House is going to present any difficulty in the way of lighting and ventilation, there will be some problems to overcome with the tunnel from Calais to Dover.

Mr. Lewis: Of course, there could not be an open cut there.

Mr. TONKIN: I think we can disregard that aspect. There may be a disinclination on the part of some people to go through in a tunnel. The Minister falls back on De Leuw Cather and Co. for its advice—a firm with a good reputation. But I would not regard the word of that company as the last one on this question.

I am disappointed that I did not receive more response from the Perth City Council on this matter. I brought it to the notice of the council and the council acknowledged my letter. I asked the council to express its point of view to the Government. It might have done so; I do not know. I was not advised whether it had done anything or not. I would say that the council has a vital interest in this question.

I do not want members to think I am looking at this only from the point of view of what it is going to do to Parliament House and how it will affect members at Parliament House. I am not endeavouring to do that at all. However, the Parliament House in any democratic country is regarded as the focal point. As I have already said, in other countries the authorities go to some lengths to point out what they have done to beautify the surroundings, and people go to those Parliament Houses and picnic in the grounds in front of them. They spend hours in the grounds, and go in and out of the Parliament House. Parliament House is shown to those people as being something which really belongs to them and something in which they should take an interest. That is the sort of spirit I would like to see developed in this State.

To my way of thinking, a cutting across the front of Parliament House destroys something which is of very great value indeed; and we ought to try to avoid

destroying it if we can. I would be quite prepared, after having expressed my views on this question, in order to prevent there being any possible embarrassment to anybody, to have the motion adjourned from time to time and not dealt with again if members do not want to express their opinions. All I want to do is to emphasise that from the point of view of this State we cannot afford not to take the fullest advantage of the heritage we have here.

I want a closer and more sympathetic consideration of this question in the hope that instead of having a gaping chasm in front of Parliament House—and so close to the centre of the city—we shall have beautiful grounds and the traffic out of sight. I think that could be achieved. The Minister indicated that there were some difficulties with regard to Hay Street. I think I should read his letter so that it will be recorded. It is dated the 4th July, and reads as follows—

> Dear Mr. Tonkin,
>
> I refer to your letter of the 24th June in which you requested estimates of costs in regard to the Mitchell Freeway. The information you sought has come to hand as of today's date.
>
> I advise that the Main Roads Department's consultants, De Leuw Cather and Co., advised the Department in 1962 that, based on simple cut and cover type of construction with three feet of fill on the roof to permit gardening and landscaping, the cost of covering the Mitchell Freeway in front of Parliament House was estimated at approximately $1,700,000. It should be noted that this cost was exclusive of landscaping, lighting and ventilation, and yet it approaches the total cost of the No. 1 Contract now under construction, which is approximately $2,016,000.

Right up to there the whole argument is on cost.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is the information you asked for.

Mr. TONKIN: I am not complaining, and in no way am I endeavouring to blame the Minister in this matter; in no way at all. I want to indicate that it is not my purpose to place the blame upon De Leuw Cather and Co., the Minister, the Government, or the Main Roads Department. All I want to do is to try to get somebody to say, "Let us have another look at this."

Can Western Australia afford to give us something better than an open cut? Can this great State of 1,000,000 square miles afford to spend a few more dollars and cover this roadway so that we won't be all the time looking at the traffic racing past and hearing this interminable roar? That is the question. I shall continue with the letter—

> In addition, a covered or tunnelled freeway would require continuous lighting, and this, with ventilation, would involve heavy additional annual expenditure. Ventilation costs have not been worked out but the capitalised cost of lighting this section, allowing for annual costs, would be of the order of a further $400,000.
>
> On more than one occasion De Leuw Cather and Co. advised strongly against tunnelling or cut and cover, not only in respect of costs but also in respect of traffic operations.

There is another argument. There is no detail given to support it; just a mere statement that there is a traffic consideration. That is something I know nothing about. It could be that this is an insurmountable obstacle. I would take some convincing, but I admit it could be.

To continue the letter—

> In brief they advised that "even with full scale lighting, the traffic characteristics of a covered section would compare poorly with those of an open cut."

I do not accept that at all. It is not a question of comparison between an open cut and a tunnel. I shall say from the point of view of appearance, the open cut would compare pretty poorly with a tunnel. But there are tunnels elsewhere in the world, and pretty big ones too, carrying many lines of traffic. Make no mistake, there will be many more tunnels built too.

Why, we are talking about putting the railway underground. I saw the proposal mentioned in the paper a while back that the Perth railway station is to be put underground. There is going to be continuous lighting required there and continuous ventilation. So if that is an argument against putting the freeway in a tunnel, it is an argument against the railway. So I discount that. The letter goes on—

> "It would be most unwise to reduce operating values here because it is an area of intense traffic activity."

I am not an engineer but I believe it is not beyond engineers to find a solution to that problem. I hope it would not be beyond them, anyhow. The letter continues—

> For your further information there are also limitations on the complete coverage of the road in front of Parliament House inasmuch as the ramp up to Hay Street from the north-bound roadway cannot be covered all the way because it comes to grade at Hay Street. This means that there would still be a large hole in the area to be landscaped in front of Parliament House.

I cannot quite follow that, but I am not saying it is not so. It may be possible to find a way to surmount that problem too. However, I would like the matter looked at again sympathetically without any suggestion of party bias or party con-

sideration. I think this transcends any party politics, because what is going to be put there, whether it be a cutting or a tunnel, will cost a lot of money and it will be there for a long time.

It is my own opinion that, if it is put there in cutting, sooner or later somebody will come along and put cover over it. Of course, then it will be a more costly proposition; and I think we ought to try to avoid that if we can.

What I want—this matter having been emphasised in the House—is for somebody to get down and have another look at this and not place so much emphasis upon the cost angle, but give more consideration to what a State such as Western Australia is entitled to have in the circumstances.

The Government has a proposal for spending a lot of money in connection with beautifying the traffic interchange area at the Narrows Bridge. The Government realises that large expenditure is necessary there in order to improve what will otherwise look like a sandy desert. If that is desirable because of its proximity to the city, so it is desirable to spend some money in order to make the best of a situation which is going to develop in front of Parliament House. If this area were out on the Nullarbor Plain, or in the far northwest, or the Kimberleys, it would be a different matter. But, this area is right in the heart of the City of Perth, which is regarded as one of the most beautiful capitals in the continent.

I think that most careful thought is necessary to decide whether the Government would be doing the right thing in taking this intense traffic activity through an open cut which will be 100 yards wide at the top. It may be that is how it will finish up—I hope not. I am appalled at the thought that that is what the Government is going to put there.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move this motion which stands in my name, in the hope that much more thought will be given to the question, not only by the Ministers and their advisers, but by members of Parliament, who have a responsibility to their electors, and to the State as a whole. I hope they will regard this question—which is not a party question in any sense of the term at all—from the broad aspect of what the State of Western Australia is entitled to have; and, in my view, it is entitled to have more than an open cut.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Works).

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [5.19 p.m.]: I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

In terms made famous by a person who was himself very famous in this Assembly, I say: This is only a small Bill.

The Bill seeks an amendment of section 122 of the principal Act; that is, the Licensing Act of 1911-63. Section 122 is a prohibitive section inasmuch as it is relevant to the purposes of the proposed amendment. Subsection (1) of the section provides that—

> No licensee shall—
>
> (a) have or keep his licensed premises open for the sale of liquor; or
>
> (b) sell any liquor, or permit or suffer any liquor to be drunk or consumed in or upon his licensed premises,
>
> upon any Sunday,

I interpolate here that for all relevant purposes, I am omitting the remaining parts of the subsection. The prohibition here is that no licensee shall keep his premises open for the sale of liquor or allow any person to consume liquor upon the premises on any Sunday.

Subsection (2) of the section—and it is towards this second subsection that my amendment is aimed—sets out certain exemptions from the general prohibition. Paragraph (c) of the second subsection sets out certain circumstances under which the exemptions—or certain exemptions—shall apply.

Subsection (2) has the general heading, but this section—meaning the general prohibition of subsection (1)—shall not prohibit the sale of liquor to, or the consumption of liquor by—and I pass now to paragraph (c) because it is this paragraph at which my amendment is aimed—any person on a Sunday, not being Anzac Day or Christmas Day, if the premises are the subject of a publican's general license, a limited hotel license, a canteen license, or a wayside-house license, and are at least 20 miles distance from the town hall in Perth, when measured by the shortest road route, or are situated on Rottnest Island.

Members will see that certain exemptions are listed and, in these circumstances, the general prohibition of subsection (1) of section 122 does not apply. My proposed amendment sets out to add certain words. That is to say, it sets out to create one further exemption from the general prohibition. Assuming the proposed amendment is accepted by the Legislature, the exemptions in paragraph (c) will then read—

> But this section shall not prohibit the sale of liquor to, or the consumption of liquor by, any person on a Sunday not being Anzac Day or Christmas Day.

Then will follow the exemptions I have listed; and I am seeking to have added premises which are the subject of an Aus-

tralian wine license, and which are situate in the Goldfields District.

Mr. Craig: Why just the Goldfields District?

Mr. EVANS: I will come to that point. As a matter of fact, I do not wish to be parochial on this question at all and if any member, who, like Oliver Twist, comes to me and "asks for more", I will gladly give it. However, I do ask members not to give me less; although I will give more, if members so desire.

I have limited this amendment to the Goldfields District so as to overcome any possible objections which members may have, possibly because of preconceived ideas which have been created in the minds of the general public. If we are truly representative of that body, no doubt some of us will have ideas which, in some cases anyway, have been conjured up in our minds by the conduct of wine saloons in the past.

However, so as to eliminate any possible objection from members who have no concern with the Goldfields District, I have limited the request, for this extension of the right to open during restricted trading hours on a Sunday, to Australian wine licensed premises in the goldfields district to apply.

This afternoon I asked a question of the Minister representing the Minister for Justice, and the answer was given to me by the Minister for Transport, who was representing those two Ministers; that is, the Minister for Justice, and the Minister for Railways, who usually represents the Minister for Justice in this House.

The answers given to me showed that, in the Goldfields District, there are only three licensed Australian wine premises; namely, two at Kalgoorlie and one in Boulder. I asked this question, not because I did not know the answer, but because I wanted members to have not my word for this situation but the word of no-one other than the Minister for Railways. As it turned out, we have the word of the Minister for Transport, also. My amendment seeks to allow Australian wine licensed premises in the Goldfields District to be allowed to open on a Sunday.

Mr. Bovell: What good will this do for the community?

Mr. EVANS: There is more to it than that because of the remaining part of section 122, which is now already the law. If the first amendment is accepted, the remaining provisions, of course, will qualify the conditions under which these licensed premises will be allowed to remain open on a Sunday. These conditions are, of course, that the premises will only have the right to trade during those hours that other licensed premises, such as premises run by the holder of a publican's general license, trade at the present time. That is to say, they would be allowed to trade for a certain time during a Sunday morning and, again, for an afternoon session.

Mr. Craig: What about the sale of bottles?

Mr. EVANS: The Minister asks if the sale of bottles is relevant, and the answer would be, "Yes." This is not because this matter is included in my Bill but because of the provisions already existing in section 122.

Mr. Craig: In other words, they would be able to sell two bottles, or more.

Mr. EVANS: If they were given this right to trade on a Sunday morning during restricted hours, the licensees would have the right to sell two bottles of wine before 1 p.m. on Sunday; and this would be consistent with their licenses.

Mr. Craig: Western Australian wine, of course.

Mr. EVANS: After all, these premises are licensed as Australian wine premises.

Mr. Lewis: Do you think this would make the control of drinking by natives in Western Australia more difficult?

Mr. EVANS: The Minister asks me whether this would make the control more difficult. I cannot say whether it would make it more difficult but, at the same time, I do not agree that it would make it any easier.

Mr. Lewis: I am asking a question.

Mr. EVANS: And I am answering it. These saloons are open six days a week, so, if the natives want to buy wine, they have ample opportunity to do so.

Mr. Jamieson: How many wine saloons are there?

Mr. EVANS: There are three in the Goldfields District—two in Kalgoorlie and one in Boulder.

Mr. Jamieson: How many hotels?

Mr. EVANS: Something like 37.

Mr. Bovell: You have given no cogent reason for this amendment.

Mr. EVANS: If the Minister would give me an opportunity to continue my speech, I hope to do that.

Mr. Jamieson: He wants to drink wood alcohol.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister has asked for cogent reasons. I will give him several sound reasons and I will let the Minister be the judge as to whether they meet the requirements of cogency according to his taste and discretion.

The history of these three licensed premised situated in Kalgoorlie and Boulder—and for all practical purposes they are the only premises concerned—is such that before 1950 when Sunday trading for the sale of alcohol in this State was regulated, hotels in many

country areas of Western Australia served liquor on a Sunday. In fact, it is no secret that in most parts of the goldfields there was open trading on a Sunday, and the wine saloons also engaged in open trading on that day. In other words, these wine saloons, together with the hotels, have always been able to meet the demands of those who have sufficient consideration and desire to buy an alcoholic beverage on a Sunday. In fact, this has been so ever since the goldfields became a centre of population, and has been so until recently, even though, when trading in alcohol by hotels was regulated in 1950, no attention was paid to the licensing of these wine saloons.

However, with the good grace of the police—or possibly by their using a blind eye like Lord Nelson—these wine saloons were permitted to trade on Sundays in line with the licensed brethren of the U.L.V.A., as the organisation was in those days, but which has now become the A.H.A. In other words, this trading in alcoholic beverages has become a custom and a usage and is clothed in respectability.

Mr. J. Hegney: What are you trying to do; regulate them?

Mr. EVANS: The fact is that the various licensees of these premises have, for 60 years or more, been endeavouring to build up their businesses and their clientele, particularly since 1950, in open competition with the licensed brethren of the A.H.A. The efforts of these licensees have shown that they have been able to give a service and that there is a demand for it.

In 1952 I believe a move was made to close one of the wine saloons; and members will find quite illuminating the following article which appeared in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* dated Friday, the 12th December, 1952:—

> Country Wine Saloons
> Sunday Trading
> Amending Bill Passed
>
> Perth, Dec. 11—An amendment to the Licensing Act to allow Sunday trading in country wine saloons passed all stages in the Legislative Council tonight.
>
> Mr. Heenan (Lab.), who moved the second reading, said that under the parent Act trading by the holders of Australian wine licenses was not permitted.
>
> In Kalgoorlie the Italian community had been deprived of having Sunday drinks at one saloon.
>
> Last weekend the police informed the licensee that in future the saloon must be closed on Sundays.

I cannot see any mention in this article of the other two wine saloons, but I know they have been conducted for many years. I continue to quote:—

> Mr. Heenan said that he felt a grave injustice was being done towards a highly respected section of the goldfields community.
>
> Mr. Barker (Lab.) said that there would not be many more than six saloons outside Perth which would be affected by the Bill.
>
> In Committee Mr. Logan (C.P.) secured an amendment to include a wine and beer licence in the Bill.
>
> He said that the only country place of this kind in the State was the Murchison Inn at Geraldton.

From that article members will have noted that the present Minister for Local Government, in 1952, was anxious not to limit the provisions of Mr. Heenan's Bill, but to extend them to cover one further type of license. At the risk of being termed a conservative, I maintain my Bill is quite conservative in comparison with the measure introduced by Mr. Heenan and approved by the Legislative Council some 14 years ago, because this measure is limited, purely and simply, to the Goldfields District. It does not, in any way, apply to wine saloons other than those in this district.

Further, I would point out that there are only three wine saloons affected and no extension of the Act is sought to include a wine and beer license. I repeat that the Bill is limited, purely and simply, to those premises selling Australian wines which are already licensed under the Act, but not licensed to trade on Sunday.

Mr. Craig: Do you know the reasons why these wine saloons were prevented from trading on a Sunday in the first place?

Mr. EVANS: No doubt the Minister, when he replies to the debate on this Bill, will enlighten us as to what those reasons are, but I am under the impression that the Legislature did not direct its corporate mind to the subject. I can recall the time when an amendment was passed in this House to enable goldfields hotels to sell two bottles of beer on a Sunday, and the Legislature did not direct its mind to extending that privilege to licensed clubs.

There was no particular reason why clubs were overlooked on that occasion, and the matter was left in abeyance until the member representing the Murchison electorate at that time was successful in having an amendment passed to remove that anomaly from the Licensing Act.

It is my humble ambition, by introducing this very small Bill, to remove one further anomaly from the Act. In the newspaper article I have just quoted, Mr. Heenan was reported as having said that, in 1952, the Italian community in Kalgoorlie had been deprived of having Sunday drinks at one of the wine saloons. This was a privilege that they had long enjoyed; and I consider that if the Italian community were entitled to enjoy

those privileges in 1952 they are still entitled to enjoy them today. However, there are many more reasons now why I ask that this legislative body should adopt the amendment contained in this Bill and give it its grace for final approval by the Legislative Council.

The goldfields population comprises many different nationalities, and among them are not only the Italians, but Yugoslavs and representatives of most European countries. These people are conditioned to the cultural favouring of wine beverages as against other forms of alcoholic drink.

They have shown a tendency and a desire to meet at wine saloons, not only to satisfy their desire to drink an assortment of Australian wines, but also to seek the fellowship of their countrymen who, likewise, attend these gatherings. I am not here to proclaim loudly that these wine saloons have always been, and are, paragons of virtue, and are institutions I can point to as being shining examples for other wine saloons, but in my opinion they are a great deal better than many I have seen in the metropolitan area; and, without a shadow of a doubt, the clientele look a great deal more respectable, generally, than some people I have seen frequenting the wine saloons around Perth.

Nevertheless, I do not want to offend members representing the metropolitan electorates in making that statement, I merely wish them to realise that this is not, purely and simply, a Bill to meet the desires of "plonkies." That is not the intention of the measure at all. Another reason why this measure should be passed is that, because of the history of Kalgoorlie and Boulder, a large section of the goldfields population is made up of invalids and age pensioners—particularly age pensioners—and many of these folk prefer to drink wine instead of beer, principally because of the economics involved.

I consider it is a shame that these people are deprived of satisfying their desires at the right price on a Sunday morning. Of course, members could say that they can go to hotels and drink—and no doubt this is true—but some elderly folk prefer to patronise the wine saloons which have always been clothed with an air of respectability. Therefore I have been asked, not only by the interests of the licensees, but also by many of their clientele, at least to express their desires in this Chamber. I cannot do more, and I certainly do not intend to do less.

Therefore I earnestly request members to give the Bill some consideration. I hope they will not feel I am parochial by seeking to limit its provisions to the goldfields. I would hasten to add that should any member care to move an amendment to enlarge the provisions of the Bill he would have my most generous support.

There is one final point I wish to make. I have already mentioned that these wine saloons have existed in Kalgoorlie and Boulder ever since the Goldfields District became a centre of population; and, of course, they have changed hands many times. In view of the fact that these premises have been permitted to trade openly on a Sunday, it is only natural that when they have changed hands the consideration for the sale of them has always included some amount representing the goodwill which, of course, would include the right—as it has always been regarded—to trade on a Sunday.

Members will realise that, although this is not the main reason for the introduction of the Bill, if this right is denied the present licensees, it will be difficult for them to have returned to them adequate consideration for what they have paid for the businesses; because the goodwill will have suffered.

I repeat that a Bill somewhat similar to this one was approved by the Legislative Council in 1952. Surely to goodness the Legislative Assembly, in 1966, can at least equal the meritorious effort of another place on that occasion! In submitting the Bill to the House I give it my imprimatur and I ask members to share my endorsement of it.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. O'Connor (Minister for Transport).

WOOD DISTILLATION AND CHARCOAL IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Mr. O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Transport) [5.45 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is complementary to the measure to ratify the agreement of the 24th June, 1966, between the Government and A.N.I. Australia Pty. Limited. A number of the clauses will be readily understood by members and will require no explanation by me.

The amendment to section 5 is to permit diversification into products of the furnace, other than iron and steel, which may be required by the foundry. At the present time the industry is only permitted to produce charcoal iron and steel, and it would be short-sighted if we did not widen this section to permit the production of other metallised products which could logically be processed by the foundry, or which could enable the foundry to diversify.

The amendment to section 11 permits the reconstitution of the board of management from the present five members to three members, two of whom will be nominated by the company. Naturally, if the company is to be responsible to the Minister for the management of the industry, it is essential that it have control of the board of management.

The remaining sections of the amendment set out the machinery for the appointment of substitute members of the board of management should A.N.I. cease to be managers. Provision is also made to change the name of the industry to Wundowie Charcoal Iron Industry.

The amendment to section 18 provides for the borrowing of money by the industry. This is primarily to enable workers' houses to be built as required. By raising these funds through the industry, we will be able to build these houses in addition to the normal housing programme.

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

WUNDOWIE WORKS MANAGEMENT AND FOUNDRY AGREEMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley—Minister for Transport) [5.50 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

During the last session of Parliament, the Minister for Industrial Development, when speaking on the Wundowie Iron and Steel Industry Agreement Bill, gave members reasons why the Government was attempting to have a company come into Wundowie to diversify, thereby providing a further outlet for pig iron.

Members will recall that Wundowie was becoming a financial burden to the Government. Losses had been made for the 1963-64 and 1964-65 financial years. Since then markets overseas for specification pig iron have further contracted. In addition, because of increased freight rates and other charges, the margin on sales which have been made has been further reduced for the financial year just completed. A further substantial loss will be made.

As intimated last year, the Government has not been able to interest any company to purchase Wundowie and run it as a privately-owned industry without subsidies—and these we are not prepared to give. The agreement we have negotiated leaves Wundowie as a Government-owned instrumentality managed by A.N.I. (Australia) Pty. Limited, which will also establish a foundry alongside the blast furnace.

Of necessity, it is a complex agreement containing as it does conditions which clarify the company's position in both the management of the existing industry and establishment of the foundry, and at the same time protecting the interests of the State. To enable members to obtain a better understanding of the agreement, I will explain that it is divided into five parts—

Preliminary
Management
Foundry
Options of Purchase
General

The preliminary section is straightforward and does not call for any amplification. Part II contains a number of provisions which require elaboration. The purpose of this section of the agreement is to establish A.N.I. as managers of the industry at Wundowie, which has been financially reorganised so that it may have a better chance to operate profitably in the future.

Initially the period of management will be for 10 years, and at all times the management company will be subject to the Minister. Naturally the Minister would not be concerned with the every-day running of the concern. This will be left to the management company, providing it keeps within certain defined guide-lines.

For example, it will be noted that subclause (1) (c) of clause 4, which grants to the management company the right to fix prices for the industry's products, sets a minimum price below which the management cannot go. The reason for this is that the management company, in its own right, will be a substantial purchaser of Wundowie's products, and if we do not have a minimum price it will be possible for the price of pig iron to be reduced to the company's advantage.

Clause 5 sets out the method of calculating the management fee payable to A.N.I. The basis of this calculation is that the company is entitled to a fee of $35,000 per annum, which reduces by $7,000 each year thereafter until extinguished. In addition, the company is entitled to 20 per cent. of the improvement in trading results in each year of the company's management over the adjusted trading results of the year 1965-66, without having regard for any improvement in profitability attributable to write-off of capital, reduction of depreciation, and interest charges, etc. The minimum fee payable is $15,000 in any year. In other words, the fee is directly tied to the results achieved within the industry—as distinct from the foundry—under A.N.I. management.

Clause 8, as first read by members, will appear complicated. It will be remembered that during the last session of Parliament, members were informed that it would be necessary to write off the industry's capital by approximately $2,200,000.

This write-off leaves the capital of the industry at $800,000, which amount will be credited to capital account No. 1. This sum shall be adjusted by the losses for the years ended the 30th June, 1965, and 1966, and by the decreased amounts of interest and depreciation which will be charged for those years. Also added to the amount will be the total of cash paid by the State to the industry subsequent to the 30th June, 1964, for approved items of capital equipment.

The reason for going back to 1964 is that we first discussed the takeover of the industry by A.N.I. during the 1965 financial

year, and all our discussions were based on the financial year ended the 30th June, 1964. The adjustments will result in capital account No. 1 being credited with $1,300,000 approximately. The exact amount will not be known until the accounts for 1965-66 have been finally determined.

A second account, industry provision account No. 1, is credited with the amount of the loss being accepted by the State as at the 30th June, 1964. This account will be adjusted by the amount of depreciation which is in excess of 4/15ths of the depreciation calculated by the prime cost method for years 1965 and 1966.

The third account to be opened in the books of the industry will be an account entitled "Government Loan Account." In effect, the balance of this account will represent the balance between current assets and current liabilities. This will be a debt due to the State and will bear interest at bank rate.

The attention of members is drawn to clause 9, which provides for the State to leave profits, if any, in the Government loan account. The reason for this restriction is to preserve liquidity within the industry. Here I emphasise that reference in this second reading speech to "industry" means the Wundowie charcoal iron industry as we now know it, and not the foundry to be established by A.N.I.

One of the problems of the industry in past years has been the amount of cash required to maintain stocks and service markets overseas. This will be an increasing problem in the future, as experience has shown that if we are to maintain, and possibly expand, our markets in Europe and elsewhere we will have to be prepared to establish a stock of specification pig iron in Europe, and possibly send consignment stocks to other parts of the world where there is a sale for specification pig iron.

Clause 11 contemplates that A.N.I. may make loans to the industry. Such action would be a preliminary to the exercising of the option to purchase.

Part III deals with the establishment of the foundry by A.N.I. alongside the existing industry. The foundry is to cost at least $600,000. This is the minimum. It will be of modern design and its operation will be, as far as practicable, mechanised. Current estimates are that a much more substantial investment will be made.

The initial design and layout of the foundry is to permit a throughput of 6,000 tons per annum, and it is expected that the major portion of this production will be sold out of Western Australia. At the present time Wundowie owns some items of minor foundry equipment, and under the provisions of clause 18 these will be sold to the company.

Clause 21 is an important provision. It deals with the price that the company will pay for hot metal. The metal to be used for castings produced for sale within the State shall be at the same price as that ruling for Wundowie pig iron, less cost of cartage and pigging. This is to prevent A.N.I.'s foundry obtaining an undue advantage over foundries established in the metropolitan area which are already supplying a service to the purchasers of castings.

The price of hot metal for castings for sale outside the State—and it is anticipated that this will form the major outlet for hot metal—shall be $34 per ton, adjusted from time to time to have regard for alteration to railway freights and the ruling price for pig iron.

Members will be aware that recently B.H.P. increased its price for pig iron by $4 per ton. This increase affects the price of hot metal under this provision, and the price becomes $38 per ton. This figure was fixed to give a net return better than we currently, and in the future, can expect for some of our overseas export sales. It will be noted that under subclause (b) (ii) of clause 21 the State is entitled to 25 per cent. of the foundry net profit before income tax. This is equal to 40 per cent. of the profits after tax.

There is a formula to provide for an adjustment if A.N.I.'s investment in the foundry exceeds $600,000. Any such adjustment, however, will not reduce the share of profits below that which we were enjoying prior to the investment in the foundry by A.N.I. being increased.

Under clause 24 the State is protected if A.N.I.'s demand for hot metal reaches the stage where the industry is to forgo some of its premium sales. It is also provided under this clause that the company shall continue to supply local foundrymen with pig iron.

Clauses 27 and 28 deal with the provision of additional houses at Wundowie. Members will appreciate that in a decentralised area, such as Wundowie, it would be impossible to obtain workers for the new foundry unless housing accommodation was provided. These clauses set out the terms under which houses will be built by the State Housing Commission from funds outside the Housing Commission's normal allocation. This will be achieved by permitting the industry to borrow money for housing purposes. Providing the sum raised in any one year does not exceed $200,000, the State's allocation under the Loan Council formula will not be affected.

Part IV grants to the company an option to purchase the industry, and an option for the State to purchase the foundry. In the event of the company exercising its option to purchase the industry, the return to the State, in total, must be at least $800,000—regardless of any losses incurred by the industry in the meantime. Part IV covers the general provisions of the agreement.

Clause 36 refers to the completion of an agreement with industrial unions protecting the services of employees at Wundowie prior to their engagement by the company. This agreement has been negotiated with and approved by the Trades and Labour Council. Clause 37 has been included to protect the payroll tax rebates which the industry is normally entitled to for export performance.

Parliament gave the Government virtually complete authority last year to negotiate an agreement in respect of the industry except for an outright sale. The Government has interpreted this to mean that an option to purchase should, for all practical purposes, be treated as a potential outright sale. Therefore, we negotiated the agreement on the basis that it would need to be ratified by Parliament. However, there was the question of the interim period so as to lose no time in the preparatory work for the establishment of the diversified and expanded industry. This is in the interests of the Wundowie community as well as in the interests of the industry itself. It is because of this the agreement has been drawn on the basis of a transition period from the 1st July and pending ratification. This is within the powers granted by Parliament.

There is provision in part I of the agreement for the formation of a management company. This was done on the 24th June when a company known as A.N.I. (Wundowie Management) Pty. Limited was registered for the purposes set out in the agreement. When ratification is complete and the legislation proclaimed, this transition period will have no further significance and the management will be undertaken by A.N.I. Australia Pty. Limited.

The remaining provisions of the agreement do not require comment at this stage as they are those normally expected in an agreement of this kind. I will conclude my remarks by summarising as follows:—

Firstly, Wundowie Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry had little prospect of continuance as a viable industry without a major reorganisation and diversification.

Secondly, the Government did not want to see the industry and the township disappear, but could not see its way clear to provide the additional funds from badly-needed loan funds, necessary to provide this reorganisation and diversification.

Thirdly, the ideal solution would have been to transfer the industry to the private ownership of a company with a strong capital structure and able to diversify and expand.

Fourthly, the form of the agreement now before the Assembly is considered to be the next best thing to an outright sale. The industry remains in State ownership, and a modern foundry—which will be a tied customer for the industry's pig iron—will be established without cost to the Government.

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

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

MR. LEWIS (Moore—Minister for Education) [6.4 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 30th August.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.5 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 30th August, 1966

CONTENTS

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