

further extensions of time will be required by some authorities. Provision has therefore been made in the Bill for the Minister to grant extensions in individual cases.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Toms.

PLANT DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. LEWIS (Moore—Minister for Education) [5.37 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is intended to simplify the procedure that follows when a person fails to register his orchard. The Plant Diseases Act requires every owner or occupier of an orchard on which one or more fruit trees are growing to register the orchard with the Department of Agriculture annually. Registration is due on the 1st July in each year, and a month is allowed from that date in which persons shall register their fruit trees. In practice, no action to prosecute for failure to register is usually taken by the department until registrations are at least 12 months in default.

Breaches of this requirement of the Act are widespread, and nearly 600 prosecutions are undertaken each year. An analysis of the fines imposed indicates that they vary from £1 and costs to as much as £5 and costs in exceptional cases. A most undesirable feature, and one that has caused a great deal of dissatisfaction to the public, is that often court costs are considerably more than the fine, and average in the vicinity of £2 14s. as compared with a fine of £1.

In addition, the associated procedures of serving the summons, court appearances, and charging of court costs create considerable inconvenience and bad public relations with the Department of Agriculture. Added to this is the cost to the department of preparing the cases for legal action, and of officers attending the court as witnesses. It has been estimated that it takes two or three hours to prepare each complaint, and attendance at court may involve nearly half a day. The aggregate cost to the department each year is therefore considerable and far in excess of the fines imposed. This amendment will give a person who has failed to register his orchard the opportunity to pay a nominal fine of 10s. instead of a court hearing.

The time in which a person may register has been extended to two months, and then, should there be a failure to register, the Director of Agriculture shall have a notice served on the orchard owner or occupier indicating that he has not registered and therefore an offence has been committed.

Mr. Jamieson: Does the department send out notices when the registrations are due?

Mr. LEWIS: Not in all cases. A warning will accompany the notice indicating that if the orchard is not registered within 21 days of the service of the notice, together with the payment of the 10s. penalty, then action to prosecute the offender will be taken in the court of petty sessions in the usual way.

I would also indicate I will direct that a reminder be sent to people receiving such a notice that they may take advantage of the opportunity to register their orchards for five years in advance at a cost of 10s., in the case of the usual backyard orchard, and in such an event a notice of the expiry of the registration after five years will be sent to every person.

Mr. Jamieson: You would be better off if you lifted it 1s. a year and sent the notice to everyone.

Mr. LEWIS: This amendment will be of considerable benefit to the general public and the Department of Agriculture, and reduce the time taken up by the Crown Law Department and the courts in handling these matters.

The opportunity has been taken at this time to tidy up the Plant Diseases Act by repealing section 41 which deals with the publication, effect, and disallowance of regulations. These powers are adequately covered by section 36 of the Interpretation Act and it is not necessary to cover them in individual Acts.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Rowberry.

House adjourned at 5.41 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 7th September, 1965

CONTENTS

	Page
BILLS—	
Albany Harbour Board Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	692
Com. ; Report	693
Bunbury Harbour Board Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	689
Com. ; Report	692
Bush Fires Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	681
Com.	682
Report	682
Coal Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill—Returned	678
Debtors Act Amendment Bill—Returned	676

CONTENTS—continued

BILLS—continued

Page

Education Act Amendment Bill—2r.	678
HaIRDressers Registration Act Amendment Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r.	676
Land Act Amendment Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r.	676
Local Government Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—2r.	676
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r.	676
Mining Act Amendment Bill—Returned....	676
Petroleum Products Subsidy Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r.	676
Police Act Amendment Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r.	678
Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act Amendment Bill—2r.	694
Sale of Human Blood Act Amendment Bill—2r.	678
Spear-guns Control Act Amendment Bill—2r.	693
Com. ; Report	694
Stipendiary Magistrates Act Amendment Bill—Returned	676
Tuberculosis (Commonwealth and State Arrangement) Bill—3r.	676
Western Australian Marine Act Amendment Bill—2r.	682

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—

Boats : Private Pleasure Craft—	
Exemptions from Registration	675
Number Registered and Fees Collected	675
Reason for Exemption from Registration	675
River Patrols : Officers Employed, and Cost	675
Fisheries Department Vessels : Insurance and Premium Rate	675
Liquor—	
Alcoholic Content : Reduction, and Effect on Drunken Driving	675
Tax : Apportionment for Treatment of Alcohols	675
Railway Employees : Resignations and Dismissals—	
Classifications and Award Rates	674
Number	674
Reason	674
Replacements	674

SWEARING-IN OF MEMBER	674
-----------------------	-----

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

SWEARING-IN OF MEMBER

THE PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): I am prepared to swear-in The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery, the member for the South Metropolitan Province.

The honourable member took and subscribed the Oath of Allegiance, and signed the roll.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): I take this opportunity of congratulating Mr. Lavery on his re-election to this House as the honourable member representing the South Metropolitan Province.

QUESTIONS (5): ON NOTICE

RAILWAY EMPLOYEES:
RESIGNATIONS AND DISMISSALS

Number

1. The Hon. J. DOLAN (for The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs) asked the Minister for Mines:

- (1) How many railway employees have left the W.A. Government Railways in each year since 1959?

Classifications and Award Rates

- (2) What are the separate classifications affected?
(3) What are the award rates of wages in each of the classifications affected?

Reason

- (4) Can any reason be offered for the resignations or dismissals?

Replacements

- (5) How many men are required to bring the railways to full strength?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) 1959-1960	2,639
1960-1961	2,681
1961-1962	2,628
1962-1963	2,963
1963-1964	2,844
1964-1965	3,382

These figures include:

- (a) Retired and deceased.
(b) Dismissals due to misconduct.
(c) Terminations due to completion of work (mainly); unsuitable for the work.
(d) Losses of females.

The respective totals under these headings in each year are:—

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
1959-1960	189	45	634	37
1960-1961	192	58	508	32
1961-1962	251	52	445	27
1962-1963	235	51	437	35
1963-1964	276	49	404	27
1964-1965	316	41	337	30

- (2) Practically every classification in the awards is included in the figures quoted.
(3) In view of the range of designations affected, it would be necessary to quote in full the relevant clauses of the awards governing all railway staff. These can be made available to the honourable member if required.
(4) Resignations are due to various reasons, such as the shift work requirements; transfers to country locations; opportunities with other

employers and personal or domestic reasons. Resignations of female employees mainly due to marriage.

- (5) Approximately 700 to restore approved staff establishment.

LIQUOR: ALCOHOLIC CONTENT

Reduction, and Effect on Drunken Driving

2. The Hon. J. DOLAN (for The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs) asked the Minister for Mines:

As in medical and many other fields of endeavour, prevention is preferred to cure, and, in view of the many road accidents that have alcohol as a cause, or evidence exists that some consumption of alcohol had occurred prior to the accident, and also, as social drinking appears to be part of our way of life—will the Government give serious thought to introducing legislation to reduce the alcoholic content of fermented and spirituous liquors?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

It is unlikely that standards to which Western Australians have become accustomed will be changed.

The effect of alcohol on a person varies with the quantity taken, not with the dilution.

FISHERIES DEPARTMENT VESSELS

Insurance and Premium Rate

3. The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Fisheries and Fauna:

- (1) With which organisation does the Fisheries Department insure its vessels?
- (2) What is the premium rate per one hundred pounds of cover?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) State Government Fire, Marine and General Insurance Fund.
- (2) £4, £5, and £7 per £100, according to the age of the vessel.

LIQUOR TAX

Apportionment for Treatment of Alcoholics

4. The Hon. J. DOLAN (for The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs) asked the Minister for Mines:

As the consumption of fermented and spirituous liquor is considered to be a contributing cause of mental illness—

- (a) Will the Government apportion a large percentage of the tax received from the sale of liquor, for the provision of

more homes and hospitals for alcoholics and mental cases attributable to alcohol?

- (b) If not, will it consider a small additional tax on liquor, the proceeds of which will go directly to homes and hospitals treating alcoholics and diseases caused by alcohol?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (a) and (b) No. The proceeds of liquor taxes are taken to Consolidated Revenue from which the running costs of institutions are met. It is not considered that there would be any advantages in making specific appropriations of the tax for the purposes mentioned.

BOATS: PRIVATE PLEASURE CRAFT

Number Registered and Fees Collected

5. The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Mines:

The Minister is asked to provide the following information:—

- (1) The number of private pleasure craft registered each year under the Western Australian Marine Act?
- (2) The annual amount of fees collected by registrations?

Exemptions from Registration

- (3) The estimated number of private pleasure craft using the Swan River which are not required to be registered or pay any fees to the Government?

River Patrols: Officers Employed, and Cost

- (4) How many Government officers are employed at weekends and on public holidays to control river traffic?
- (5) For how many years have officers been engaged in such service?
- (6) What is the cost per annum of this service?

Reason for Exemption from Registration

- (7) Why is only one section of private pleasure craft owners who use the waterways of the State, called upon to subscribe to the costs of traffic control?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) For the year ended the
30th June, 1963 5,608
For the year ended the
30th June, 1964 8,680
For the year ended the
30th June, 1965 9,866

	£
(2) For the year ended the 30th June, 1963	2,804
For the year ended the 30th June, 1964	4,340
For the year ended the 30th June, 1965	4,933

(3) Not known. However, there are at least 1,000 sailing craft which do not have to be registered.

(4) Two Harbour and Light Department inspectors; one Water Police constable.

(5) In excess of 40 years.

(6) £3,900.

(7) The compulsory registration of privately-owned pleasure craft was introduced basically as a necessary measure to assist in the control of operators of marine craft which were endangering the safety and lives of the users of other craft and swimmers, etc. On investigation it was considered that these dangers arose almost entirely from powered craft and not from sailing craft which do not have to be registered.

A further reason why sailing craft do not have to be registered is that the great majority of them are already registered with yacht clubs and are easily traceable.

BILLS (4): RECEIPT AND FIRST READING

1. Land Act Amendment Bill.

2. Petroleum Products Subsidy Bill.

Bills received from the Assembly; and, on motions by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), read a first time.

3. Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment Bill.

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. A. R. Jones, read a first time.

4. Hairdressers Registration Act Amendment Bill.

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. F. D. Willmott, read a first time.

BILLS (3): RETURNED

1. Mining Act Amendment Bill.

2. Stipendiary Magistrates Act Amendment Bill.

3. Debtors Act Amendment Bill.

Bills returned from the Assembly without amendment.

TUBERCULOSIS (COMMONWEALTH AND STATE ARRANGEMENT) BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health), and transmitted to the Assembly.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [4.55 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill contains 20 clauses and is designed to provide amendments on matters which have been brought to the notice of the Government and which have had the approval in most cases of the three associations concerned.

Clause 2 provides for an amendment to section 10 of the Act, which provides for a poll of electors of a municipality to vary the mode of election of a mayor or president, and the amendment is designed to ensure that the poll shall be void if less than 10 per cent. of the electors or ratepayers entitled to vote have done so. This means that where a poll has been demanded, the mode of election will not be changed unless at least 10 per cent. of the electors take part. The Local Government Association has asked that this amendment should be made; and similar amendments are proposed elsewhere within the Act where polls of electors or ratepayers are prescribed so that a poll shall be declared void if less than 10 per cent. of the electors or ratepayers entitled to vote do so.

Clause 3 proposes an amendment to section 12 of the Act relating to changes in the names of wards of a municipality, the present provision merely providing for the alteration of a name of a municipality; and it is desired that even when wards are unaltered, the name may be changed.

Clause 4 provides for an addition after section 19 of a new section, 19A, to provide for the situation where portion of one district is severed therefrom and annexed to another district. It is provided that the rights of the electors within the area so severed and annexed may be determined by the Governor under the provisions of section 20, and also that the provisions of section 13 relating to actions and proceedings, and assets and liabilities of councils will apply to these instances. Section 19 at present completely covers cases of severance and annexation where a new ward is created, but fails to deal with the cases where the annexed area is simply added to an existing ward. This proposed amendment will rectify the omission.

Clause 5 provides for an amendment to section 30, which deals with polls of electors which may be required by the Minister upon the presentation of petitions; and this amendment, similar to that applying to section 10, provides that the poll shall not be effective unless not less than 10 per cent. of those entitled to vote do so.

Clause 6 provides for the insertion of a new section, 43A, which has been requested by the Country Shire Councils' Association to enable a member of a council to give notice of his intention to resign as from a future date—in effect to give notice of his resignation—and for the commencement of formalities necessary to fill the anticipated vacancy prior to his resignation from office.

Clause 7 provides for an amendment to section 127, and this amendment is to enable the counting of votes for multiple vacancies to proceed in accordance with the provisions of the Act in cases where a person fails to place a number against only his last preference, as is permitted by section 121.

Clause 8 provides for an amendment to section 174, which deals with the right of members to vote when they have an interest in a matter before a council. This amendment is proposed in order to allow members to speak when the interest is so slight or so remote as to be negligible. This is based on English practice.

Section 174 is also proposed to be amended to enable a member of a council to take part in the discussion of a matter in which he has an interest where an absolute majority of the council determines that a member may speak on the matter under consideration, but shall not vote thereon. This amendment proposes that a record shall be kept of the decision of the council in the minute book and also that he abstained from voting. There are cases where it is in the interest of the council and the district that a member who is debarred should be able to take part in the debate in order to assist the council in making a correct decision.

The next amendment, in clause 9, is in order to rectify a typographical error.

Under clause 10, a new section, 199A, is proposed to be included, giving a council power to make by-laws to control holiday camps in a similar manner to that control which is exercised over caravan parks.

Clause 11 amends section 244 to provide that where anything deposited in a street is removed by a council, the council may dispose of it without incurring any liability.

Section 12 provides for an amendment to section 400 to allow, in cases such as the redevelopment scheme in the City of Fremantle, for premises on each side of a pedestrian mall to be extended over that mall at a height of about 15 feet in order to make better use of the land and also to add to its appearance.

This clause also provides for an amendment to section 400 which, although the council has power to compel the removal of verandahs or posts, appears to give the right to re-erect. The amendment will make the prohibition of verandahs on posts effective in each district which makes a by-law for that purpose.

Clause 13 provides for an amendment to section 520 of the Local Government Act which at present provides for a council to have the right to construct crossings for a ratepayer of a municipality within its district at the cost of the ratepayer, whereas section 358 allows for the council to bear half the cost of crossings. The deletion of the word "crossings" from section 520 will eliminate this conflict.

Clause 14 provides for the inclusion in the definition of ordinary revenue of a municipality, of the grants received or sums reimbursed by the Commissioner of Main Roads in respect of works carried out or to be carried out by a council. This amendment has been thought necessary to resolve any doubt that main road grants are rightly regarded as ordinary revenue of the council and that the sums reimbursed are available for general purposes.

Clause 15 deals with an amendment to section 533. This is the same principle as that contained in clause 10.

Clause 16 provides for an amendment to section 540 of the Act. This has been introduced at the request of the Local Government Association because it has been found that land agents and others are causing a great deal of trouble by insisting on their right to inspect the rate book in order to obtain information relating to their business activities. This is particularly troublesome where the system in use is a card system. The amendment proposed will enable them to see the valuation register, which will give them the information they need, leaving the rate book cards available to the staff to work on.

Clause 17 provides for an amendment to section 599 to make it clear that the revenue for overdraft purposes includes Government grants for roads.

Clause 18 provides for an amendment to section 611, and again this amendment deals with the requirement that a poll shall not be void unless at least 10 per cent. of the ratepayers entitled to vote thereat do so. This particular section is related to loan polls.

Clause 19 includes a new section, 624A, to allow a council to accept an advance redeemable out of future rates to carry out work such as the construction of a road giving access to a subdivision, or similar cases, where the council and the Minister consider that such an arrangement would be for the good of the district. It is based on section 178A of the New South Wales Act.

The final clause, 20, provides for a new section, 691A, to allow a council to confer on an outstanding citizen or on a visitor,

e.g., a member of the Royal Family, Premier, etc., the titular honour of being a free-man of a municipality. This is similar to an honorary degree in the University. The proposal has been supported by the three associations concerned with local government.

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

SALE OF HUMAN BLOOD ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [5.5 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The reason for this amendment is that the Commonwealth Minister for Health has advised that, subsequent to the passing of the Sale of Human Blood Act, 1963, a related matter has come to the attention of his department. Information has been received which indicates that a pharmaceutical company was investigating the possibility of obtaining supplies of human placenta from hospitals in Australia for export to the U.S.A. The proposal involved the purchase of whole human placenta, which would then have been exported by air, in deep-freeze containers, to the company's parent organisation in the United States where it would be used for the production of immune globulins.

After being contacted by the company, several hospitals, other than teaching hospitals who do supply human placenta to the Royal Red Cross Society's Blood Transfusion Service, indicated a willingness to comply with the request.

Although this company has been dissuaded from proceeding with the proposal, there is a real possibility of other companies entering this field unless some preventive measures are adopted; and it is felt that the general question of purchase and export of human placenta involves two very important considerations.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Another outlet for free enterprise, is it not?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes. Firstly, if this were to become a profitable commercial activity, it may be very difficult to maintain sufficient supplies in Australia for our own purposes. The supply of human placenta is already no more than sufficient for our present requirements, and future increases in requirements are expected to absorb future increases in supplies. Secondly, this development would tend to raise the related question of payment to individual blood donors for their services, which would be undesirable.

For these reasons the Commonwealth has requested that we adopt a policy under which hospitals will not sell to commercial firms any human blood, blood derivatives, or human organs (including placenta) from which blood or blood derivatives may be obtained. As our Act refers to blood only, it appears that an amendment is required to cover the additional items referred to.

It is difficult to say what the requirements of human placenta are. The demand is variable; for example, on the outbreak of, say, hepatitis, the demand for immune globulin can be quite great. At other, normal, times the demand is not great, but it is still used in various cases.

The derivative, immune globulin, can be stored for use when emergencies arise. It is probable that in the Eastern States the supply of human placenta is nowhere near the demand, and that is the reason for the Commonwealth request for a prohibition of sale.

Blood consists of cells plus liquid known as plasma. The plasma consists of water, salts, and proteins. The plasma proteins include albumen and globulin, and the globulin is the fraction to which any antibodies, developed in the individual from which the blood is drawn, are absorbed. The globulin fraction is, therefore, commonly referred to as immune globulin.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. G. Hislop.

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), read a first time.

COAL MINES REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Bill returned from the Assembly without amendment.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 26th August, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan) [5.11 p.m.]: The Bill has been introduced to comply with one of the election promises given by the Government, and its purpose is to provide for a greater measure of financial assistance to independent schools.

There are some proposals about which I would pass only general remarks. One provision relates to the supply of additional free stock, and another refers to interest payments on loans made for the purpose of providing residential accommodation in these schools.

I wish to deal particularly with subsidies for the purpose of swimming pools and with the question of tuition subsidies, which were promised by the Government. I shall deal with the second one first. In the policy speech on behalf of the Government it was promised that tuition fees would be subsidised to the extent of £15 a year for first, second, and third-year students; £18 a year for fourth and fifth-year students; and £21 a year for first degree students at the University.

I am a little worried over the fact that there is no mention in the Bill of the third item—the £21 subsidy to University students in their first degree course. I understand that this subsidy is being granted, but I thought that some mention might have been made in the Bill; and if it has not the Minister, perhaps, will in his reply inform the House whether this subsidy is to be provided for, so that we may know just how this money is being spent.

I know of University students who have had the £21 deducted from their bill of fees. As there are almost 2,000 students concerned and quite a considerable sum of money involved, I feel the House would welcome information about what is happening in regard to this particular matter.

On the question of subsidies for swimming pools, I point out that already departmental schools are being subsidised to the extent of 25 per cent. of the cost, with a limit of £1,000. I might pose this question: Just how realistic is the whole proposal as it affects all the schools?

I point out that in the whole of the Fremantle area—with which I am familiar; and there are plenty of other similar districts, in the metropolitan area at least, which could be affected in the same way—there are a number of high schools, both departmental and independent. I would mention the John Curtin High School; the Hamilton High School; Christian Brothers College; St. Joseph's Convent; Sacred Heart Convent, and others; and there must be at least 50 primary schools in that district.

The offer of £1,000 to help any one of these schools to build a swimming pool is, I submit, completely unrealistic because it involves so many things. There is the provision of a place where, a swimming pool can be constructed. There is also the raising of the necessary money. These problems are generally not within the financial capacity of the schools. Swimming pools are, of course, a great necessity in any modern community. The first purpose of a swimming pool is to teach

children to swim. The value to everybody of being able to swim is unlimited. We can imagine how many lives would be saved if everybody in the community could swim.

That is the first function of a swimming pool. The second function is that it gives the more advanced swimmers an opportunity to learn lifesaving in which, of course, there is an enormous value to the community. The third purpose of a swimming pool is for the holding of carnivals to enable swimming standards to be maintained by the various schools. This is very necessary, particularly if Australia is to hold her own among the swimming nations of the world. We all know that up to recently Australia has been supreme in this field of sport, even though she is a comparatively small nation so far as population is concerned. Our swimming successes have been unsurpassed.

The fourth, and probably the greatest value of a swimming pool, is to build up the physical health of our youth. Swimming is a most relaxing and healthy sport. The whole approach to swimming pools, however, should be realistic; it should be such as to benefit all sections of the community.

To revert to the Fremantle district for a moment. I would say that Fremantle is as civic-minded and as keen to do as well for its citizens—and I include all the local authorities in this—as any group anywhere. For some years they have had the idea of establishing an Olympic swimming pool in the centre of Fremantle. That pool would provide for the needs of all the schools in the Fremantle district, and by the careful rationing of time and the fixing of periods during which the various schools could use the pool, they would each have an opportunity to make use of the facilities provided. The only reason why the pool has not been built—and this is a fundamental obstacle which affects everybody—is that there is not sufficient money available.

In all earnestness I would submit that if a Government had a policy of making £1,000 available to a school, that policy should be extended so that a grant of £10,000 could be made available to 10 schools if they were eligible. A Government which thinks and acts big in the interest of our youth and of the district, together with the future health of the men and women of Western Australia, could, for a district like Fremantle, give attention to the provision of £50,000 for the establishment of this facility.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is not difficult to think big when you do not have to provide the funds.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: If the Government can promise £1,000 to any school—and that is the basis of the scheme—it can equally provide £50,000 to a combination of 50 schools. I feel the statement is

perfectly logical. If a number of schools build private swimming pools they would not be used as fully as they ought to be. Apart from this there would be a certain amount of economic waste. On the other hand a central pool which is used by all the schools and by the public would not only provide the necessary facilities for the schools, but would be a wonderful boon to the district itself.

I offer this suggestion, because I hope that if an approach is made to the Government by the local governing bodies in the Fremantle district, the Government will give serious consideration to providing as much help as possible. The benefits that would accrue not only to the district but to the State as a whole would be such that any subsidy made available for a pool of this nature would fully justify the money spent. The result would be excellent. The Bill provides what the Government promised and, accordingly, I support the measure.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan) [5.21 p.m.]: I also support the Bill, but with some misgivings. I think the Government at this juncture is being extravagant in providing subsidies for the building of private swimming pools in schools. There are about 48 to 50 State schools in my electorate, and I am continually plagued with requests from these schools for some sort of assistance from the Education Department to help with the levelling of the school grounds, the construction of ovals, the enclosing with fly-wire of school rooms, and so on. We are, however, always met with a "No" from the Education Department, which says it cannot expend moneys on such items; that it is the responsibility of the school concerned to level its own grounds, to provide reticulation, and so on.

One of the oldest schools I have in mind is the Hamilton Hill School, which still has boulders three or four feet high jutting out of the playground. The school is in a deplorable condition even though money has been spent on it recently. Despite of all this, we see an election bait being offered to private schools in the provision of assistance to help them construct swimming pools.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What do you call the undertakings your party gives to the public prior to elections?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: There were none of that nature.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What do you call them?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Something to benefit the students.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You would call it something different from a bait, because it is put up by your party.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It would be something to benefit students, generally, irrespective of denomination, class, creed, or anything else. Before the Government is extravagant enough to offer such inducements, I think the department's own buildings and grounds should be put in order.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What is it going to cost the Government for swimming pools?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I do not know.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Then how can you say it is extravagant.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It is extravagant when we consider the deplorable condition of some of the department's own buildings and grounds.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: No matter how much or how little is spent you will call this extravagant.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: It is extravagant if money can be expended in this manner when the department's own grounds and buildings are, in some cases, in a state of disrepair. Good luck to the schools which are getting this money: those which can afford to raise the balance of the finance to construct a swimming pool. I wish every State school could be in a position to do just that. But they are not in such a position; they are not able to put down a bore to provide a decent playing area for the children—a grassed area. In some cases it is necessary for an appeal to be made to the local authority for certain work to be done on school grounds, and so on. I would say there is not a member in this Chamber who has a State school in his electorate which does not want something done to the grounds or building.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I grant you there is not one member in the Chamber who does not want something done.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am talking about the legitimate complaints a member receives from the schools in his area at one time or another. A short while ago I visited a five-year high school which was outside my electorate. It did not have a playing area or the money to provide reticulation for a playing area.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: The Eastern Goldfields high schools have not got playing areas.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am speaking about the Merredin High School. I could also name some schools in the area I represent. One school that readily comes to mind is the Brentwood State School. The school's share for the provision of reticulation was £2,000. The school had to pay for the construction of the oval over and above that.

It is time the Education Department gave some thought to assisting primary schools, in particular, in bettering their grounds. This would be of some comfort to the teachers, quite apart from the children who attend the schools. Some of these areas are plagued with flies, but it is virtually impossible to get any-fly wiring done at a State school. The South Coogee School, for instance, had to pay for the entire fly-wiring of that school; and in this area there were countless millions of flies around the verandahs and rooms of the schools because of the animal manures used in the market gardens in the district.

The Coogee Beach State School has a rock pile for a yard, and that school has written to the department, as has the Hamilton Hill Primary School. They have also both approached me in the matter. All the department can say is, "You have to raise the money yourself to carry out these works." On the one hand we find these struggling schools, which cannot afford to do this work for the benefit of the children, being denied finance for essentials; and, on the other hand, the more prosperous schools, which can afford to have grassed areas, being given inducements of subsidies to help them build swimming pools.

In a society such as this the whole thing strikes me as being a bit lopsided. I wish every State school were in the position to take advantage of this subsidy to help it build a swimming pool. I agree entirely with Mr. Dolan's sentiments, and I trust the department will have a serious look at what it can do to help primary schools, which are its responsibility.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [5.29 p.m.]: I thank Mr. Dolan and Mr. Ron Thompson for their general support of the second reading of this Bill. I do not know the exact answer to the question raised by Mr. Dolan in connection with the University payment, but when the Bill is being dealt with in Committee I will get the answer and let the House know what the position is.

On the general question, I repeat what I said by way of interjection: It is a relatively easy matter to think big in these things when one does not have to pay according to how big one thinks. I say that quite seriously. The approach by Mr. Ron Thompson in connection with the whole matter is in reverse to the approach by Mr. Dolan, who suggested we should be even more generous and pay 10 times £1,000 to 10 schools in a collective way. I will refer this matter to the Minister for Education, because I do not know whether or not he has given any thought to this proposal.

Neither am I in a position to say exactly how many schools will be able to take advantage of this opportunity, but I think

it is perfectly true to say that the proposals submitted in this Bill were accepted in general accord by the public and, particularly, by those who can be expected to benefit from the putting into effect of a promise made at an election.

I say advisedly to Mr. Ron Thompson that it is not fair to refer to an undertaking by a political party in the event of its being elected to the Treasury bench as political bait unless one is prepared to admit that anything done at all in the way of an election promise is political bait. This cannot be divided into two categories. On the one hand, a pre-election promise by a party to be carried out if it were elected to the Treasury bench cannot be referred to as political bait while, on the other hand, a promise made by another political party comes under a different category. I do not consider there is any use for that word at all; these things are undertakings given at the time of an election.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: They would be called an inducement.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: When a Government is elected it should, if it is in a position to do so fulfil its undertakings; and by the support given by the two members who have spoken to this Bill, the Government will be able to fulfil the undertaking it gave on the 20th February when the last general election took place.

In the Committee stage I will endeavour to give some further information on the points that have been raised.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BUSH FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 26th August, on the following motion by **The Hon. L. A. Logan** (Minister for Local Government):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. F. D. WILLMOTT (South-West) [5.34 p.m.]: I trust the Minister will not be too disappointed, but it is my intention to support this Bill.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I could almost clap.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: As the Minister pointed out when he introduced the Bill, the main purpose of the proposed amendment is to allow of the disposal of refuse from oil or natural gas discoveries by burning. In order to do this it is proposed that the Minister, on the recommendation of the Bush Fires Board, can suspend the operation of section 25 of the Act either wholly or in part. That is the section which lays down the conditions under which fires may be lit during the prohibited or restricted burning periods. It

refers to fires for various purposes: cooking purposes, the disposal of carcases of dead animals, the operation of brick kilns, and so on. I think that part of the Bill is quite all right and is necessary to bring about what is required.

However, there is one other proposal in the Bill that surprises me a little, because under any exemption granted by the Minister under the provisions of the proposed amendment, the permit holder is automatically exempted from the operation of section 46 of the Act; and that section is the one which gives a local authority, or a fire control officer or, under certain conditions, a forestry officer, the power to prohibit or postpone any lighting of a fire; and it also gives power for them to direct what shall be done to control a fire which is already alight.

I do not expect there will be any difficulties in this matter as far as the burning of refuse from oil or natural gas discoveries is concerned, but the Bill provides a great deal more than that, because it provides that this exemption may be granted for the purpose of burning any refuse of any industry, trade, or process. That is a pretty wide definition. Any industry, trade, or process must surely cover a very wide field and, although I do not think there will be any imminent danger of contention between the Bush Fires Board and local authorities, the time could easily arise when it would bring conflict between the Bush Fires Board and a local authority or between the Minister and a local authority.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Of course, it is entirely in the hands of the Minister for Lands.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Yes, it is; but, like bush fires boards, Ministers for Lands come and go, and they may have different ideas. Therefore, in the future, there may be conflict with local authorities on this matter. If such a position should arise, I think those conflicts could be dealt with at the time; but I am rather surprised at this inclusion in the Bill, and I think it would have been better had the measure confined itself more definitely to the disposal of refuse from oil and natural gas discoveries instead of opening the gate as wide as it does. However, I do not propose to oppose the Bill on this ground. I pointed this out because I think the trouble may arise at a later date. However, I feel it could be dealt with then. I support the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. F. D. Willmott) in the Chair; The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3: Section 25A added—

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. Logan is in charge of this Bill, but I would like to give the Committee a little more information. The amendment to this Act has been introduced specifically for the purpose of dealing with occasions of burning oil or gas at well sites where discoveries of oil and gas take place.

I was at Yardarino for three days on the occasion of the first gas strike. It was necessary to be there for three days as certain difficulties were encountered during the testing process. Had members been there to see this gas escape under controlled conditions, they would appreciate the necessity of being able to burn the refuse; because gas, under those conditions, could set up a dangerous state of affairs.

In the case of Yardarino, the Irwin Shire Council was called in by the company in a spirit of co-operation; and I venture to suggest that this would invariably be the case. These oil companies with their vast amount of experience in prospecting for oil, with the knowledge of what to do, and with a desire for public liaison, would almost invariably communicate with the local authority concerned and consult with the Bush Fires Board. I do not think the fear which you, Mr. Deputy Chairman (The Hon. F. D. Willmott), expressed will amount to much. However, if it does, I can give an assurance that something will be done.

The important thing is that during out of burning times it can become absolutely essential to be able to burn this gas or oil; and the controlled burning of it is not as dangerous as its being exposed to the atmosphere or its escaping in some uncontrolled form.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 26th August, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (South Metropolitan) [5.46 p.m.]: The Minister will possibly be surprised when I tell him that I am going to support this Bill also. It is not often that that occurs twice running.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am not surprised about this at all.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: You might be surprised when you hear my comments about matters which are not referred to in the Bill.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You should not draw the President's attention to the matter.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The Bill consists of three amendments which are necessary, and which have been recommended, possibly, in this form by the Royal Commissioner who inquired into the safety of vessels—commonly called the Boat Safety Royal Commission.

I agree entirely with the amendments. The Minister, in his introductory speech on this Bill, pointed out that as a result of Commissioner Wallwork's recommendations this legislation was deemed necessary. I take it then that as the Royal Commissioner's report was mentioned, the same latitude will be afforded me as was afforded the Minister and an opportunity will be given for debate to take place in respect of what the Royal Commissioner recommended.

On the 18th August, 1964, the Government, concerned—and rightly concerned—at the loss of fishing craft and pleasure craft along our coast, saw fit to appoint Stipendiary Magistrate W. J. Wallwork as a Royal Commissioner to inquire into the matter. Mr. Wallwork was assisted by Mr. K. G. Forsyth of the Harbour and Light Department and Mr. G. Travia, who was President of the Geraldton Fishermen's Association and who has had an extensive knowledge of the sea.

A 70-page report containing numerous recommendations was presented to the Government. Those recommendations were vital. The report, at the beginning, states that during a three-year period, six fishing boats and 18 lives were lost. Those figures would possibly be alarming in other parts of the world, but our particular coastline is a bad one; it is very rugged and treacherous.

With your permission, Mr. President, I wish to read out parts of the report so that members in this Chamber will know some of the recommendations which I consider should be put into effect by the Government. Probably previous Governments should have taken more interest in the fishing industry and in the welfare of all the people who use our anchorages. However, unfortunately—and I say this constructively—the Harbour and Light Department has been overtaxed with an increasing number of boats and with increasing duties. The staff has not been kept up to the requirements. Likewise, the Fisheries Department is short of trained personnel and money, and it is impossible for that department to function efficiently.

I will not endeavour to take any parts of this report out of context, but for brevity I intend to quote portions of what

was said. On page 8 of the report the Royal Commissioner said in his opening remarks—

It is not likely that the cause of the "Cathy Jo" disappearance—

Incidentally, that was the last fishing boat which was lost, and that loss triggered-off this Royal Commission. To continue—

—will ever be determined nor will her exact whereabouts at the time. Her loss followed losses of the fishing vessels "Linda" near Moore River, "Marlene Anne" near Escape Island, "Carol Lee" near Rottnest, "Kerry Lee" in a locality unknown, "Nor 6" near Shark Bay, and "Wahini" near Kalbarri, all within a period of approximately three years. Altogether 18 lives were lost from these vessels. The disasters gave rise to misgivings concerning the seaworthiness of the vessels, the efficacy of the safety equipment carried or which should have been carried, the competence of the skippers and crews, the administration of the Harbour and Light Department and the efficiency of the search and rescue organisation.

I think those last remarks will cover the main recommendations which have been brought down by the commissioner.

One of the terms of reference dealt with was the reason for the casualties, and the causes of accidents at sea and nearing anchorages. The following references appear on page 13 of the report:—

Item 1—Dragged or Broke Moorings—27 per cent.

Item 2—Dumped in Breakers near Reefs—24.5 per cent.

Item 3—Struck Reefs—15 per cent.

Item 4—Unknown—13 per cent.

Item 5—Sprung Leak—6.5 per cent.

Item 6—Fire or Explosion—5 per cent.

Item 7—Engine Failure and Stalling—4 per cent.

Item 8—Engine Failure and Mechanical Failure—3.3 per cent.

Item 9—Overloaded—1.6 per cent.

So, it can be seen that there are a lot of things which contribute to the loss of boats on our dangerous shoreline. On page 17 the commissioner goes on to say—

Your Royal Commissioner and my advisers are unanimously of the opinion that far too little has been done at Government level for the protection of ocean-going fishing and private vessels by way of the provision of shore facilities, which play such a vital part in the welfare of vessels while at sea and travelling to and from the sea. Such facilities include light-houses, leading lights, day markers deep channels, safe anchorages, slipways and mooring pens.

The charge cannot be laid against the fishing industry that it has not moved to help itself. It will be shown later that the fishermen and their co-operatives, as well as private enterprise associated with the industry, have made very substantial contributions to the well-being of the industry and the cost of its upkeep.

The statement shown below indicates the contribution made by Western Australia to the economy of the Commonwealth in the matter of exports of marine products for the years ending 30th June, 1963, and 30th June, 1964, respectively. The robust figure of £5,872,000 or 69.9 per cent. of the total for the financial year just ended is a major effort.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Will the honourable member please connect his remarks to the Bill before the House?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: My remarks are in line with the remarks of the Minister on the findings of the Royal Commission which inquired into boat safety.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You are telling us what is not in the Bill.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am telling the House that, if the Minister desires it that way. I think it is necessary that these points should be in the measure. The title of the Bill is the Western Australian Marine Act Amendment Bill, and it is intended to amend the Western Australian Marine Act, 1948-1962; and, with respect, I think that what I have to say should be conducive to the Government making further amendments to the Act to bring it up to the standard recommended by the Royal Commissioner.

I would go further and say I think that when a Government appoints a Royal Commissioner and he presents a comprehensive report, such as Commissioner Wallwork has done, our Standing Orders should be changed so that the report shall be made the subject of debate in the House rather than that the report be tabled. In that way members would have a greater appreciation of the work which is put into obtaining the report and the recommendations which are made; and I feel sure that not so many reports would find their way onto dusty shelves in some office or other and left indefinitely.

Returning to the report, it will be found that in the year 1962-63 Western Australia produced £5,348,000 worth of fish and crayfish. In the year 1963-64, the figure was £5,872,000. New South Wales produced £302,000 worth in 1962-63, and £412,000 worth in 1963-64.

As pointed out in the report, we have done little to assist fishermen in Western Australia although, as the commissioner said, the fishermen have contributed to

their own welfare and safety by means of jetties, and so forth, along our coastline. However, in New South Wales thousands and thousands of pounds are being spent for a fraction—a mere fraction—of the earnings that our crayfishermen alone bring to the Government; not only to the Western Australian Government, but to the Commonwealth Government. I think this is mainly a Commonwealth responsibility and that an excellent case could be put to the Commonwealth not only for leading lights and safe anchorages, but also for what is recommended in this report. If we are to have an efficient marine Act, we should have an efficient rescue organisation as well.

At the present time we have one Dakota aircraft stationed in Western Australia. When the *Cathy Jo* was lost, it was several hours before the Dakota got under way in the initial search. It did a good job, but my personal opinion is that the search was in the wrong place. The following day that aircraft was removed from the search operations—and numerous telephone calls were made from Dongara to my home, to the home of the Minister for Police, and to the Premier's home—because the Dakota, the only rescue aircraft in Western Australia, had been booked to go to Ceduna, and she duly went there.

It was then left to private aircraft owners to make their aircraft available to conduct a search; and, with all due respect to the owners of those private craft, I do not think they have the same knowledge of this work as the R.A.A.F. personnel have.

However, I was talking about the work that has been done in New South Wales to provide facilities for fishermen. In New South Wales the fishermen produce £302,000 worth of fish per annum as against our figure of approximately £6,000,000 annually for crayfish. In Ulladulla two new breakwaters have been built at a cost of £187,000 to service 24 boats. At Evans Head £180,226 has been spent on facilities to cater for 25 boats. At Tweed Heads the authorities have spent £390,000 on facilities to service 30 boats, and at Bermagui, £160,000 for servicing 10 to 15 boats plus 10 tuna ships in the season. At Eden, £190,000 has been spent on facilities for servicing 31 vessels plus 10 tuna ships in the tuna season.

But what have we spent? We have spent roughly £450,000 on the construction of a fishing boat harbour at Fremantle; and I would say that is the only major construction work that has been done for the fishing industry which, excluding grain and cereal production, is the largest exporting industry of the State.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: A slip and pen stocks have been built at Geraldton, and they are very good.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Yes, but they were not built specially for fishermen.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think they were.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Yes, they were. They were definitely built for them. It is a fishermen's wharf.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Yes; a special fishermen's wharf was built and it is very good.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I stand corrected and I will say that Geraldton fishermen have had some facilities provided for them. A sum of £450,000 was spent on a fishing boat harbour at Fremantle, but we found, before the job was completed, that Harbour and Light Department machinery was moved there; and a large proportion of the area, which everybody thought was to be used for fishing boats, is now used for dredges and other types of boats. Even the dredge *Sir James Mitchell*, which belongs to private enterprise, was berthed there until recent times.

A good deal of the foreshore in the fishing boat harbour has been reclaimed. This has reduced the acreage of water available for mooring purposes, and it is definitely too small, even though it has been in operation for only a few years. All the fishing boats which have Fremantle as their home port could not fit into the harbour at the one time. Probably the Geraldton fishermen are in a more favourable position inasmuch as more natural anchorages are available there than are available around Fremantle.

The Royal Commissioner recommended that extra pens could be built at Geraldton to service the boats that use that port from time to time. He also recommended the following order of priority for the construction of fishing boat harbours; and this is based on their location and the density of concentration of vessels combined with the need for protection:—

- (1) Denison (Dongara).
- (2) Lancelin.
- (3) Jurien Bay.

He went on to say—

The following order of priority of construction of multi-purpose small boat harbours for use by fishing boats, tourist vessels and yachts is similarly based:—

- (1) Mandurah.
- (2) Rockingham.

He goes on further to refer to—

Point Samson
Carnarvon
Shark Bay
Murchison River
Cliff Head
Beagle Islands
Snag Island
Green Head
Green Island
Cervantes Island
Wedge Island

Ledge Point
Cape Leschenault
Yanchep
Safety Bay
Busselton
Augusta
Nornalup
Albany
Esperance

in his report as "lesser anchorages," but only because of the number of boats using the anchorages I previously mentioned.

As I have already said, in New South Wales countless thousands of pounds have been spent on fostering the fishing industry in that State; but here, although our industry produces so much more, other than the expenditure at Fremantle and Geraldton, we have spent nothing.

I can recall attending a meeting in Dongara when it was pointed out that the only way a boat skipper could find his way into Port Denison by night was with the aid of an electric light on a man's roof which he linked up with a street light which, I think, was in the caravan park. That was the only lead light that fishermen in the Port Denison area had to enable them to return home at night. We must also remember that, particularly during the white crayfish season, many fishermen start work at three or four o'clock in the morning and might not get back to their moorings until midnight. They work around the clock.

Sitting suspended from 6.8 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Prior to the tea suspension I was dealing with the provision of safe anchorages, on which the Royal Commissioner said—

Safe Anchorages—Immediate Needs.

The port of Denison stands out as having a major and immediate claim on available public financial resources for the establishment of a completely equipped boat harbour, primarily for the use of fishing vessels and for the use of private vessels as an important but secondary consideration. Some natural protection is afforded the anchorage by a reef at the southern corner, but the whole anchorage is completely exposed to north-west to westerly gales. A loading jetty has been provided, but this also is as much exposed as any vessel lying in the anchorage.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: What page is that?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: That appears on page 18.

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver): Order! Will the honourable member address himself to the Bill before the House? I have been extremely tolerant, but the honourable member continues to quote from the report by the Royal Commissioner instead of addressing himself to the Bill.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Very well, Mr. President. I agree that you have been most tolerant. The Royal Commissioner has pointed out that the existing legislation is adequate to implement the major recommendations he has made, and unless the Government can give us something concrete in regard to its intentions in this respect it will be my intention to make a move to seek the making of additional regulations.

However, I think it is the duty of the Government and the Fisheries Department to do something in this respect and not merely introduce a Bill dealing with only three sections of the Act and containing only one major amendment—an amendment which seeks to throw the onus of proof on the skipper of a vessel that he was not the skipper at the time of an offence and which provides that he has to give any information that may be required by departmental officers. This will mean that if any breach of the Act is committed the skipper in command of the vessel at the time can be investigated by those officers.

Another important aspect is the provision of safety equipment in all vessels. It is a well-known fact that when annual inspections are carried out from time to time on licensed craft and, to a large degree, on pleasure craft, many boatowners borrow safety equipment from another owner so that when the inspection is made the boat is complete with all the necessary safety equipment. The snap inspections, as proposed in the Bill, will prevent this practice from continuing, and the officer of the department will also have power to compel the owner of a vessel to carry out any direction made by him. This is an excellent provision.

The Minister, when summing up, should tell us exactly what is intended by the Bill; because, to bring forward a small measure such as this with little explanation, especially after the great concern that was expressed by the Government when it ordered an inquiry to be made into boat safety, is just a waste of time. The expense of conducting the inquiry into boat safety and the time and effort that was spent by numerous people in giving evidence before the Royal Commissioner in an endeavour to protect lives and to obtain better conditions were certainly not warranted after one has studied this Bill; because there is no doubt that the object of the Western Australian Marine Act is to prevent fatalities and improve conditions.

I am surprised that there is not a clause in the Bill making it mandatory for all persons who intend to proceed to sea in a boat to take out some form of insurance. This aspect of the question concerns me greatly, because whenever a fatality occurs at sea both the State and the Commonwealth are involved

in great expense in searching for the missing vessel. Also, the responsibilities left behind by those people who are drowned in boat accidents have, in many cases, to be borne by the Child Welfare Department or the Pensions Department. Recommendations made in an effort to provide for insurance have appeared in two reports, and I am greatly alarmed when I find that no move has been made to put these recommendations into effect by legislation.

If no effort is made along these lines by the Government it will be the responsibility of members who interest themselves in these matters to bring forward a motion in the House requesting that the major recommendations made by the Royal Commissioner be incorporated in legislation for the safety of those people who proceed to sea in vessels, and also for the purpose of providing better anchorages for the owners of crayfishing vessels, who are major contributors not only to the economy of Western Australia but also to Australia generally.

I do not think it would be fair for the State to bear the whole cost of implementing these recommendations. The Commonwealth Government has a great responsibility in this matter, and the State Government should approach the Commonwealth Government forthwith for a special grant to be provided for the provision of safe anchorages and for another Dakota or Neptune aircraft to be stationed in Western Australia. I support the Bill.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [7.40 p.m.]: This Bill is rather disappointing because it contains just one small provision in regard to boat safety. The provision to which I refer is that which empowers an authorised person to board a vessel to examine it if he thinks it necessary, and, if it is not seaworthy, to direct it to the nearest port. That is practically all the the Bill amounts to. When we consider that a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the safety of small vessels on the Western Australian coast—a Royal Commission which, I should imagine, cost a considerable amount of money—one wonders why the Government has not gone further than merely introduce a Bill to do what this Bill seeks to attain.

To my way of thinking the measure is rather a hit and miss attempt in so far as boat safety is concerned, because the Harbour and Light Department would not have sufficient boats to carry out the patrol work necessary. Accordingly, if an authorised person were empowered by the department to board a vessel, or if a police officer, as is stated in this Bill, were given that authority, it would be necessary for him to procure a boat to enable him to board the vessel in question. From my reading of the Act such authorised person

would have power to require any person with a boat to take him out so that he could board and examine the vessel in question. The little that this Bill will do to safeguard boats on the Western Australian coast is, I am afraid, negligible.

I do not want to speak too long on this measure because there is so little to speak about, but I am surprised that the Government has not given much graver consideration to this problem with a view to introducing legislation which will deal with the position more effectively. I appreciate that if the recommendations made by the Royal Commission were carried out *in toto* it would be a very costly matter to the State. It would be practically impossible for the department to find the money to carry out all the recommendations of the Royal Commission, but I feel that at least some effort should be made in connection with this matter, and perhaps some money could be found to assist in ensuring the safety of boats on the Western Australian coast.

The proposals contained in the measure will cost the State little, if anything; and if that is all the department advises, and, perhaps, the Minister thinks, in regard to boat safety so far as the State is concerned, it does not say very much for their efforts to provide the necessary steps to ensure boat safety along our coast.

I am afraid I will have to support the Bill because it is a small start. I do hope, however, that the Government will see fit at a later stage to give this matter much more consideration in an endeavour to make some effort to ensure the safety of boats along our Western Australian coast.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North) [7.44 p.m.]: As other speakers have already said, this Bill has been brought down to preserve life and to avoid casualties at sea. I must agree with Mr. Baxter when he says that the Bill does not implement as many recommendations of the Royal Commission on boat safety as it should. If it did it would attain its objective far more satisfactorily.

The Bill before us seeks to amend part VIII of the Western Australian Marine Act, which concerns vessels that are required to be licensed—vessels like hire boats, pleasure boats, whaling boats, pearling boats, and fishing boats. These are all vessels which are required to be licensed under the Western Australian Marine Act.

The provisions in the Bill will enable the officers of the Harbour and Light Department, and other authorised persons, to board those types of vessels at any time and to inspect the machinery, safety gear, and equipment, or whatever may be on the boat, and whatever may be required to be on the boat under the regulations. The regulations are numerous and cover quite a wide

variety of safety measures. I do not think any of us can object to giving the Harbour and Light Department that authority. Under the Western Australian Marine Act the police have that authority at all times; but the Harbour and Light Department employees, or inspectors, or others who may be authorised by that department, can only be given that authority under the amendments contained in this Bill.

As I have already said, the measure deals with part VIII of the Act, which refers to the licensing of vessels for safety purposes. It does not, however, cover other types of vessels, such as canoes, row boats, yachts, or auxiliary cruisers. I would not be surprised if this legislation will not require to be licensed the very big vessel which sailed into Fremantle Harbour last week from Tasmania, which weighed several tons, and in which the owners contemplate making a world tour. It will not be required to pay a meagre 10s. a year and to have a number painted on its hull in a conspicuous place. In my opinion it will be exempt from this provision, although I am open to correction, because it carries so much more sail—measured in square feet under some formula—than the horsepower of the motor which may be on the vessel.

Accordingly, there appear to be quite a number of anomalies; and while this Bill seeks to protect some people who go to sea in boats, I would say there are many boats which would be exempt from this Act and which the authorities, as I understand the Bill, will have no power to inspect or examine. They will have no power to examine the machinery and lifesaving equipment on those particular vessels. So I must agree with Mr. Baxter when he says the Bill falls far short of what is required to ensure the safety of vessels on our coast.

It would interest members to know that a question was asked in another place this afternoon in connection with fatalities. According to the answer given, there have been 111 ships of the fishing fleet lost south of Carnarvon during the last five years, including 1965. That is a very large number indeed. Apart from this 24 lives have been lost from those vessels. These men were experienced fishermen who had been licensed for years, although some of them, may have been new at the game.

Those vessels were lost in that period through negligence, carelessness, or oversight on the part of people who earned a living from the sea and who had to take risks. We all know that it is necessary for fishing fleets to take risks almost every time they venture out to sea. We know that crayfishing boats must operate close to, or on top of, reefs; they have to set the pots close to, or on, reefs where the crayfish hide during the day. There is always a great element of risk attached to fishing. That might be the reason why

111 fishing boats out of some 900 in Western Australia were lost in the five-year period to which I referred.

When we consider the privately-owned pleasure boats—which the department seems to be chasing all the time—we find that in the past six years 20 lives have been lost off small boats, and mostly rowing boats. One fatality occurred on a catamaran when the person was washed overboard. Yet these types of craft are exempt from registration under the proposals in the Bill.

It is an injustice that certain sections of people who use the waterways will continue to be exempt from registration. If registration is a means to ensure safety—I doubt very much whether it has an effect on boat safety—then it should be applied to a 10 ft. dinghy with a two-horsepower motor, as well as to the big schooner which arrived recently in Fremantle or to the *Panamuna*, a well-known vessel, which won several Bunbury to Perth races. Those are the facts.

I do not think the licensing of vessels will save lives. We cannot protect people from their own misunderstandings and misjudgments, and this has been proved by the losses which have occurred in the fishing fleet, and in which experienced fishermen were involved. Whilst I consider some form of legislation should be adopted, and every vessel which uses the waters should bear some definite marking—if not a number, then at least the name, so that the it could be identified if the vessel was wrecked, or if a search was made for it—the mere fee of 10s. will not be the means of protecting the lives of people.

I was interested to hear the answers given to some questions which I asked the Minister for Mines today, although he is not responsible for the answers, because he represents the Minister who is in charge of the department. I asked—

Why is only one section of private pleasure craft owners who use the waterways of the State, called upon to subscribe to the costs of traffic control?

His reply was—

The compulsory registration of privately-owned pleasure craft was introduced basically as a necessary measure to assist in the control of operators of marine craft which were endangering the safety and lives of the users of other craft and swimmers, etc. On investigation it was considered that these dangers arose almost entirely from powered craft and not from sailing craft which do not have to be registered.

A further reason why sailing craft do not have to be registered is that the great majority of them are already registered with yacht clubs and are easily traceable.

I would suggest to the Minister that he give consideration to the registration of every type of craft, but that he abolish the 10s. registration fee. It is not fair that one section should have to pay this fee. Those who are not subscribing funds to the control measures seem to receive the greatest protection.

In answer to a further question which I asked today the Minister told us that for over 40 years a policeman and two officers of the Harbour and Light Department have been employed on river traffic control, and that the annual cost is £3,900 now. I would suggest the figure is greater than that, and a mistake seems to have been made. Two Harbour and Light Department officers, one constable, and three patrol boats are engaged on traffic control on the river. The figure given by the Minister is rather conservative.

For 40 years the taxpayers of this State have been subscribing to this protection, but two or three years ago this Government decided to impose a further tax upon one section of the users of our waters—some owners of pleasure boats throughout the State. The Minister should give consideration to that aspect; he should not protect members of yacht clubs. I have no objection to a course being set aside for yacht races, because I consider this to be a great sport, but I do not think it should receive preferential treatment in regard to registration fees.

Reference is made in the report of the Royal Commissioner who inquired into boat safety to a loss of life from a catamaran. I have seen this type of vessel travelling at a much greater speed than that of the average pleasure boat on the river. On one occasion I asked the owner and skipper of a catamaran the estimated top speed of the vessel on days when the normal south-west wind was blowing. He told me it was around 14 or 15 knots.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They have been known to get up to speeds of 30 knots.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: If they hit anything at that speed they would go straight through. I have in mind one mishap which occurred to a vessel in the last season as a result of a collision. That was the *Panamuna*, which was put out of action all of last season. The vessel was holed by another craft at the start of an ocean race, and the repairs cost several thousand pounds. This class of vessel is exempt from registration, but the grounds upon which such vessels are exempted savour of some type of protection.

The Minister told us that the measure was necessary to assist in the control of operators of marine craft which were endangering the safety and lives of the users of other craft. How anything can be more

dangerous than a catamaran travelling up to 30 knots—as the Minister says—I do not know. The answer goes on to say—

A further reason why sailing craft do not have to be registered, is that the great majority of them are already registered with yacht clubs and are easily traceable.

Does the Minister suggest that bicycles, tricycles, motor scooters, motorbikes, motorcars, and automobiles of all kinds which belong to various clubs should not be registered with the police—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: And boat trailers.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND:—simply because they belong to a club of some description? I say it is unfair. It may be remembered that some two or three years ago—I forget which—I moved in this House to alter the regulation which covered boat licensing. My move was not supported. I was invited to attend a meeting of yacht club authorities and the only reason they could give me as to why they objected to being registered was that the fee was now only 10s. per year, but in three or four years' time it would be £5. That was the only substantial reason submitted.

It was freely rumoured throughout the yacht clubs and amongst boating people generally that the fee was to be increased this year. The Press must have got hold of it somewhere; because, before Parliament met, or early after it did meet, the Premier or somebody else stated in the Press that there was no intention of increasing the fee this year. That is one let-off, anyhow, for those who have to pay the 10s.

Seriously, surely it is a very plausible argument that because a person belongs to a club of some sort it is not necessary for him to register. I would suggest to the 9,000-odd boatowners—that is the figure given according to replies I received to-night—who have been required to register by law for years, that they form a club. Some have, but not all. Surely there are plenty from Wyndham to Esperance who do not belong to any club, but are required to register.

There are hundreds of farmers who carry around a small boat fitted with an outboard motor for the purpose of skiing and so on. They have to register. I should imagine they would have been the first to make a noise about paying 10s. In my experience, they watch every penny very carefully.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Do you suggest they should form a Mukinbudin yacht club?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: They have lakes, such as Lake Yealering and others. They are now brought within the ambit of this Act and are required to be registered.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Like all farmers, they never complain.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I am not going to say anything about farmers. They work hard and deserve all they get. In all seriousness, I hope the Minister in this House will draw the attention of his colleague in charge of this Act to the anomalies that exist when catamarans can travel at 30 knots, and probably more, because they carry more sail. Surely they are a danger; and we read in the report that there has been one fatality caused by a catamaran. I support the Bill.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines).

BUNBURY HARBOUR BOARD ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 26th August, on the following motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan) [8.6 p.m.]: This Bill seeks to do one thing only and that is to alter the scale of fees paid to the chairman of the Bunbury Harbour Board and its members. Whilst this measure is before the House I would like to say that it is unquestioned that these boards, in their various working capacities throughout the State, are most efficient and very much appreciated. The efficient control of a harbour means much to the town that is supported by it; and it means much to the inland area which depends upon the efficient running of the harbour in regard to the acceptance of inward cargoes and the export of goods produced by the district itself.

In his opening remarks the Minister mentioned that a committee had been formed to examine complaints made about various anomalies and differences in amounts paid as fees to members of various Government boards and instrumentalities; and it is as a result of this investigation that this particular Bill was introduced. I feel that the remarks of the Minister were broad in concept; and I am wondering whether, in his reply, he could give us a little more information about this committee and what its ramifications were.

A committee formed to examine various complaints about and anomalies in different amounts paid to members of various Government boards and instrumentalities could, I think, have quite wide consequences if this issue were taken completely in accord with the remarks of the Minister. I note there is a recommendation that the payment of fees will now be on an annual basis and will apparently be submitted through the means of a regulation.

The Bill does not explain how it is proposed to arrive at this annual increment. It does not say whether it will be arrived at in regard to hours spent at meetings over the previous year, or whether it will be based on the number of meetings held over a period of time. There is nothing to say on what basis the committee will link up its recommendation to the Government in this matter.

Whatever figure is arrived at, I feel sure it will be quite reasonable, having regard to all the circumstances that are applicable to the authority and the work the board undertakes; but it would be of interest to the House to know on what basis the amount of money will be arrived at in view of the fact that there could be other legislation emanating from the investigations made by this committee.

The Minister concluded by indicating clearly that this figure would be a variable amount; and this, of course, to me seems to be a reasonable assumption. The volume of work in this connection would not be static; it would be variable, moving either up or down according to the progress of the district or a particular situation that would apply from year to year.

I notice that in the proposed new section 10 the word "Governor" is used instead of the word "Minister". The proposed new section reads—

10. The chairman and the other members of the Board shall be paid such remuneration respectively as the Governor shall from time to time determine.

I feel that it would be preferable to use the word "Minister".

This matter was discussed quite recently in this House. By the inclusion of the Governor in these matters we are bringing him too close to the administration of problems of Parliament and the rulings of Parliament. These matters are departmental and as such are directly under the control of a Minister. Therefore I feel it would be preferable if we adopted the policy of using the word "Minister," as he is the controlling authority.

There is nothing in the Bill other than what I have explained. The principle involved is merely one of machinery to increase the fees paid to these gentlemen who, undoubtedly, earn them.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West) [8.12 p.m.]: This Bill has been described as a small Bill and its contents as being simple. I would briefly like to make some comment, mainly with regard to the contents of the Bill being small or trivial. There is a background to this which is important.

This Bill recognises the effectiveness of the co-operation which exists between a small local community body and the Government of the day or Government departments. It is not inappropriate to refer to some of the history of the Bunbury Harbour Board, or the Bunbury Harbour Trust as it was once known.

I do not want to disturb members by producing this tome, but I wish to quote from the 1912 report of the trust as it appears in *The Cyclopædia of Western Australia*, volume 1. In referring to the need for some replacements or renovations to the Bunbury Harbour the report states—

In view of this contingency and the increasing export, the Board feels that the time has now arrived when the exigencies of trade demand considerably improved facilities, recognizing that the proper development of this part of the State and the hinterland adjacent thereto is absolutely dependent upon a thoroughly up-to-date harbour equipped with the necessary appliances to cope expeditiously and cheaply with the mineral and agricultural wealth of the district. The requirements of the Board have been placed before the Government, and it feels assured that its requests will receive the favourable consideration that their importance merits.

It is interesting to refer to the fact that in this same report of 1912 is the information that the number of vessels using the port during 1911 was 165, which catered for 318,248 net tons—a slight decrease on the figures of the previous years. The total loads shipped amounted to 199,965, representing 356,010 tons. In view of my previous comment, I consider this gives recognition to the co-operation of this body and the work of members of the board over many years. I feel that, in the past, Governments have failed to meet the requests made in 1912 to keep pace with this anticipated development of Bunbury and its hinterland; and that, likewise, they have failed to give proper remuneration to the members of the board throughout those years.

The original legislation, introduced in 1909 by the then Premier (Sir Newton James Moore), the member for Bunbury, provided for the establishment of this board and its commissioners, mainly for the purpose of integrating much of the work of a great many Government departments. At that time a great many departments were involved, and quite obviously they were not getting very far. It was found convenient to the Government of the time to integrate them into one local body; and for that great service, which would save the Government a good deal of money, the Government was prepared to make certain

remuneration available which would be described as nothing more nor less than out-of-pocket expenses for the number of meetings these gentlemen would attend.

This has been the situation for many years; and, as Mr. Willesee has said, this Bill now proposes that there shall be recognition of the service rendered. These payments will be made on an annual basis and for the great service being performed for the State.

It is appropriate to mention that the anticipations of the commissioners or board members of 1912 have not since been realised. I draw attention to this by referring to the fact that for the year ended the 30th June, 1964, the total trade was 691,142 tons, which is a little less than twice what it was 55 years previously. The number of ships in 1964 was 141, as compared with 165 in 1911-12. However, the total gross registered tonnage has increased enormously; and in this last year, the report of which was tabled recently, the total gross tonnage handled at Bunbury was over 1,000,000 tons. I understand that when the report is made available for 1965, the figure will be far in excess of this.

We must recognise that the Bunbury Harbour Board, in keeping with so many boards of like constitutions throughout Western Australia, is, in actual fact, administering a great public asset. According to the report of the board, the total assets administered for the year ended the 30th June, 1964, were in excess of £3,000,000, a very high proportion of which is Government property which has been financed and provided by the Governments over the years.

Therefore we can say that the members of this board have been paid virtually only a pittance over the years, but they have been satisfactorily and successfully administering a harbour and an asset valued at over £3,000,000 to the State.

I do not wish to delay the House on this matter, because I think members are generally in support of the Bill; but I did wish to bring these facts to the notice of members. This historical reference is interesting, to say the least. I believe that what was said those many years ago still has its application, particularly in regard to the development of the harbour itself, and the land-backed wharves, and so on, which have only recently been built.

In that same report of 1911, the board drew attention to the need for greater accommodation, as follows:—

The jetty at the present time is usually taxed to its utmost capacity, so that it will be impossible to deal with the additional trade named unless considerable extra wharfage space, as well as more extensive facilities, are provided.

I think we should bear in mind that ever since that time the Bunbury Harbour has managed, by some means or other—and I

think it is largely as a result of the administration in that centre—to cope with trade; and that is despite the fact that in all those years the original jetty has been utilised and only in the last few years have we had the land-backed berth.

To conclude, I would say that I support this Bill wholeheartedly because it gives opportunity for appropriate remuneration to be paid to the gentlemen of high calibre who are community-minded enough to provide the services which they do, and which they virtually provide in their own time. Those people will receive recognition in this way.

I think it can be said that the work of planning and of policy making is not done at weekly meetings. It is usually done outside working time by those community-minded citizens. I am pleased to give my support to this Bill.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [8.22 p.m.]: I think all of us here are grateful for the timely action by Mr. Wise in drawing attention to the remarks of Mr. McNeill. He made it possible for us to hear that interesting discourse.

I thank Mr. McNeill and Mr. Willesee for their contributions to this debate. Mr. Willesee asked for some details. As I understand the position, there were a number of boards and such bodies operating in the State with a fairly wide divergence of payment on different bases, and it was felt that they should be rationalised to some extent.

An investigation revealed some of the variations, and a plan was adopted so that payments would be rationalised. Also, over a period of years the necessity for regular meetings, which had been envisaged in the early days, no longer existed in many cases. At times, some of the meetings had become a daily occurrence, and at other times, not so frequent as in the past. Therefore, it was felt that payment on an annual basis would be infinitely better, as a certain amount of work had to be done. This was better determined by the actual members of the particular board. I trust that gives the honourable member the explanation he was seeking.

The actual amount of payment, which was referred to by Mr. Willesee, is set by regulation made possible by the inclusion of appropriate regulation-making powers in the Act. This Bill takes out sections 10 and 11 of the Act and replaces them. The regulation-making powers make it possible to vary them from time to time.

As I understand the situation, regulations, which have to be tabled, make the reference to the Governor necessary, because these have to be signed by the Governor in Executive-Council and tabled—not just a ministerial decree that such a thing will happen.

I thank members for their support of this measure. We do believe that it will rationalise the financial remuneration of those people who, as Mr. McNeill has pointed out, have done such sterling work over the years.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

ALBANY HARBOUR BOARD ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 26th August, on the following motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan) [8.27 p.m.]: This Bill is almost word for word with the previous Bill. It deletes similar sections, and the only difference is in the title of the Act.

I think that to repeat here anything that was said in connection with the Bunbury issue would be needless repetition. The principle is exactly the same, and the recommendation comes from the same people who made the recommendation for the previous Bill. Therefore, I support the measure.

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [8.28 p.m.]: I support this measure. Although this Bill is similar in nature to the previous measure which we have adopted, it is of no less importance. In the growing area of the southern district, which the Port of Albany serves, I feel that this measure is long overdue. We have a board functioning in a very important way, and the members of that board spend a considerable amount of time in their duties.

Those of us who have anything to do with meetings realise that in between meetings there is a considerable amount of research and business to attend to in connection with the functioning of the particular board or organisation concerned. In my opinion, it is right that any remuneration should be on an annual basis rather than on the basis of the number of meetings a member attends.

I support this Bill, and I notice that in this afternoon's Press there is a reference to the Port of Albany which rather emphasises the importance of boards. It is reported that Mr. Justice Gallagher today rejected an application by the Australian Stevedoring Industry Authority to downgrade the Port of Albany.

The authority had applied to have the port downgraded from "A" class to "B" class from the 1st October to the 31st December.

However, that application was rejected, and it is worthy of note that Mr. Gallagher said he had been satisfied by the evidence that Albany was a developing and versatile port. To quote his words—

I think it not only in the interests of the men but in the interests of the port and Australia that Mr. Ashburner's order should continue.

That, I think, emphasises the importance of harbour boards and the members who constitute those boards.

Speaking of members of boards, I would like to take this opportunity of expressing appreciation of the work of a former member of the Albany Harbour Board, a gentleman who was, for many years, the chairman of the harbour board—I refer to the late Charles Bolt, who gave a great deal of his time and life to the interests of Albany, and particularly the field associated with the conduct of harbour facilities in that area. This is typical of board members throughout the State, who undertake the duties associated with various boards. I support the measure.

THE HON. J. M. THOMSON (South) [8.32 p.m.]: For obvious reasons I rise to support the Bill, and what has been said as regards the Bunbury Harbour Board Act Amendment Bill applies equally to this measure. I think it is appropriate that at this time we should pay tribute to the men who have fought so hard to bring these harbour boards into being. In this case the principal Act was assented to on the 24th December, 1926, and no doubt the legislation was introduced originally because of representations from and agitation by leading business people in the district; and I refer particularly to the late John Norman who was a mayor of Albany and who played a very important part in the creation of the Albany Harbour Board, as he did in so many other spheres in the life of Albany.

It is appropriate that we should now see fit to amend the Act to cover the position where board members are required to attend more meetings each year owing to the increased activities in all ports on our coast; and this amendment will enable those members to be paid on a basis different from that which is now operating.

It is interesting to note the expansion that has taken place in shipments through the Port of Albany. As Mr. Ferry has said, the southern portion of the State has developed considerably, and we have tremendous exports of grain, and also imports, of superphosphate and other materials, through the port of Albany. As a result of this considerable increase in development, board members have an important and exacting job to do, and it is only right that they should be remunerated in a proper way. Therefore the Bill which is now before us is worthy of the support of all members.

THE HON. G. C. MACKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [8.35 p.m.]: I thank members for their support of the Bill and the interest which they have taken in it. I had the pleasure of knowing Mr. John Norman, to whom Mr. Jack Thomson referred; however, I did not know Charlie Bolt, to whom Mr. Ferry referred. It is obvious that this move to rationalise and readjust the basis of payment for the members of these boards has met with the approval of members, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

SPEAR-GUNS CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 26th August, on the following motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan) [8.37 p.m.]: This Bill is neither long nor contentious; all it seeks to do is to widen the interpretation of the word "inspector." As the Act stands, the word "inspector" covers only an inspector of police or an inspector of fisheries, and it is desired that it be amended to enable the word "inspector" to cover an officer appointed by a local governing body, who will have the authority to police the Act.

However, I want to take advantage of the opportunity to say something about the people who, to a certain extent, are being disciplined—I refer to spear-fishermen, and perhaps I might include also their progenitors, the skindivers, because they are associated. To become a spear-fisherman one usually has to learn the fundamentals of skindiving and in my view spear-fishermen and skindivers are a group of people who need our support. In this category I do not include the irresponsible type; I mean those who belong to clubs and really enjoy spear-fishing and displaying all the characteristics that we feel our Australian manhood possess.

I shall give a couple of examples to show what I mean when I say that these people should be supported. During the last fortnight a man fishing with his grandson north of Carnarvon was rescued by a young teacher who was holidaying there. I knew this young man well—as a matter of fact I used to teach him—and certain aspects of his character were those of courage and a willingness at all times to help anybody.

The man who was fishing off the rocks was washed into the water and got into difficulties. The young teacher to whom

I have referred put on his flippers and went in after him. To give members some idea of what the conditions were like at the time, the newspaper report stated that the currents were treacherous and the breakers were huge. Everybody in the water was in danger of being crushed on the jagged reefs.

It took this young fellow an hour to get the man he was rescuing out of the water, and I believe the valuable spear-fishing training he had made that possible. Therefore, if he had not allowed himself to be engaged in this hazardous pastime it would not have been possible for him to save a life.

Taking into consideration that aspect alone I would suggest that we should show the utmost tolerance towards these people. One of them wrote to me recently concerning the area mentioned by the Minister in his speech, that was to be the subject of a proclamation in the *Government Gazette*. The Minister said that examples which may be quoted are bans to be placed at Scarborough Beach, Trigg Island, Mettam's Pool, Hammersley Pool, North Beach, and Watermans Bay.

I would say that the ordinary man in the street reading a proclamation in the *Government Gazette* proclaiming an area, or the boundaries of an area, would get a completely wrong idea of what was meant by the proclamation. For instance, taking one of the Minister's examples, the ordinary person would merely read that the proclamation covered that portion of the Indian Ocean bounded from some point in the south to Trigg Island in the north and so on, and would naturally conclude that if he spear-fished anywhere in that area he would be in trouble.

I saw the Minister and got his opinion on the matter and I am pleased to say that he is most sympathetic towards these men, who will be allowed ingress into and egress from the water in these areas, provided they keep well away from bathers and behave in a way normally expected of well-disciplined and responsible people. If they comply with these conditions they will not be interfered with.

In the stop press of yesterday morning's issue of *The West Australian*, I read the following report:—

Papeete (Tahiti): Australia's Ron Taylor has won the individual title in the world underwater fishing championships here.

There is one man, in the field of spear-fishing, who has given this country an international reputation, which, I think, adds to Australia's prestige. I used to know a young man very well—I still communicate with him—who was one of the pioneers in the field of skindiving; and, on two or three occasions, his prowess in this field proved to be of assistance to the Government of the day. When

dredging operations were being conducted prior to the construction of the Narrows Bridge, the dredging gear broke down on one occasion, and this young man was sent for and was asked to clear from the pipes the obstruction that had been encountered by the dredge. A rope was tied to his feet and he eventually came up with a fluke of an anchor which had probably been there for 50 or 60 years. After he had removed this obstruction those concerned were able to continue with their dredging.

Another job he was called upon to do was the cleaning of the sluice gates at Mundaring Weir. He and his partner carried out this work in a day, whereas previously it was a week's work to cart the gear to the site and rig it up so that the cleaning could be performed. I have mentioned those incidents because the lad concerned is my own son, and therefore I am very keen to give these men a good build-up because I think they deserve our encouragement. I agree that this is a necessary amendment for the purpose of disciplining their operations. Nevertheless, I believe that at all times we should be prepared to encourage young men who develop the characteristics of our race and who, I think, set a good example to others, especially those who engage in spear-fishing. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 26th August, on the following motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [8.46 p.m.]: This is a Bill to which, I think, we can quite safely give our good wishes because, in the main, it has been designed to tighten up some of the forms of registration of births and the conditions appertaining thereto, which I think is most necessary.

One of the most interesting features in the Bill is the suggestion that there should be a Commonwealth-wide investigation into the question of individuals born alive after the 20th week of gestation. Previously the time for registration of a birth

was after 28 weeks' gestation, but now it has been reduced to 20 weeks. Following the passing of this Bill, the research which will be made possible will be done by computer, and it is interesting to note that the Commonwealth Government is co-operating by providing the computer. The provisions of this Bill will also require an increased number of registrars who will have placed upon their shoulders the duties of administering this Act.

These registrars will simply have to forward the information that they have obtained of the registration of births to the Registrar-General, because all the results of the investigations will have to go through some form of headquarters to be fed to the computer. This could produce a good deal of evidence of the number of individuals born alive after 20 weeks of gestation and who survive, and also evidence of those who do not survive. This may open up a considerable new area of research in the field of obstetrics.

I am wondering why the period of 20 weeks has been chosen—possibly because of the basis of investigation that has already been done. However, there is still room for further investigation into the termination of pregnancy before the 20th week, because a good deal of interest has been aroused in the gynaecological and obstetrics field in the failure of pregnancy before the 20th week.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: What about after the 20th week?

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: After the 20th week an entirely new problem arises. Also, after 20 weeks the causes of death could be considerably multiplied. This will produce a good deal of work in the computer field, but I should have thought that, to make the whole thing complete, information on the terminations of pregnancies treated by members of the medical profession before the 20th week would give a complete picture of the story of gestation.

This will go a long way towards adding to the knowledge in this field, and I think it is a Bill that we can quite well applaud. The value of the measure, of course, is that it will be Commonwealth-wide, and accordingly it will be of greater value than if the information were compiled in one State.

It is of interest to note that any research grows in value according to the number of cases that are reported for investigation. That is one drawback we have in this State, at the moment, with our small population. It is difficult for us to make any really worth-while studies in types of diseases which are at all rare, because we do not produce the number in this State to make a very satisfactory estimation, or to reach any point of agreement. Therefore it is only when we have these large figures to

go by that we can really rely on the findings. This, now being done on a Commonwealth-wide basis, should give us a great deal more knowledge than we have had in the past.

I would also like to applaud the fact that although the Registrar-General has the right to say "No" to a person who requires the registration of a birth, the Bill does not take away the right from the individual to appeal, finally, to the Minister. I do think, however, that it is correct to give to the Registrar-General the right to say that he does not think a request is being made in conformity with the Act. Under the provisions of the Bill the Registrar-General has the right to refuse such a request.

The measure gives an added protection to the individual, to the child who is registered, and to the parents. I think some added changes will be envisaged in the future, and possibly some more changes as a result of research that is being undertaken. Speaking generally to the Bill, I would like to say that I give it my whole support.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee.

House adjourned at 8.53 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 7th September, 1965

CONTENTS

BILLS—	Page
Architects Act Amendment Bill—Report	705
Broad Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	707
Com.	709
Report	709
Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment Bill—Report	705
Coal Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill—3r.	705
Health Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	709
Com. ; Report	710
Housing Loan Guarantee Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	705
Message : Appropriations	706
Jetties Act Amendment Bill—2r.	706
Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	711
Com. ; Report	711
Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	710
Com. ; Report	711
Police Act Amendment Bill—3r.	705
State Tender Board Bill—	
Intro. ; 1r.	705
Tuberculosis (Commonwealth and State Arrangement) Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r.	706

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—

Air Pollution : Kwinana and Cockburn Sound Area—	
Control by Clean Air Act	696
Industries Concerned	696
Medina : Policing of Preventive Measures	696
Sulphur Oxide : Emissions	696
Boats in Coastal Waters—	
Losses and Types	702
Loss of Life	702
Rescues : Number	702
Charitable Appeals : Collections at Polling Centres	701
Courthouse at Fremantle : Hearings—	
Delays : Effects	700
New Building	700
Roster of Cases	700
Decentralisation—Implementation : Government Plan	702
Employment for Youth in Country Areas : Lack of Opportunities and Social Effects	702
Harbour, Esperance—	
Dredging—	
Adherence to Original Plan ..	697
Area and Depth	697
Completion	696
Wharf—	
Completion	697
Connection with Railway Link	697
Industrial Development—	
Financial Assistance from Government	703
Industries Assisted : Details	703
Land—	
Avon Locations : Inkpen Estate—	
Release for Agricultural Purposes	702
Timber Available : Wundowie	
Charcoal Iron and Steel Interest	702
Housing Commission Land at Woodlands—	
Building Lots	704
Subdivisional Plan : Tabling	704
Kalamunda—Revaluations : Method	696
Mines Regulation Act—Permits under Section 45 : Number Granted, and Conditions	699
Superphosphate : Lakes Area—	
Deliveries from Esperance Works	701
Inclusion in Esperance Port Zone	701
Water Supplies at Albany : Enlargement by Linking of Neighbouring Streams, etc.	696
Workers' Compensation—	
Pneumoconiosis Committee—Evidence of Kalgoorlie Medical Practitioners : Omission from Transcript	697
Pneumoconiosis Claims—	
No. MP. 1238	698
No. MP. 2675	698
Numbers Not Receiving Payment	700
Silicosis Claims : Government Policy	697

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—

Boat Safety Regulations : Gazetteal	705
Lotteries Conducted by Charitable Organisations—	
Forms : Tabling	704
Rules : Alteration	704
Railway Crossing at Market Street, Guildford—	
Files : Tabling	704
Flashing Lights : Provision	704