Mr. COURT: I have them marked specially for that purpose. We have brought into this Parliament variations to agreements that have been written by this Government because we could not vary them within the terms of the variation clause. There is nothing new or novel in this clause.

As for the Leader of the Opposition suggesting we are trying to do our best to be offensive to Parliament in this sort of thing, the fact is we bring these agreements here and Parliament can reject them. Nothing we can do can take this power away.

The Leader of the Opposition is correct when he says that this type of agreement is brought to Parliament because of necessary variations of the laws—sometimes laws that are completely outmoded for our modern industry and mining progress. I would remind the honourable member that the Ministers of this Government sign dozens of agreements that Parliament never sees, just as he did when he was a Minister. There is hardly a week goes by when practically all the Ministers do not sign agreements in some form or another. Some are complex and some are simple, but they do not come here because the Statutes concerned provide the conditions under they will operate.

The variation clauses of the agreements brought to Parliament are necessary from time to time in the ordinary course of commercial negotiation, bearing in mind the variation provides for mutual consent. It is not done at the whim or fancy of the Government or the company. These variations can be made for the purpose of—

> implementing or facilitating the carrying out of such provisions or for the purpose of facilitating the carrying out of some separate part or parts of the Corporation's operations hereunder by an associated company as a separate and distinct operation or for the establishment or development of any industry making use of the minerals within the mineral lease or by-products of any plant of the Corporation established hereunder or making other use of such of the Corporation's works installations services or facilities the subject of this Agreement as shall have been provided by the Corporation in the course of work done hereunder.

Anyone interpreting that fairly would come to the conclusion—and I do not put myself up as does the Leader of the Opposition as an interpreter of the law—

Mr. Tonkin: Well, you ought to. You have been engaged in making it long enough.

Mr. COURT: If I want the law interpreted from a legal point of view I pay someone who is qualified to interpret it.

Mr. Tonkin: What is the meaning of this word "implement"?

Mr. COURT: It means to perform or to make it work.

Mr. Tonkin: That is right.

Mr. COURT: That is right. No-one will ever convince the Leader of the Opposition, but if he looks at the clause he will see that it provides that the agreement can be varied for special purposes, and no more.

Mr. Tonkin: For the purpose of implementing this.

Mr. COURT: I say here and now that unless we have a clause like this it will be completely impractical. For instance, if no such clause were included and Western Mining found it could get another by-product from its plant, we would have to come back to Parliament before the company could use the by-product for the good of the industry and the State; and this would be quite stupid.

Schedule put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 10.33 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 11th September, 1968

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

QUESTIONS (6): ON NOTICE

ACCIDENTS INVOLVING SPOUSE

Payments by Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust

1. The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE asked the Minister for Local Government:

   (1) What number of cases has the Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust dealt with since the 1966 amendment which involves the trust in liability where the spouse is the injured party in the following instances:—

   (a) where the vehicle is uninsured and the trust has paid in full to the injured party;

   (b) where the vehicle uninsured involved spouse *versus* spouse and the injured party has been paid in full?

(2) (a) What was the amount paid under (1) (a); and

(b) what was the amount paid under (1) (b)?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON (for The Hon. L. A. Logan) replied:

(1) Nil.

(2) Answered by (1).

MITCHELL FREEWAY

Safeguards

2. The Hon. J. DOLAN asked the Minister for Town Planning:

(1) What provisions have been made on the freeway between Murray Street and Mount Street for the circumstance where vehicles become immobile?

(2) What protection against falling into the freeway will be afforded people using the garden area between Parliament House and the freeway?

(3) What purpose is served by the fence on the garden area in the centre of the freeway in front of Parliament House?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON (for The Hon. L. A. Logan) replied:

(1) Four breakdown lanes, one on each side of both carriageways, will be provided in this section and, in addition, emergency telephone installations will be provided.

(2) Landscape development plans being prepared by the Public Works Department do not provide for people to use this area.

(3) Pedestrians entering the Hay Street off-ramp in error will be protected from falling into the garden area some eight feet below and thus kept away from the freeway traffic.

LAND AT KAMBALDA

Release

3. The Hon. J. J. GARRIGAN asked the Minister for Mines:

Does the Government intend to release residential lots of land at Kambalda to private individuals?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

No. Under the agreement between the State and Western Mining Corporation, the whole of Kambalda townsite has been leased to the corporation for residential, commercial, and industrial purposes with the right to apply for freehold of each lot when developed in accordance with conditions specified.

TENDERS

Disparity

4. The Hon. N. E. BAXTER asked the Minister for Mines:

With reference to the article headed "Govt. Concerned over Disparity in Tenders," published in *The West Australian* on Saturday, the 7th September, 1968—

(1) Would the Minister agree that—

(a) the disparity in tenders of Beazley Homes Ltd. of New Zealand and that of local companies is enormous; and

(b) the article indicates that my reference to the unreasonable cost of public buildings during the debate on the Supply Bill has quite a lot of substance in view of the fact that the article states "Without consulting their books, the local companies immediately cut more than $500,000 from their quote."?

(2) Does the Government intend to have the disparity in tenders examined, to ascertain the cost and profit factors of local quotes?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) (a) and (b) The Government is naturally perturbed at the considerable difference between the local and New Zealand tenders for the homes at Dampier and Tom Price, but it must be appreciated that this is only one tender within a number of very large projects in the north where the major part of the residential and other building contracts have been won by local firms.

It is reasonable to assume that the New Zealand competition will have an effect on local tenders and bring about a reassessment of methods and costing which will enable the local firms to win these contracts—as is the desire of the Government and the companies concerned.

(2) See answer to (1). It should be appreciated that the contract won by Beazley Homes, and which has achieved a considerable degree of publicity, is between two private companies. It does not involve any cost to the Government. It is therefore hardly

appropriate for the Government to intervene in the manner suggested by the honourable member in a matter that is essentially one between business firms.

WOOD RIVER STATION

Access Road

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

What action has been taken to provide an access road to Wood River Station in East Kimberley, as requested by A. W. & R. V. Stanley, the pastoral lessees?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

The lessees of Wood River Station have only recently raised this problem and the matter has been referred to the Main Roads Department to ascertain its road proposals in the area which could assist the Lands Department in determining a location for the proposed road.

The actual provision of an access road will need to be taken up with the local shire or the Main Roads Department by the lessees.

POLICE OFFICERS

Precautionary Measures at Scene of Accidents

6. The Hon. G. E. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Is the Minister for Traffic aware that recently, on a busy suburban highway, two police officers measuring up after a traffic accident, were nearly run down by the driver of a car who was temporarily blinded by the lights of approaching cars?

(2) Will the department take the necessary precautionary action to ensure in the future when such work is required to be performed at night, or when visibility is not good during the day, that officers wear distinctively coloured apparel, or alternatively that suitable warning signs be exhibited to alleviate the risk referred to in (1)?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) No. If the honourable member will advise the date and location of the accident, inquiries will be made.

(2) Motor vans used by the accident inquiry staff are equipped with flashing lights and warning signs. As these are provided solely for the purpose of giving warning that police officers are working at the scene of an accident, it is not proposed to supply distinctive clothing.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

ACCIDENTS INVOLVING SPOUSE

Payments by Motor Vehicle Insurance Trust

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE asked the Minister for Local Government:

In view of the reply given to question 1 on today's notice paper, I wish to make the position crystal clear. Instead of making one part of the answer consequent upon the other, I ask him now, definitely, whether there has been any case since the inception of the 1966 spouse *versus* spouse provision whereby an uninsured driver has been before the trust, and has the trust been involved in any expenditure?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

I have not been in my office since 8.55 this morning. I received the answers to Mr. Willesee's question in my office at Parliament House this afternoon. The information given to me by the secretary was that the manager of the trust had stated that answers to the two questions were relatively the same and, accordingly, he gave that answer. If the Leader of the Opposition is not satisfied, I am prepared to go back and make sure that the right answers have been given to the questions he asked. I cannot give the information off the cuff, but I am quite prepared to make sure of the answers given to the questions asked.

BILLS (2): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Housing Advances (Contracts with Infants) Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by The Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Justice), and read a first time.

2. Nurses Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health), and read a first time.

BILLS (3): THIRD READING

1. Road and Air Transport Commission Act Amendment Bill.

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

2. Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill.

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), and transmitted to the Assembly.

3. Artificial Breeding Board Act Amendment Bill.

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

COMMONWEALTH AND STATE HOUSING AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [4.49 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [4.50 p.m.]: As the Bill deals with money allocated to building societies under the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement, I wish to raise several matters relating to the agreements made between the societies and the individuals who borrow money from them so that they can be brought to the notice of the Minister.

One of the matters which was brought to my notice relates to a compulsory agreement, and there are several anomalies in it which I believe warrant some attention. The first of these anomalies is that when the agreement was signed a copy of it was not handed to one of the principal parties; namely, the person borrowing the money, despite the fact that a copy was requested. Later, when the home was nearing completion, the builder was paid the final instalment before the house was actually completed.

I also support the remarks made by Mr. Wise during the second reading of the Bill, when he said that funds seem to be more readily available to some builders than to others. I have the names of some builders who participate in this practice. Perhaps the directorates of some of these terminating societies should be examined to ascertain whether certain builders are members of the boards.

The fourth matter I consider should be examined is that in the agreement of which I am speaking the insurance on the building was tied to a particular insurance company. Such a practice restricts the freedom of the home buyer by preventing his obtaining the best insurance terms possible.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [4.53 p.m.]: The matters raised by Mr. Claughton are incidental to those actually handled by the building societies and do not relate to the principle of the Bill which was discussed yesterday; that is, the taking over of the assets of the mortgage. All I can suggest is that as the cases mentioned by Mr. Claughton are specific instances of complaint in certain areas, if the honourable member will commit them to paper, supplying the names and the dates, I will forward them to the appropriate authority and suggest that an investigation be made.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATE TRADING CONCERNS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), and passed.

BILLS (2): REPORT

1. Trustees Act Amendment Bill.
2. Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance Surcharge) Act Amendment Bill.

Reports of Committees adopted.

HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [4.56 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Families of moderate means, having limited funds available as a deposit on a home, are assisted towards home ownership under the provisions of the Housing Loan Guarantee Act. The State guarantees the repayment of advances made by an approved lending authority where those advances conform to specific terms and conditions as agreed to by the Minister for Housing.

This is an encouragement to investment in housing through building societies and other approved institutions. Furthermore, building societies and other approved institutions are indemnified against default on the part of the home purchaser if the home building loan conforms to the specifications laid down in the Act. Currently these requirements are as stated in section 7B of the Act.

Briefly, loans come under three main categories, these being—

95 per cent of the value of the house and land where the value of the house only does not exceed $6,000; or

90 per cent. of the value of the house and land where the value of the house only does not exceed $8,000; or

80 per cent. of the value of the house and land where the value of the house only does not exceed $10,000;

but in no case can the maximum loan exceed $9,600.

These requirements were promulgated to permit high ratio loans for lower cost houses to provide greater assistance to persons with limited finance available for a deposit. Over the past 12 months, however, 83 per cent. of homes financed from guaranteed funds cost between $8,000 and $10,000, requiring at least a 20 per cent. deposit. No loans were arranged in respect of house values alone not exceeding $6,000.

Existing conditions and requirements have now been reviewed in order to permit higher ratio loans as a general rule, which explains the reason for introducing this Bill. Recognition of the differing levels of house costs in the metropolitan region, the north, and other country areas is apparent in its clauses.

The Bill firstly provides that, in the metropolitan region, up to 95 per cent. of the value of the house and land may be loaned if the value of the house alone does not exceed $10,000, but with a maximum loan of $10,000.

Secondly, it provides that outside the metropolitan region, south of the 26th parallel, loans may be made up to 95 per cent. of the value of the house and land if the value of the house alone does not exceed $11,000, but with a maximum loan of $10,000.

Finally, north of the 26th parallel, loans may be made up to 95 per cent. of the value of the house and land if the value of the house alone does not exceed $17,500, but with a maximum loan of $13,000.

Advances totalling $14,100,000 from approved lending authorities have been made since the 1st July, 1959, and guaranteed by the State. From these funds, 2,079 families have been assisted in the purchase of their own homes. The passing of this amending Bill will enable more homes to be built as part of the current drive to overcome some difficulties in housing finance. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [5 p.m.]: I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

This piece of legislation, which has been introduced to Parliament, has, as its main objective, provisions which will enable the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Board to put to use, by way of extending sewerage services, the unused loan allocations of local authorities.

Provision is also made to enable the board to take over sewerage works which may be constructed under local authority's powers and, also, to carry out such works by this means or by overdraft.

It is further proposed that the board be authorised to acquire, without payment of compensation, main drainage works carried out by developers. Also, the board will be authorised to recover the cost of making good damage caused to main drains.

And, finally, an appropriate amendment is included in this measure to cover a procedure which is being practised with respect to the allowance of water made in connection with the payment due.

Complementary legislation has been introduced to amend the Public Health Act, to allow a local authority to raise an overdraft for the purpose of providing sewers or works connected with sewers, which may be disposed of to the board.

While the board has power to acquire property under the provisions of the Act, it is proposed, without limiting this general power, to authorise the board specifically to purchase from a local authority any sewers or works connected with sewers, which may have been constructed from money borrowed by the local authority, either by way of loan or overdraft. Recently we passed certain amendments to the Local Government Act which contained the same kind of provision. Terms, upon which the works may be acquired by the board from the local authority, will be those to which the authority is committed upon the raising of the loan or upon the granting to it of the overdraft which finances the works.

There is a section to be inserted into the Act to provide for the board to acquire sewers or works provided from local authorities' funds. It will be seen, upon reference to the Bill, that this proposed section sets out the powers to be given to the board to purchase from a local authority any sewers or works connected with sewerage that have been constructed with money borrowed by the local authority under division III of part XXVI of the Local Government Act, 1960, or by funds made available to the local authority through an overdraft under division II of the same Act, and which are vested in the local authority pursuant to section 53 of the Health Act, 1911.

This new provision requires that the Metropolitan Water Board accept the liability for the repayment of the loan on such terms as it was raised by the local authority, or repayment of the overdraft on such terms as the overdraft was given or arranged.

The intention is that any transaction of this nature will be carried out only at the mutual wish or desire of the local authority and the water board.

With respect to drainage works, there is an amendment to cover the actual practice in operation of acquiring main drainage works which have been carried out by developers generally or as a condition of subdivision.

The board is at present authorised to acquire a constituted main drain or any part, and the whole of the pipe, conduit, or channel already in existence from a local authority without compensation. The amendment in this Bill extends this power of the board in relation to any person as well as to a local authority. In such cases, the work is generally provided as a condition of subdivision. As indicated earlier, the practice being followed is that which the Bill now proposes, so that it will be covered by Statute.

The measure which we are now considering also authorises the cancellation of part of a main drain, as well as a main drain. It makes provision also for the allocation of excess water charges. The Act requires, at present, that a notification be given to the board of change of ownership or occupation. The purpose of this is to permit of the allocation of excess water charges amongst consumers. When change of occupation is not notified to the board, meters are not read; and it has been the practice to allocate excess water charges according to the period of occupation. This is done on a rough sort of formula. It is now proposed that, in these circumstances, the board may assess the quantity of excess water to an owner or occupier, thereby giving statutory authority to an existing practice.

Another amendment requires that the allowance of water made in respect of the rate levied should attach to the land and not to an owner or occupier or, indeed, to any particular period of occupation. As the parent Act stands at present, an owner or occupier of the rated land is entitled to a supply of water in respect of the rates on the land.

It will be appreciated, however, that it is not practicable to allocate the water allowed for rates month by month, or period by period, over the rating year, because the allowance is not in any way concerned with the period of water usage, nor whether the rates are actually paid at the time.

The practice of the board has been to assess excess only after all water allowed for rates has been consumed, irrespective of whether land changes ownership or not. It is now proposed to amend the Act for the purpose of setting out that the water allowed for the rate on the land is not apportionable between successive owners or occupiers, and that any succeeding owner or occupier is entitled to the quantity of water allowed for rates still remaining when he acquires ownership or becomes the occupier. Thus, any adjustment of quantities of rebate water should be left to individuals to work out when a change of ownership takes place, because it is impracticable for the board to apportion rebate water over periods of time within the rating year.

The board, under its by-laws, determines the quantity of water allowed for rates charged. The powers of the board in this regard are limited, however, to the making of by-laws regarding the amount of water allowed for rates that are paid. However, the general provisions in the Act, authorising the allowance of water for rates, are not related to payment. Hence an amendment in this connection will eliminate the restriction for making by-laws only in respect of those cases where rates are paid.

And, finally, the amendment enabling the board to recover costs of repairing damage to metropolitan main drains, where damage is caused by, or arising out of contravention of section 71(E), is commended to members.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan.

POISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 10th September.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [5.8 p.m.]: I do not disclaim anything that appears in the Bill, but I do not like it. Yet it might be a necessity. In the introductory speech of the Minister he said—

> From time to time in the past, circumstances have arisen which have justified the withdrawal of this authority for specified periods.

I take it those are the periods of the sale of various drugs. He went on to say—

> Legal advice on this matter is that there is no power within the Act to withdraw this authority. The matter was considered by the Poisons Advisory Committee.

I am wondering whether power now exists to cancel the sale of drugs by qualified people, such as pharmacists.

That brings me to the point that we might be just playing with this question. If there is a dangerous drug, it should be banned and it should not be allowed to come into the State. Perhaps the Minister will investigate the position in order to determine how much of the drug—Relaxa-tabs——is obtainable in this State. A pharmaceutical assistant has told me that he has not had a call for any of the drugs of this type for a long period; and this person has been operating in his particular suburb for many years.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The section of the Act on which you are speaking has no reference to Relaxa-tabs.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: How far does the Minister intend to go with drugs such as those?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They do not come into the Bill at all. Regulations are being framed to enable the sale of these drugs over the counter, but the purchasers have to sign for them.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The sales are being recorded by the pharmacists, because they keep books in which the purchasers sign for these drugs.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: If they have such books, it should be pointed out that they are not required, because that is not a statutory requirement as yet.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Some of the pharmacists keep such books, and I do not think there is anything wrong in doing that. When drugs such as these are really of no benefit to human beings, are we sometimes not acting like schoolboys in relation to banning their sale within Western Australia? I do not know whether the sales can be prohibited, because the drugs are imported from the Eastern States, and maybe from other countries. It does not present a nice picture when we have to impose more and more restrictions on the individual. I am in agreement with the Minister, in that something has to be done to control the sale of these drugs.

To go back to the Relaxa-tabs, there are many chemists who stock this drug; and people who purchase it are required to sign a record of the purchase. The purchasers are aware that this drug has to be used in the proper manner. I have been consulting some of my pharmaceutical friends on this matter, and it was pointed out to me that if a person wanted Relaxa-tabs he could obtain them readily. All he has to do is to read carefully the conditions under which they are to be used; if he did that he would not be in any difficulty.

I am certain there are districts in which trouble over the sale of drugs has arisen, but this does not apply to the whole of our community. If a drug is sold to responsible citizens who want to use it in the proper manner then such sale should be permitted. If there is any way in which I can help the Minister to prohibit the sale of drugs which are of no value to the individual, which do not provide any relief, and which have a very deleterious effect, then I will be pleased to do so. On many occasions when drugs have come into this State I felt something should be done about them.

Power should be available to ban drugs such as these. If necessary, steps should be taken at the meetings of the advisory council, which are attended by the Minister, to ascertain whether the other States also take the view that the sale and the entry of these drugs cannot be prohibited. In saying that I am not being critical. We should deal with this matter as a separate body of people. When a drug causes a great deal of concern to the Public Health Department we should face up to the situation; and if a difficulty arises then the whole populace should be told that they should not touch the drug. There are hundreds of drugs which could be used, instead of the ones I am referring to. Some of these drugs have a deleterious effect and a hold on people.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Are you referring to the Relaxa-tabs or to the barbiturates?

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I was talking about illicit drugs. If illicit drugs are causing the trouble, I think the people who sell them would admit that they do not want to cause any trouble.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Is not the trouble that some of them are illicit in some circumstances, but licit in other circumstances?

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Yes, but the whole situation is completely different between their being illicit and licit. The pharmacists, and everybody else associated with these drugs, do not want to sell them, and there should be considerable control over their sale.

Before the drug is taken off the pharmaceutical list there should be a conference between the profession and the pharmacists because I think it would be agreed that certain drugs should not be called upon. In that way, I feel we could get together and take a real stand to preserve the health of the individuals for whom we feel so sorry. Those people try out these drugs in an attempt to make them forget their troubles. If this Bill will assist those people I will be very grateful.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 10th September.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [5.17 p.m.]: In speaking to the Criminal Code Amendment Bill I think it is vital to observe that the Criminal Code is amended usually at least once in the life of every Parliament. That is quite understandable when one realises the liberal extent of the coverage in the schedule to the principal Act. Indeed, I think it would be correct, too, to say that the Criminal Code of 1902—with its 750 sections, approximately; its amendments; its rules; and the Secret Commissions Act—must be one of the most remarkable of our Statutes.

As members who have need to refer to the Criminal Code will know, it is included in one volume of the printed Statutes. The index to the Code covers 118 pages, and

the Criminal Practice Rules are set out in 139 pages in the same volume. All this compilation is found to be necessary for the control of crime in our community. I concede that very much of it, in the light of present-day circumstances, is redundant. I think it should be admitted, too, that very much of it is wholly inappropriate to the circumstances of the way of life of today. I will not weary the House by referring to some of the most remarkable inclusions in this present year, to cover practices and crime of 50 or more years ago; but they are there.

Through the centuries vast changes have occurred in the interpretation of what should be, in a sense of justice, a punishment to fit the crime. It is not very long ago, in an historical sense, since the stealing of a hare was a crime sufficiently important to warrant the deportation of the person who stole the hare. I think it could be said that in instances such as that the punishment certainly did not fit the crime. I think it will be found in the Bible, in the Book of Deuteronomy, that an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, and other prescribed penalties for criminal acts, clearly set out what a fitting punishment was thought to be in those days.

If I were in better voice perhaps I could sing the theme from the Mikado referring to the punishment fitting the crime. However, not being in sufficiently good singing voice, I will not weary you, Mr. President.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I doubt your capacity to get a reasonably good chorus.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I, like others, do not like to see members walking out of the Chamber when I am singing, or even reading.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We might find it difficult to find a punishment to fit the crime.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: To return to the serious vein: From time to time it is found necessary for Parliament to review the rules and to vary the type of criminal acts regarded in the law, and to adjust the penalties. That is what this Bill presumes to do. To what extent penalties, whether penalties by way of heavy fines or by imprisonment, deter the criminal, I have never yet been able to decide.

To the hardened criminal I would think it would be very doubtful whether, in the carrying out of his criminal life, the penalty is uppermost in his mind when he considers committing a crime. I would think his consideration would be whether there was any risk of his being found out, or any risk of his being branded as an habitual criminal. I would think that in most cases where people consider breaking the law—the law as effected and governed by penalties in the Criminal Code, which determines an act of crime—the thought is whether there is any likelihood of the action being discovered. Second to that, perhaps, in the case of lesser crimes or lesser actions, the thought would be towards the fine to be imposed. In the case of drunken driving, I think the thought is the fear of publicity, as well as the loss of a driving license, which decides whether a person shall have an extra one or two for the road, or none at all.

In the case of the lesser crime—people who do not habitually do things with criminal intent—I think it is a fair assumption that it is not the size of the fine or the length of the term of imprisonment which the law invokes—or can invoke—that decides whether the crime shall be committed. I think the main consideration is the thought of being found out and the publicity which the person will suffer which makes him decide, very often, what he will do.

The points I am discussing, naturally, are involved in some of the clauses in this Bill—the size of the penalty, and whether publicity should be given in one instance for one sort of offence. In looking at the Bill very closely, I think it could be said that the amendment to section 586 of the Criminal Code—that is, clause 17—appears to be wholly right in the practice that is proposed.

There are very many sections in the Code where the lack of clarity of meaning might readily allow the release of an obviously guilty person because of a technicality, or the wording of the law. As Mr. Medcalf said last evening, I think this amendment must have an effect in determining that a person charged with a crime, and apparently obviously guilty of one or more criminal acts, would not be released as could be the case at the moment.

The day-to-day experiences in the courts clearly indicate a few frailties in the Criminal Code. Before leaving that point, I say that enormous work needs to be done in an examination of the Criminal Code to see what revision can be made to remove from the Code all the redundancies and all the obsolete provisions it contains. I do not know how the Minister will ever get around to such an examination.

Clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill deal with those very nasty people, the blackmailers and the extortionists, and this matter certainly requires very serious consideration by the Chamber. Those very nasty people who, by various means extort or gain from threats, will now be covered by new wording influenced by the change in wording in the Queensland Criminal Code.

The penalty remains the same—namely, 14 years with hard labour. Whether that be a punishment to fit the crime is, of course, a matter of opinion. A number of blackmailers have, both in fiction and in

fact, been people of apparent respectability. Quite often, people who have extorted goods or cash from other people, when found out, are discovered to be quite respectable citizens.

Nothing should be done to prevent the brightest searchlight being directed on such people, and on the methods they use. That brings me to the point that I am dissatisfied with clause 4 of the Bill. There must be—and I speak only as a layman—a provision somewhere in the law to enable our respected judiciary to prohibit the disclosure of a person's name in certain circumstances.

If we are to preserve the identity of either a criminal or a Crown witness in such a case, there must be considerable doubt as to the desirability of such a practice. We should look at what is represented in the sections affected by this amendment; namely, sections 396, 397, and 398. The respective descriptive marginal notes are—

> Demanding property with menaces with intent to steal.
>
> Demanding property by written threats.
>
> Attempts at extortion by threats.

Those three sections of the Code are now to be amended; but, as they stand, it is clearly stated what a person may not do in regard to extortion.

I could concede that a person who has been blackmailed, or threatened with blackmail or extortion, would be very diffident about disclosing what a fool he had been, firstly, in giving the blackmailer cause for blackmail; and secondly, for answering to his response. However, I am very doubtful as to the wisdom of excluding publicity of all kinds—as is prescribed in clause 4—in order to protect a person who may be fearful, or have other reasons for not wanting to come forward to lodge a complaint. I would very much prefer to see that clause out of the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Altogether?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Altogether. We should let the system stand that if His Honour, the judge who is determining the case, or hearing it, decides in his wisdom that a person's name should be withheld and his identity preserved, this should be the continuing rule. It happens now and the Press respect that sort of request and do not apply any pressure.

I think the amendment could make the scope too wide in connection with crimes covered by this clause, and it could be applied in far too wide a sense. In my opinion it must be regarded as a rather dangerous clause.

Other clauses in the measure deal with an increase of the specified fines for different crimes, such as stealing cattle and other kinds of stealing, false promises, and so on. These are very important clauses but whereas an amount equivalent to $100 was considered to be an adequate punishment to befit the crime in 1913, when the consolidation of the Statute was made, it is certainly not adequate in today's circumstances that the fine should be a maximum of $300.

Today I asked two gentlemen who occupy different positions in the financial world what their comparison of a fine of £50 in 1913 would be with a fine today. It appears the ratio would be one to five. If that information is in any way reliable, the fines proposed in the Bill are being reduced from those which were imposed in 1913. It would be nearer the mark if fines of $600 were included in the Bill. I consider that a figure of $300 is not sufficient when making amendments to these very old provisions, considering the size of the fine which was thought to be a deterrent in 1913.

I wonder why there is the need to vary the verbiage of section 378, which is proposed by clause 2 of the Bill. The subsection which is being amended reads—

> If the thing stolen is any of the things following, that is to say:—A horse, mare, gelding, ass, mule, camel, bull, cow, ox, ram, ewe, or wether or the young of any such animal, the offender is liable to imprisonment with hard labour for seven years.

Now we propose to say—

> If the thing stolen is an animal (not being a cat or dog) valued at more than three hundred dollars or if a number of animals (excluding cats and dogs) valued, in the aggregate, at more than three hundred dollars is stolen, the offender is liable to imprisonment with hard labour for seven years.

The proposed penalty remains the same as it is in the Statute, but now a value is being fixed on the commodity stolen. I suggest it does not matter whether the beasts being stolen—and it applies, I presume, mostly to cattle and sheep—number 50 or 150.

A prescribed value is now included to the effect that if the beasts are worth more than $300, the people who have stolen them are liable to imprisonment with hard labour for seven years. I wonder why the changes have been made?—namely, to bring in the value, to avoid specifying the sort of thing being stolen, and excluding cats and dogs. I would like the Minister, if he is able, to amplify the reasons for these changes and for the inclusion of the amount of $300. In the past there have been amendments to the Droving Act and other Acts affecting the carrying of sheep and cattle in order to prevent the stealing of sheep and cattle, but those amendments appear to have been ineffective, in so far as the fines provided

for have been insufficient to control the menace of the sheep stealer. Surely the crime of stealing 50 sheep is just as great as that of stealing 150 sheep. In my view it does not matter whether they are worth $300 or $150, if the act is committed with criminal intent to steal.

We know how it is done. The thieves back the truck in, with the apron over the fence, and a good dog rounds up the sheep and runs them into the vehicle. It is simply done and it is still being done very frequently. In my opinion it does not matter what the number is—whether it be 20, 50, or 100 beasts—nor does it matter whether they are old ewes or pedigreed rams; if the intention is to steal it is that which should be analysed when altering law of this form.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What you are really saying is that the punishment would fit the crime if the punishment is the same for stealing one sheep as for 50 sheep.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: If the Minister cares to go through the Criminal Code, he will see that variations are specified according to whether something worth, say, $1,000 or something worth lesser amounts is stolen. In many instances he will find that no variation is written into the Act, but he will see that violent variations are written into the Act in many other cases.

In this case it is the action or the practice of stealing cattle and sheep which should be suppressed, and I consider the penalty should be nearly equivalent, no matter what the value of the stock may be.

Mr. Medcalf very interestingly divided the Bill into proportions of intention and I consider he gave a very clear exposition of all the principles represented in it. However, in considering the Bill as a whole I think members will see the justification for the variation that occurs in several of the clauses, although there is very little justification in the case of others.

In the interests of justice, in my view there is no necessity at all for the retention of clause 4 in the Bill. In Committee I may have more to say, but for the time being I support the measure.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Justice) [5.42 p.m.]: First of all, may I thank Mr. Medcalf and Mr. Wise for their examination of the Bill and the useful comments which both members made.

At the outset I should like to say that an examination of the Western Australian Criminal Code has been going on for some time. The Code States of Australia have come together with a view to arriving ultimately at something in the order of a uniform Criminal Code.

When I refer to the Code States, I mean those States which operate under a Criminal Code as distinct from those which operate under a Crimes Act, or some other Act. Probably it will be some time before the whole of the Code is overhauled and is eventually ready; nevertheless, I would like members to know this work has been going on for some time.

In the main, the substance of the Bill and the 17 clauses it contains will probably be subjected to fairly close examination—especially the clauses to which some objection has been indicated—when the Bill is in Committee. With your permission, Mr. President, and with the permission of the House, I should like to let the Bill go through the second reading stage this afternoon and I will deal with the Committee stage on another sitting day. In the meantime I will have the opportunity to examine more closely the points made by members, particularly those made by Mr. Wise this afternoon.

I am bound to say, however, that I think there has been some misconception about the purpose of the Bill. Once again I find myself—and it is not an unusual state of affairs—somewhat at cross-purposes with the daily Press. The Press on this occasion regard my arguments as specious.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Would you object if one of us said that?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, I think I would.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I thought you would.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In general application the word "specious" means "appearing to be true," or "appearing to be fair," but, in fact, being neither. Apparently it is the privilege of the leader writer to remain anonymous, but I sometimes think it is a pity that leader writers continue to remain that way. Often I feel I would like to know the name of a leader writer so that I could ring—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: His neck!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: —him up and have a conversation with him, and perhaps sort out our points of view; and, furthermore, to tell him—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That he is not always right.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: —that he is not always right. I say that without any malice aforethought, because I realise that as members of Parliament, and as Ministers, we can be criticised for the things we do. However, I have no intention of defending what the leader writer has been pleased to call my specious approach to this Bill. I would like members to listen to these words: It is regrettably obvious in cases of blackmail that the victim has usually acted in some way to his discredit. After all, to be the subject of blackmail usually presupposes conduct

which the author does not wish to be publicised. It would be rare indeed to find a blackmailer's victim of blameless character. If the Press are at liberty to publish to the world at large the offensive details of the victim's misdeeds then it would be a brave man who would be prepared to report such a matter; and obviously to do so would achieve the very result which he was prepared to pay a substantial sum of money to avoid.

This was highlighted recently when the Press did not even wait for the commital proceedings but rushed straight into print with a verbatim report of the complaint which stated, with regrettable clarity, the victim's indiscretion. In this situation a blackmailer can make his demands almost with impunity because he can usually rely on his victim not being prepared to report the matter. In short, the publication of details of these charges indicates the need for some protection as provided in this Bill.

I think it is important to bear those words in mind when considering clause 4 and the reason for it. Whether clause 4 goes too far is another matter, one which I might be prepared to debate, and perhaps I might be prepared to give way on some aspects of it. As Mr. Medcalf so rightly pointed out, why should a blackmailer have his name kept from publication in the Press? After all, he is the fellow who should have his name publicised in the Press so that people can see what sort of a person he really is. However, to say it is an extremely bad principle to administer justice in the dark—as was said—is just not factual.

The objective of the clause is not to prohibit the attendance in the court of representatives of the Press. In fact, the clause would not prohibit the publicity of a case appearing before a court if the court decided, in the public interest, it was desirable the case should be publicised in the Press.

If the clause had been worded the other way around, which would be that cases shall be published in the Press, unless the judge said that they shall not be, then in a case lasting an hour, a day, a week, or some other length of time, the Press would not know whether or not the court would direct that the proceedings should not in fact be published. In my view the only way to word a provision of this type, if there is to be any prohibition on the publicity in these cases, is in the form now found in clause 4 of the Bill.

I do not think there is anything really wrong with that except, I repeat, that I am prepared to discuss the issue of whether the name of the blackmailer—and that is the common term used, because I think it is appropriate to the situation—and the names of the other people involved in the case—the solicitors and so on—should be published; but I certainly do not think the name of the victim should be publicised. I agree with Mr. Medcalf; we should go out to try to protect the victims in these cases. As Mr. Wise said, the sort of person who resorts to blackmail is, to say the least, a nasty individual.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Something like that happened in Moora recently.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I gave an example of a recent case.

The Hon. E. C. House: There was one in Bunbury, too.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not think the leader writer of *The West Australian* had a proper appreciation of the matter when he wrote the leading article to which I have referred. I repeat: The proceedings will not be held in secret. They will be open to the Press whose representatives will be able to listen to the cases in the courts and, if the judge decides that in the public interest the proceedings should be published in the Press, he will say so at the conclusion of the case. It would be impossible for him to say at the beginning of a case, or halfway through a case, that the proceedings shall or shall not be published; because up to that time he has not heard the whole case and therefore would not be in a position to decide on the matter. I am a little surprised Mr. Wise thinks the whole of clause 4 should go in view of the explanation I have endeavoured to give.

The Hon. E. C. House: He dealt with clause 4 last night.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: We have finished with that Bill. We are on the Criminal Code. In respect of the other matters raised by Mr. Wise, I would like a little more time to consider some of them, and between—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I think the value of the fine is worth looking at.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I shall certainly look at the question of the fine. I think I can remember being asked at some time, in regard to a particular amendment which involved some penalty, why the monetary penalty was being increased but the time penalty was to remain the same. The answer was that time has not lost its value, but money has. I think that answer is appropriate in this case.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: This occurs about six times in the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, but I think I will leave it on that basis and have a closer look at the remarks made by Mr. Wise and Mr. Medcalf. Neither honourable member opposed the Bill, for which I am grateful, and when clause 4 is dealt with in Committee we can have a more open debate on the matter. I am grateful for the support the Bill has received, and commend it to members.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

NICKEL REFINERY (WESTERN MINING CORPORATION LIMITED) AGREEMENT 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.

METROPOLITAN REGION TOWN PLANNING SCHEME ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 10th September.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [5.57 p.m.]: I agree with all that my leader said about this Bill last evening. To me one of the most serious aspects of the measure is the endeavour, initially, to arrive at some basis for compensation for injurious affection and then, as it were, to scatter to the four winds all ideas of arriving at a value. Then if a person, whom I would call the aggrieved person—the owner of the property—is not satisfied he must go to arbitration.

The Arbitration Act—I think it is of 1895—still contains, as it did so long ago, ample provisions for an attempt to reach a just decision where differences of opinion occur. However, in cases of this kind those provisions do not satisfy the position unless there is a specific reference to the form of arbitration or the course that arbitration will follow.

I say that because I believe that any attempt to measure, in a monetary sense, what is termed in the law as injurious affection is a most difficult matter; in other words, injurious affection is difficult to assess. If injurious affection only meant an interference with business, or with proposals to improve a property, perhaps it would be easy to determine. But injurious affection reaches into the very hearts and lives of the people, and for this no adequate measure of compensation is easy to determine.

Indeed, one could take ideas from determinations of our Supreme Court, where compensation is awarded for all kinds of injuries and disabilities occasioned by some other person. I am sure all members of this Chamber have at times wondered at the large volume of compensation considered to be necessary to meet the circumstances where a person has been injured, physically or mentally.

All those aspects come into effect under this Act by interfering with the sanctity of the land title; by stating what a person must do with his own property; because if the Crown requires that property, the Crown takes it. Under the authority of the parent Act the Crown is able to do that, and to arrange for the prescribed methods of paying compensation.

Some of the stresses placed on individuals, because of circumstances which would come within the category of injurious affection are, in several cases, many times greater than the amount that has been offered by way of compensation for this purpose.

The proposal in the Bill states that if the person concerned—the owner of the property—cannot agree with the decision of the officers who judge the situation, the matter shall go to arbitration.

I am sure the Minister himself would go a long way towards arriving at some simple form of arbitration, under which persons qualified to assess the situation are employed and who will not be too harsh about the costs. I think that would be the Minister's wish.

But that might not be the solution. It is possible that the arbitration to be used will be the legal machinery associated with the Supreme Court, which is a very costly matter. And, after all is said and done, who is to pay?

There have been many examples of areas —and one notable example—within the outer metropolitan region of Perth, on the escarpment, where the amount involved was $250,000. It is possible that $250,000 is the all of somebody affected by this legislation; somebody who might not be satisfied with arbiters selected from people who have a knowledge of people and of circumstances, and somebody who might prefer the matter to be decided on a legal basis in a court of law. By whom will they be paid?

It is possible that a husband and wife have, perhaps, planned to do something with a property in their old age; they have dreamed things for it and for themselves associated with it, and yet they are mentally tortured by the provisions of some of our town planning laws.

What is commensurate with their suffering, in a money sense? How is it possible for us to compensate them? We just cannot do so. Accordingly, I feel the greatest caution is necessary in deciding how these things shall be determined.

Last evening Mr. Willesee gave an indication of the great responsibilty of Parliament in conferring powers—and it should remain the responsibility of Parliament—on officers acting under a specific Act. Perhaps there is no law within the British Commonwealth which confers upon individuals such authorities and powers as do our town planning laws. When the authority is conferred upon a person there is, of course, immediately demanded of that person a very great responsibility.

Sitting suspended from 6.6 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I have been endeavouring to show that I think this Bill introduces something new from what is now to be found in section 36 of the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme

Act as it applies to injurious affection. I can see very little merit in the proposed alterations to that section.

Section 36, which deals with compensation, betterment, and acquisition, makes particular reference to the provisions to be made in the case of injurious affection. The Bill endeavours, and perhaps with good intention, to approach compensation, particularly as it affects injurious affection, in a different way; to enable agreement to be reached amicably by conference to start with, and if it cannot be reached, for some other method to be adopted.

To put in essence what I have been endeavouring to say would be this: That while the Act proposes and the Bill suggests a way to compensate for injurious affection, I think what is lost sight of is that compensation may be payable and be measurble on injurious affection as it injures the value of the land, but there is no way or measure suggested to compensate the personal affect of injurious affection.

I think all members who have had experience of other people's problems in this matter will agree with me that serious mental stress has been caused in many cases, for which no compensation is payable. Therefore, while I agree the Bill is presented in good faith in an endeavour to find a better solution than that which the law now provides, I do not think it deals with the real problem.

THE HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [7.36 p.m.]: Some of the clauses in this measure may appear to the Minister—he has been dealing with the matter of town and regional planning almost since their inception—to be rather simple, but to the layman, and to quite a few members of Parliament, it takes a long time to study the provisions of the Bill in relation to the principal Act, and in relation to the Town Planning and Development Act.

In dealing with the clause which refers to the election by the authority to acquire land where injurious affection is claimed, we have to refer back to section 12 of the Town Planning and Development Act. This was not very clearly explained at the commencement of the Minister's speech. I will read that part of it to members in order that they will be quite clear on the matter. I quote—

> Paragraph (a) of clause 3 is designed to amplify the provisions of section 36 of the Act, which provide for the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority to elect to buy property in lieu of paying compensation for injurious affection when an application to develop land has been refused, or approved subject to conditions that are unacceptable to the owner.

The Minister went on from there, but did not set out how the present purchase price would be arrived at. It would appear that the provision would apply to any land where the owner applied for development and the land could be involved in a town planning area, or would be covered by regional planning. It appears it could be applied to land that was not originally in a town planning scheme. I refer to land that would eventually be resumed for public open space.

Out of a hotch-potch of words I will try to make the position as clear as I can in an endeavour to connect the principal Act with the amendments. It will take some working out.

The Hon. C. E. Griffiths: You can say that again!

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Section 12 of the Town Planning and Development Act, whereby compensation is not recoverable in certain cases, reads as follows:—

> Subject to the provisions of paragraph (c) of this subsection, land shall not be deemed to be injuriously affected by reason of any provision of a town planning scheme which comes into force on or after the appointed day, and which deals with any of the matters specified in clause ten of the First Schedule to this Act . . .

I think at this stage I should refer to clause 10 of the first schedule to that Act, which reads as follows:—

> Classification or zoning of the scheme area for various types, kinds or classes of residences, flats, trade, business, industry, commercial, recreation, education or other public or institutional purposes, and including areas for agricultural or rural use and for any other general or particular puposes, whether of the same class or kind as the class or kind before enumerated or not and fixing the sites or areas for any of the purposes included in this Schedule and prohibiting in any of these zones or classification any building or use of land of or for a general or particular nature or purpose.

Section 12, which I quoted earlier, continues as follows:—

> (i) permits development on that land for no purpose other than a public purpose;
>
> or
>
> (ii) prohibits wholly or partially the continuance of any non-conforming use of the land or the erection, alteration or extension on the land of any building in connection with or in furtherance of, any non-conforming use of the land, which, but for that prohibition, would not have been an unlawful

> erection, alteration, or extension under the laws of the State or the by-laws of the local authority within whose district the land is situated.

In my opinion, this refers to special cases where a town planning scheme comes into force on an appointed day and owners are entitled to injurious affection. There are many provisos preventing a claim for injurious affection. The sections under which one can claim injurious affection are very limited.

Generally speaking, I would say this would not refer to all land that is to be acquired or resumed by the Crown and where injurious affection is claimed. It refers only to where a town planning scheme comes into operation after an appointed day. I hope I have made this clear to members, as I know it is hard to understand. I have had a good look at the amending Bill and it has taken some working out.

The amendment proposes that the value of the land shall be based on the time when development is refused or is not suitable to the owner; and then it provides that the value shall be determined by arbitration in accordance with the Arbitration Act, 1895.

If the Government acquires, or decides to acquire, land from any person, to my knowledge that person has the right, irrespective of what the Minister puts into the Act, to go to arbitration by taking the matter to a court.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: If necessary.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: He has a right to go to court and claim compensation. So I cannot see the value of the words, "The value shall be determined by arbitration in accordance with the Arbitration Act, 1895." A person now has the right to go to court and have his case determined in accordance with the Arbitration Act, or by some other method agreed to by the authority. The only difference is the time at which the value of the land is to be set; and that is at the time development is refused, or when the development which the authority is prepared to grant is not suitable for what one wants.

This leads me to another facet: As Mr. Clive Griffiths said last night, what time must elapse between the refusal by the department to allow development, and the time when the authority decides it will buy the land? Will the authority make that decision immediately, as was suggested by Mr. Griffiths? There should be some provision that within a month, or some similar period, the land should be acquired, and a settling should be made within a reasonable time.

Of course, values would have to be agreed on, and the owner might have to retain the services of a Q.C. to fight the case in court. Solicitors are not always available to go to court, and courts are not always ready to accept a case within a limited time. The case could drag on for a long time before settlement and payment for compensation is made. The main factor we have to consider is the time between the refusal to develop and the time of settlement.

I know of a case where, over two years ago, the authority decided to resume land. That case is still proceeding today and the owner has obtained four private valuations at the suggestion of the Public Works Department resumption and valuation section. He paid for each one of those valuations out of his own pocket and there has been no suggestion by the Public Works Department land resumption office that it will meet the cost of those valuations. The owner has received no assurance that he will receive back the money paid out to the valuers, at the department's suggestion. On top of that expense, his case is in the hands of a Q.C., and I do not know how much longer it will drag on. This is the kind of thing that can happen. Even when one gets to court, and the court makes a decision, a great deal of time has elapsed.

The person whose land is being resumed has to meet the costs of the solicitors, and his share of the court costs. Surely it is time some provision was placed in both the Acts affecting resumptions to provide for a set line of action with regard to offers and claims.

I have been looking at an Act which has been passed in Victoria, but I understand that up to date it has not been proclaimed.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That Act has now been proclaimed.

The Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I wrote to Victoria for some details, but as yet I have not received a reply. However, the Minister advises me that that Act has now been proclaimed. I refer to the Valuation of Land (Appeals) Act, of Victoria, and it is an Act to make better provisions for appeals against valuations of land, and for other purposes. The Act deals with two specific matters: compensation for land resumption; and appeals against valuations for rating purposes, with which we are not concerned. Division 3 of the Act deals with compensation for compulsory acquisition of land, and sets up a number of boards for dealing with claims for compensation.

The point I want to get to is that that Act sets out the costs of, and those incidental to, any such inquiry by the court or a board. The Bill states that if the sum awarded is more than one-fourth greater than the sum offered by the acquiring authority, or if the sum awarded is more than one-tenth greater than the sum offered by the acquiring authority, and is not more than one-tenth less than the sum claimed by the owner, the authority will

pay the costs. The first provision I mentioned is clear enough to everybody. The second provision appears to be a little more complicated, and I will set out an example.

The sum originally offered by the authority could be $4,000, and if the value of the sum awarded is more than one-tenth greater, the total figure would be $4,450. If the sum awarded is not more than one-tenth less than the sum claimed by the owner, and if the owner claimed $5000, the final figure would be $4,500. This sets a fairly narrow margin but it has the effect that the authority realises that it will have to keep its offer up to a reasonable figure if the case is to go to court.

The person concerned—or the victim—from whom the property is being acquired knows that he has to keep his value at a reasonable figure, otherwise he could be the party to pay the costs. I think that is quite a good suggestion. I would not say that these equations—as one might call them—would be the answer. However, this Act must have received a fair amount of study in Victoria for those figures to be stipulated, including the costs to be paid. The legislation does set out who has to pay the costs—one side or the other.

We do not have a provision like that in our legislation. Unless the authority is prepared to make an *ex gratia* payment of costs to the owner—which I do not think is a good thing—the owner has to pay. Something should be set out in our legislation regarding costs when these matters go to arbitration so that the people whose land is acquired know where they stand. Those people would then not claim a value which they knew would not be awarded by a court, and the authority would also know that if it set a value which was too low it would end up having to pay the costs. This is a deterrent to both sides and a better arrangement to get the two parties to agree to a reasonable value for the land. In one instance, the authority would pay the costs and, in the other instance, if the amount awarded was below the value by one-tenth, then the owner would pay the costs. I think the Victorian system is a good one.

It is a pity the Minister had not been a little more explicit because I think he would have saved a lot of debate. As I said earlier, this amendment refers to a limited field of land acquired under the town planning scheme. It is not a general provision covering all land which is acquired. Unless one reads the relevant Acts very closely, and studies the speech made by the Minister at the second reading, one cannot understand what the amendments refer to. I trust the Minister will follow this up.

The Bill aims to do only what is already being done today. In other words, if one wants to claim injurious affection for resumed land, under this limited section, when the authority has acquired the land, it is provided that the parties can apply for arbitration to arrive at a value. That is what happens today. The only point involved now is the time factor between the authority deciding to acquire the land and the refusal, by the authority, for the land to be developed.

I would like to see included, in both Acts affecting resumptions, provisions regarding the cost involved. When I was representing a near hills area I knew of a number of people who had land resumed when resumptions took place. Many of those people did not fight. Their properties were small and although they knew the money offered was not enough, they also knew that if they went to court it would probably cost more than they would get out of the action.

I can assure members that the Public Works Department land resumption office is not the easiest office to deal with. From figures given by the Minister in this House, on another matter, one can see that some people seem to get exceptionally high values for their properties while others receive what they consider to be low values. I cannot understand the reason for this. A department, whose job it is to make land valuations, surely must take some notice of independent sworn valuers. There are cases where the department takes no notice of the valuers. It starts off at a very low figure and will, perhaps, sneak the price up a little. This should not be necessary. The department should have enough experience to know what the value of land should be. I am afraid the department does not know, or just does not want to know, the true value of land.

That is why I say to the Minister that we should put a provision in both Acts which will be clear to the landowners whose land is acquired. Those people should not only be protected as far as their land valuations go, but also be protected with regard to costs which they have to meet in connection with arbitration which might take place. I support the Bill at this stage, but I trust these matters will be given consideration.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (South Metropolitan) [7.58 p.m.]: I would like to ask the Minister, through you Mr. President, a question which he may be able to answer when replying to the debate. I refer to section 36 of the Act. I have a friend who has a property in Leederville. He desires to sell the property, and has been made an offer on three occasions. However, he has been told by the authority that his land is required for a road complex in the area. He has been advised to sell under section 36 of the Act because the authority will not require the land for probably 10 or 15 years. This has placed the man in the position where he

just cannot sell because the agents cannot get anybody to buy. My question to the Minister is: What is the position of that particular man so far as his equity is concerned?

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. F. R. White.

MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 4th September.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [8 p.m.]: At the outset I wish to say that it is with pleasure I support a piece of legislation of this nature, because it is directly endeavouring to do something for the benefit of an individual; to give him a greater opportunity to survive. The Bill is quite simple, but it will have extremely beneficial effects in the township of Exmouth, Western Australia.

One cannot fail to wonder that within our laws we have such restrictions which prevent an accredited man of medicine from practising in this State, and because of this he is unable to treat, or to assist in the treatment of a person who is sick or who is injured. Neither can his services be called upon in an emergency. How often, at the scene of an accident, does one see all those present endeavouring, with the most sincere intentions, to do everything possible for the injured person, and possibly doing more harm than good? Further, how often does one feel relieved when someone walks from among the group that is present and announces he is a doctor? Immediately every other person who is endeavouring to assist stands back, or does whatever he is instructed to do by the doctor for the purpose of assisting the injured person.

To me it seems there is something wrong if that doctor were, in particular, an American, and could not render treatment to an injured person, or even perform an operation which was vitally necessary at the scene of an accident. Indeed, as the law stands at the moment, he could not even assist an accredited and qualified medico in such circumstances. Whilst speaking in this vein, one wonders how many people have been detrimentally affected by such a doctor not being able to render assistance in an emergent situation such as I have described.

However, such a state of affairs will not be encountered in the future at Exmouth, Western Australia, at least, because after this Bill is passed an American doctor will be able to assist his Australian counterpart to perform an emergency operation. He will also be available for consultation with an Australian doctor on any case. The basic feature of the Bill is that the individual will be the one to benefit, because he will be able to avail himself of all the medical assistance and knowledge that is available in the area. Incidentally, as mentioned by the Minister, and in accordance with the provisions in the Bill, the services of a visiting doctor will be rendered without fee or reward.

So one can do nothing but applaud the Bill and hope it is the forerunner of more pieces of legislation of a similar type to meet situations such as the one this Bill is designed to meet. I hope the measure will also lead to closer associations among Australian, American, and perhaps European doctors, because if this does eventuate it will be to the benefit of humanity in general. It is with great pleasure I support the Bill.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [8.6 p.m.]: This Bill is necessary in view of the fact that there are a number of American doctors at Exmouth who will, if the Bill is passed, be working for the benefit of the local community. Nevertheless, I cannot agree completely with the remarks made by Mr. Willesee, because if Australian doctors or medical students desire to increase their knowledge of, or practise in some branch of medicine for which they have a particular bent, in the United States of America, before they can do so they have to pass a strict examination.

From my own son I learnt that, before he visited America, he had to pass an examination which was a list of short questions, but there were about 200 of them asked. It was an extremely searching examination and therefore, in the same way, it was considered restrictions may have to be imposed on doctors from other lands in order that we might say quite truthfully that they are well fitted to occupy a position as medical practitioner in this country.

I repeat that I consider the Bill is necessary, but if we are to have reciprocity we should seek to have our Australian doctors who have been well trained at universities of repute to be given assurance that they will be accepted in America as professors or teachers of medicine, or as general practitioners.

The Bill is accepting the fact that the American doctors are trained and are well organised and will do an excellent job for the community in Exmouth. The measure, however, merely provides—

> (d) Any person who satisfies the Board that—
>
> (i) he has such qualifications in medicine or surgery and such experience in the practise thereof as in the opinion of the Board fit and qualify him to practise medicine or surgery in the State; and
>
> (ii) he is serving as a member of a visiting force in the capacity of a medical officer,

may, if the Minister in his absolute discretion thinks fit, be registered as a medical practitioner under this Act,

We do not know how extensive was the questioning of these men who are to practise at Exmouth. Quite frankly, I would say that they are probably well-qualified men, but if some of our students holding, say, qualifications of the Royal Medical College of Physicians, as against the qualifications held by the Americans at Exmouth, some reciprocity should be called for. I will not press for this at the moment, but I may do so later.

At the present time, with the real urge to allow the Americans to carry on their practice and care for the welfare of the American citizens at Exmouth, and possibly also assist in the treatment of Australians there, I think I can accept the Bill. Nevertheless, I repeat that there ought to be, following the passing of the Bill, a lessening of the weight on the one side as against the other in regard to reciprocity, especially when it is realised that Australian students are asked to answer about 200 questions before they are even allowed to enter the United States of America.

Some assurance should be given that these American doctors are competent to act as physicians and surgeons, but realising the urgency of the matter I will vote for the second reading of the Bill. Nevertheless, I wish to say in conclusion that if the number of American doctors at Exmouth increases we should make every endeavour to obtain some reciprocity between the two countries regarding the qualifications of medical practitioners.

THE HON. G. E. D. BRAND (Lower North) [8.12 p.m.]: I also support the Bill. As a representative of the area at Exmouth I take this opportunity to thank the Minister and the officers of the Public Health Department for their foresight and their confidence in the area, by establishing a 15-bed hospital which can be increased to a 30-bed hospital in the event of an emergency.

I also wish to take this opportunity to thank those doctors who have visited Exmouth for the purpose of relieving the medical practitioner in the area. I do know that one, Doctor Gallash, is now busily working at that centre.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: And a very good doctor, too.

The Hon. G. E. D. BRAND: Yes, he is a very good doctor. It instils confidence in the people to know that doctors, such as Doctor Gallash, are willing to come to Exmouth to assist on occasions, especially those who have entered retirement. I would like to express that the people at Exmouth also feel indebted to the Minister and his officers for the confidence they have shown in the area.

I would now like to relate a little experience of my own. Some time ago I had occasion—I forget when, exactly—to visit a doctor and he issued me with some tablets for the purpose of keeping my weight down, and members can now see the result. At the time I was staying with the local policeman and his young daughter in my opinion could be gainfully employed by the Customs Department for the purpose of searching ships, because she found the tablets that had been issued to me and swallowed a handful of them. It was only due to the unselfish attitude shown by one of the American doctors—as his Australian counterpart was not available at that time—that the girl's life was saved, because he worked tirelessly on her until she was out of danger. Constable Pike and his wife are very grateful to the efforts of that doctor, to say nothing of my own gratitude.

I therefore support the Bill most wholeheartedly. I will leave to Doctor Hislop's attention the question of reciprocity between Australia and the United States of America in regard to the qualifications of medical practitioners. In conclusion I wish to repeat that I thank the Minister and the officers of his department for what they are doing for the town of Exmouth.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (Lower West—Minister for Health) [8.14 p.m.]: I thank Mr. Willesee, Dr. Hislop, and Mr. Brand, for the comments they have made on the Bill, and I agree with Mr. Willesee that this is a Bill in the debate on which one can participate with some degree of pleasure. In debating the Bill we would not want to discuss all the ramifications of reciprocity, but I am suggesting, with due deference to Dr. Hislop, that in lieu of bringing up this subject at some length in this place he might exercise his right to bring it up within the ramifications of the Australian Medical Association. That might prove to be of greater value.

In the Bill we are referring to the specific area of Exmouth. It behoves us to forget matters such as protocol which go along with reciprocity. I suppose that if urgent medical attention is required at a holiday camp in the Rocky Mountains, and an Australian doctor happens to be there, the American authorities will forget about the regulations in the same way as we propose to do in the case of Exmouth.

There is need for this Bill for reasons such as that mentioned by Mr. Brand, when the doctor did for humane reasons what he did do. However, he did place himself in some jeopardy, because on occasions some people do funny things. It has been known that a person, going to the assistance of another in good faith, found himself at the wrong end of legal action which emanated from his generosity and kind heartedness.

I am grateful for the speed at which this Bill has been handled. It is obvious to all that the quicker it gets through both Houses of Parliament the quicker it will be proclaimed, and so enable these doctors to work.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It is obvious that these American doctors at Exmouth are qualified.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: From my experience of the American Navy they use nothing but the best, whether it be ice-cream or doctors. I thank members for their support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery) in the Chair; The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Minister for Health) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title and citation—

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: There is one small matter I should raise. I think all members will join with me in placing on record the pleasure and, indeed, the gratitude of those assembled here in their official capacity as representatives of the people of Western Australia, for the very great co-operation that has been extended by the two medical officers and by Captain Friedman at Exmouth in so readily agreeing to going over half the way, in order to make this area of co-operation possible. I would like to place that on record so that it appears in *Hansard*.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report.

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

GERALDTON PORT AUTHORITY BILL

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 4th September.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (South Metropolitan) [8.20 p.m.]: In speaking to this Bill I would like to pass some brief comments. Firstly, I commend the Minister for the historical outline he gave in the first part of his introductory speech. Very often such outlines can be followed readily to indicate the record and history of undertakings.

The formation of a port authority for the Port of Geraldton at this stage of our history will, in fact, be of great benefit to the town, the district, and the surrounding areas. With the development that is taking place in the northern part of the State Geraldton is placed in the position where it is necessary for great improvements to be made to the harbour to enable it to handle the cargoes from the hinterland—cargoes such as iron ore, and possibly nickel and other minerals from the Meekatharra and Wiluna areas.

Unless some steps are taken to deepen the harbour at Geraldton the town will suffer greatly in the general complex of advancement which is taking place along the northern coast of this State, because the larger type of ships that are being built in these days will not be happy to call at Geraldton to pick up a part of their load, and to top up the load at another port. The developments which have taken place in that area over the past 10 years warrant the establishment of a port authority; and with the introduction of the larger sized ships this authority will be better able to administer the port, and it will benefit the progress of the district.

The bulk-handling facilities at the port, whilst not particularly large as far as bulk-handling facilities go, are certainly a great improvement on what they were 10 years ago. In my view with the establishment of a port authority we will very soon see a great improvement made to the existing facilities.

The money required for the deepening of the harbour will finally have to come through the Treasury, but I think that when the port authority is established it will give a greater emphasis to any attempt made to raise the standard of the harbour by making available deeper waters for ships. Whilst I am on this point I am aware there is a development committee operating in the district, of which my nephew (Mr. Bill Newbold) is chairman. I know that this committee has made some propositions to the Minister for Works.

I am still of the opinion that the promise which the Premier made at the general election before last to deepen the harbour has not been fulfilled to any extent. I might be wrong in saying that, because I do not know the planning that goes on in Government departments; backbenchers rarely do know.

When the Geraldton port authority is appointed it will, firstly, have approximately $300,000 extra finance, compared with what has been available to the Harbour and Light Department. This authority will be able to exert pressure on the Government to make further funds available through Government loans or through its own borrowings.

In an industry of this nature, where changes in administration are likely, some of the staff who have given valuable service to the Harbour and Light Department may find themselves to be redundant in the new planning. I find that under the provision in clause 17 the port authority will be required to submit annual reports to the Minister; and this is a very good provision.

Clause 18 refers to the appointment of officers, and subclause (2) states—

> The Port Authority may appoint such other officers and servants as may be necessary for the administration of this Act and may dismiss any of those officers or servants.

I appeal to the Minister who will be responsible for the administration of the Bill when it becomes an Act to do what is generally done in other industries: When there is a takeover the persons already employed, from the top echelon to the lower paid ranks, are given full consideration when the question of redundancy arises. Very often in a situation such as this, officers who are considered to be redundant are of an age which precludes their moving into another industry to obtain work. I am sure it is the policy of the present Government to do the right thing, and I do not think it is really necessary for me to draw the Government's attention to this aspect. I would expect it to ensure that the existing staff who are considered to be redundant will be used on work in a similar type of industry.

Clause 52 (1) interests me, because it states—

> The funds necessary for the effectual exercise by the Port Authority of the powers conferred by this Act shall be—
>
> (a) such moneys as are from time to time appropriated by Parliament for that purpose;
>
> (b) the income derived by the Port Authority from all dues, rents and other levies under the authority of this Act; and
>
> (c) such moneys as the Port Authority may borrow under and subject to the provisions of this Act.

That leads me to the conclusion that the Geraldton port authority will still be under the control of the Treasury.

Clause 52 (2) states—

> All moneys referred to in subsection (1) of this section shall be paid into and be placed to the credit of an account at the Treasury to be called "Geraldton Port Authority Account", and shall be applied to the purposes of this Act.

Subclauses (1) to (3) of clause 53 give the authority power to borrow. Subclause (3) reads—

> (3) Any money borrowed by the Port Authority under this section including interest payable thereon is a charge upon the money from time to time standing to the credit of the Account or in any bank account of the Port Authority, and upon any works, undertakings and other assets vested in the Port Authority and the due repayment of the moneys so borrowed including the interest payable thereon, is hereby guaranteed by the Treasurer, for and on behalf of the State.

The point I am trying to make is that although the port authority will have the power to borrow, finally the whole matter will rest with the Treasury. In 1937, 1,500,000 bushels of wheat were shipped through the port, while last year 19,800,000 bushels were handled. In future, of course, bigger ships will be required to call at the port.

I have already mentioned the iron ore which will come from Koolanooka, and also the prospects with regard to nickel. I am sure the Government will support the actions of the Department of Industrial Development in encouraging greater tonnages through the port. I know Albany and Bunbury have already received help in this way since port authorities were established for those harbours.

With regard to the administration and deepening of the harbour, I would like to pay a tribute to the very fine record the Harbour and Light Department, its officers, staff, and menial workers, have achieved since the department took over the harbour in 1957. In that year 365,000 tons of cargo were handled, while this year 1,370,000 tons were handled. That, in itself, I believe is to the immense credit of the department.

Most of the clauses in the Bill are machinery. At the same time that we of the Labor Party offer our support of the Bill, I would again like to wish the new port authority every success in its further bid for decentralisation.

THE HON. J. HEITMAN (Upper West) [8.34 p.m.]: I would like to offer my congratulations to the Government for its decision to set up a port authority at Geraldton. I feel the Harbour and Light Department should be congratulated also for the wonderful job it has done over the past 10 or 11 years, as has been mentioned by Mr. Lavery. I think it should be very proud of the record of the improvements it has brought about in Geraldton during that time. Now the decision has been made to establish a port authority, I am sure the men on the job will carry on with the improvements, meeting from time to time to ascertain the shortcomings and devise ways of overcoming them.

Mention has been made of the amount of wheat which goes through Geraldton, and in this regard I would like to congratulate Co-operative Bulk Handling for the wonderful installation it has established in Geraldton. It is a farmers' organisation and has done a terrific job. It must have saved the Government millions of dollars throughout the State. The terminal it has at Geraldton is able to load the incoming ships very quickly and there

does not seem to be any hitch whatever in the engineering set-up handling the grain in that area.

It has been mentioned that something like 19,800,000 bushels were handled last year, and I would forecast that this season well over 20,000,000 bushels will be handled through Geraldton. This, of course, stresses the point that this development has been made not only in Geraldton itself, but in the surrounding regional areas also. Therefore the people of Geraldton, and of the surrounding districts, must feel mighty proud of the fact that the harbour has reached the stage where a port authority can be appointed in order to further improve the area.

Recently, when the Dillingham company commenced operations in the area, there was a great deal of cross-talk about the Government's having let the people of Geraldton down; but I feel that it was a step in the right direction, and that the people of Geraldton and the surrounding regions will be very grateful for the fact that the Government enabled Dillingham to establish a shipbuilding and shiprepairing business, and also to manage the slipways.

From time to time we hear talk of the deepening of the Geraldton Harbour. I feel that eventually this must be done, but before anything of such major importance is carried out, a very good excuse for it must exist. I feel sure that the excuse in this case will be that Western Mining will be encouraged to pelletise its lower grade ore and export it through Geraldton. This would give the Government the necessary excuse to spend the large amount of money involved in the further deepening of the harbour.

We often hear people talking about the deepening of the harbour as though the Government had done nothing about it, but I would like to point out that a terrific sum of money has been spent on deepening the harbour to 28 ft. 6 ins. With the new method of shipbuilding, bigger and bigger tonnages are being handled. This makes one wonder whether the port should be deepened or whether different types of ships should be built to carry the grain, iron ore, and other commodities exported from a port of this size.

I can remember during the war years ships of 10,000 tons used the harbour. They used to take a certain amount of wheat away and then come to Fremantle to top up. However, these days ships of 20,000 tons go in and out of Geraldton without much trouble at all. Therefore the Government has not neglected this very important work. Neverthless it is a project which must be carried out gradually. It is not possible just to take out 12 feet or 15 feet of ocean bed for three or four miles.

Many engineers have suggested we tackle the deepening of the port from another angle; that is, to go out past the Point Moore lighthouse. However, I do not think any of these engineers have made a survey in this regard. It has been mostly talk of what should and could be done.

Recently when I went up there after there had been a great deal of talk about the deepening of the harbour, I saw a boat anchored out past Point Moore. I was greatly surprised when I saw a big waterspout. I was not sure whether it was one of the engineers with a snorkel, or whether somebody was engaged in the deepening of the harbour. I afterwards found out that it was—

The Hon. V. J. Ferry: A whale!

The Hon. J. HEITMAN:—an oil survey ship setting off explosions and taking a survey of the ocean bed. It was a big disappointment after having heard all the talk of the suggested new port out from the Point Moore lighthouse.

Before this port authority was decided upon, I imagine a great deal of research would have gone into ascertaining the amount of dues which could be earned by the authority in Geraldton or, for that matter, in any of the other ports of Western Australia in which authorities are to be established.

We all know that the wharfage dues for wheat have been pegged for a while to come. I often wonder how the wharf charges on iron ore will work out; whether they are fair and equitable or whether, to encourage the company to send the ore from Geraldton, some benefit should accrue. However, I feel sure that whichever way it goes, and whatever has been done, it has been done with the thought that places like Geraldton should be built up to further the State of Western Australia.

I believe the Government has done a terrific job in getting Western Mining Corporation's iron ore show at Morawa off the ground by making the first contract with the Japanese for iron ore. My only regret is that the contract made must cut out very soon unless the company starts pelletising and more contracts are obtained. Unless this is done the project could fold up within the next five or six years. This would be a great pity for both Geraldton and Morawa.

In both these towns a great number of houses have been built and people have been attracted to work in the area. This, of course, occurs in any place in which mining projects are active.

Like everyone else, I support the measure. I feel it is a step in the right direction. As I said when I commenced my speech, people on the spot will be making decisions and will be allowed to borrow in more or less the same way as a local authority. Any deficiency will have to be met by the Treasury. Under the Bill, all money borrowed must be paid back through

the port authority. Such a business arrangement will act in the best interests of all concerned.

I trust that the Port of Geraldton will push further and further ahead and thus serve the surrounding regions, which are very rich in mining and agricultural pursuits, and, in turn, the State.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North) [8.43 p.m.]: I support the Bill. I notice that, as in other legislation concerning port authorities, the appointment of the board is to be left entirely in the hands of the Government. Five members are to be appointed by the Government for a term of three years. Under the old set-up, successive Governments appointed members to represent all the people the harbour served. For instance, one of the members appointed would represent the producers; another, the shipping interests; another, the commercial people; and yet another would represent the workers. The chairman would also be appointed.

Therefore, although it is not specifically provided in any of the port authority legislation, I hope the Government will not depart from the adopted practice I have just outlined.

I remember on one occasion, as Minister, approving the appointment to the board at Albany of a member representing country interests. His name was House. I also remember being asked by farmers, pastoralists, and commercial organisations that certain people be appointed to fill vacancies, in order that the representation remained on a satisfactory basis.

I hope the Government will not discontinue that practice, and will endeavour to spread the representation among all sections of the community. If it does so it will get a better result. My experience in the past is that harmonious relations have existed among all members of the boards, especially among those members forming the Albany Harbour Board and the Bunbury Harbour Board.

Strange to say, as these ports develop with the advent of greater traffic, it seems the administration of the port, in my opinion, does not need the services of such an elaborate board of management. However, a board or an authority will relieve the Government of some responsibility, especially in regard to finding the required finance to administer the port.

These boards are proposed to be set up wherever they are required. For many years the ports of Geraldton and Esperance were administered by the Railways Department. The trade has now more than reached the stage where it requires somebody on the spot all the time. I have no argument at all with that proposal. I think it is good that local men should administer local and public utilities such as harbours. Far better results are obtained in this way, and I am very happy to support the move to establish the authority.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [8.47 p.m.]: I would like to thank members for the approval which they have given to the Bill. I wish to make reference particularly to the last remarks made by Mr. Strickland. From discussions I have already had with the Minister responsible, I would say he is thinking along the same lines as Mr. Strickland suggested. The Minister has suggested that if any member considers certain people might be suitable for appointment to the authority, he should not be frightened to mention the names to the Minister. I think the Minister wants as wide a representation as possible, making sure at the same time that the most suitable people are obtained. Possibly this is one reason organisations are not named. To a certain extent it stultifies the appointment of a good man if he is representing a particular organisation. There may be one already and two may be wanted; it is better to leave the position free by not naming them.

Mr. Lavery mentioned the deficiency of the port in regard to depth. This problem has been with us for a long while. It is a problem which has caused many Governments hours of thought and much cost in trying to determine what is the best thing to do. It is a pity that the port has this disability.

I can go back many years, even to the time when I was sitting on the other side of the House, and the question of the deepening of Geraldton Harbour was discussed at that time.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I well remember it.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: At that stage I even asked for the papers to be laid on the Table of the House. If I remember rightly, I was told I could have a look at them in the Minister's office. Like all wise members, I knew very well that if I looked at them in the Minister's office they were confidential and I could not use the information. Consequently I did not look at the file in the Minister's office but used my own observations and said what I wanted to say.

Prior to 1957, before the Harbour and Light Department took over, representations were being made by the Farmers' Union and other organisations for a port authority. I think perhaps the right decision was made when it was resolved not to appoint an authority at that time but, instead, to pass control to the Harbour and Light Department from the Railways Department. I am quite sure it would have been premature to have appointed a port authority at that stage.

Naturally I am very pleased to be the Minister introducing the measure to this House. I was born in Geraldton and, as I said the other day, I worked on the harbour for two years. I have lived there, worked there, and represented the area for 21 years. Naturally I feel some pride in being able to introduce the measure to the House at this time.

With regard to the depth of the harbour and the alternative suggestion mentioned by Mr. Heitman, I should like to say that continual blasting has gone on for a considerable number of years now. This problem is just one of those challenges. The harbour bed is part of the Continental Shelf; and blasting has been carried out in the channel itself; even in the calmest weather there is a 5-foot swell. It is difficult to find a method of stabilising a ship to enable the right type of blasting to be carried out. The floor is so hard it is very difficult to drill and blast. Whenever there is a blast almost the whole of Geraldton is rattled by it.

Mr. Heitman mentioned the possibility of Point Moore. The only drawback to this suggestion is, I think, the sum of money which would be required and whether there is a real need for it. In the course of industrial development I know the Government has made many investigations and inquiries through many companies in an endeavour to find an economic way of treating minerals and the like. Every inquiry has been made with a view to channelling them through the Port of Geraldton to enable extra money to be spent on further development which would possibly give us a deep-water port. The possibility of this is not exhausted by any means.

There is a terrific amount of mineral exploration going on today, not only around the north, in Kalgoorlie, and in Kambalda, but even in the Murchison area. With all this exploration no-one knows when the day might come when a find will be sufficient to warrant sufficient money being spent to enable the port to be developed as it should be developed.

Mr. Lavery was quite right in the remarks he made concerning the funds of the board. I think it is very important that the authority have the power to raise loans, but they will still be guaranteed by the Treasurer. I would hate to think the authority went to the people to raise $300,000 without a Treasury guarantee. It might be very difficult indeed. That is the reason for this suggestion.

Once again, I thank members for their approach to the Bill and, like them, I hope that when the authority is set up it will find a great deal of pleasure in looking after its own interest. In the long run I think it is something for it to look after its own interest. I certainly hope it will be able to keep the port operating efficiently and profitably.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. N. E. Baxter) in the Chair; The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 17 put and passed.

Clause 18: Appointment of officers, etc.—

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: When the Minister replied, he did not make any comment on the request I made. He may not be able to do so; but, once again, I would like to emphasise that although I support the Bill I would like to see some protection afforded to the staff who are already employed in the area. The Minister may have something to say on this matter.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am sorry I omitted to mention this when I replied. Mr. Lavery will find that when the changeover took place in Albany and Bunbury, we experienced no problems in this regard. I assure the honourable member that the Minister will give him the information which he is worried about. However, I am pretty sure there will be no queries in this regard.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 19 to 37 put and passed.

Clause 38: Port dues—

The Hon. J. HEITMAN: In the past fishermen have paid a license fee to enable them to unload crayfish or fish and load other material at various ports such as Geraldton, Port Denison, or other ports along the coast. They have been paying the one license fee or wharfage charge to cover the whole lot.

I wonder if the Minister can tell us how the new set-up will affect fishermen, because there is a big trade in those areas. I wonder whether they will have to pay extra harbour fees whenever they go into Geraldton; that is, fees additional to the license fees which they pay at the present time.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not know the exact answer to this query, but I should imagine the *status quo* will remain; that is, whatever dues are paid to the Harbour and Light Department at the moment for the use of the port will still apply to the new port authority.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 39 to 81 put and passed.

Clause 82: Police officer to report breaches of the Act—

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I ask the Minister what this clause means, because I am rather intrigued with the wording. I have known of situations where a police officer may have to deal with certain breaches under an Act, but this clause refers to "any of the provisions of this Act." I would have thought the port authority would have its own vigilance officers.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am sure this is only a safeguard provision. I think the honourable member will find that at Geraldton there are water police who come under the control of the Police Department. The main purpose is to make sure that if a police officer, or any officer for that matter, finds someone doing something he should not be doing, the port authority will be made aware of it. I think that is all the clause means.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Thank you.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 83 and 84 put and passed.

First and second schedules put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported, without amendment, and the report adopted.

ESPERANCE PORT AUTHORITY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 10th September.

THE HON. J. M. THOMSON (South) [9.6 p.m.]: This Bill will be the instrument whereby the control and administration of the Port of Esperance will pass from the Harbour and Light Department to a body corporate comprising five members representing commerce, primary production, local government, and shipping—and in the reference to shipping I would also include representatives of the waterside workers.

The establishment of this authority will be of very great benefit to the Esperance area and will be of immense satisfaction to the people of that district. It will be the means of furthering the progress of Esperance, including the surrounding districts, and the Bill will bring the Port of Esperance into line with two other outports of the State, namely Albany and Bunbury. It will also bring the port into line with the Port of Geraldton—we have just been dealing with a Bill covering a port authority for that port.

At this point I think it would be appropriate for me to congratulate the Government, as I did on the introduction of the Albany Port Authority Act a year or so ago. On that occasion I took the opportunity to congratulate the Government for its move and I do so again on this occasion because of the importance of these outports to the State as a whole. It is proper that these outports should be controlled by port authorities such as is envisaged by this Bill.

One important provision in the measure will enable the authority to embark on the construction of certain extensions and other requirements per medium of the borrowing powers which are given to it by this Bill. The development of the Esperance area, and the progress made there, which have led up to the necessity for this measure, are of interest. I think we are all well aware of the huge amount of overseas capital that has been invested in the Esperance region, and what it has meant to that region. Likewise we are conscious of the fact that our own people have invested large sums of money in this area in the development of agriculture.

I have before me some figures relating to the stock population in the Esperance region, and I propose to refer briefly to them. These figures cover the number of holdings stocked and the number of sheep and cattle respectively from the months of March and April, 1964, to the same period in 1967. For convenience I have grouped the figures because they refer to all areas under development.

In 1964 there were 257 holdings stocked with a total of 42,550 sheep and 19,800 cattle. By 1967 there were 405 holdings stocked with a total of 1,017,520 sheep and 31,014 cattle. Those figures are indicative of the development and expansion that has been going on in this area. Still quoting from the figures which were compiled as late as last year we see that within the 13 to 15-inch rainfall area, 700,000 acres of land were alienated, and in the over-15-inch rainfall area, 1,400,000 acres were alienated. It is interesting further to note that land for alienation in the 13 to 15-inch rainfall area totalled 1,200,000 acres, while in the over 15-inch rainfall area there were 1,100,000 acres.

The approximate total area east of the rabbit-proof fence, within the 13-inch and over rainfall area, was a further 4,400,000 acres, making a grand total of 8,800,000 acres. This area of 8,800,000 acres of land is capable of carrying a large number of stock and growing a large quantity of grain, and I shall refer to the question of grain in a few moments.

I was interested to compare the percentage increase in exports through the port. These figures have been supplied to me by courtesy of the Harbour and Light Department and they cover the period from the 30th June, 1958, to the 30th June, 1968. Further to my reference to holdings stocked and acreage, I find that the increased tonnage handled by the port was considerable. In 1963, a total of 18,282 tons of grain were shipped. In 1966 that figure had increased to 46,313, an increase of 153.3 per cent., while in 1968 the tonnage further increased by 383.6 per cent. The total tonnage handled was 153,015 tons. Of this total, 11.9 per cent. was handled in 1963, and in 1966 30.3 per cent. was handled. This figure increased to 57.8 per cent. in 1968.

With reference to grain, again the figures are interesting. I took the base year as 1963, once more, and in that year

11,470 tons of wheat went through the port. Of the total tonnage of 103,371 tons, the figures for 1963 represented 11.1 per cent. For 1966 the tonnage handled represented 28 per cent.; and for 1968 they represented 60.9 per cent.

The increases in the tonnages of super and sulphur which are also very necessary in agricultural development, are most interesting. In 1966, a total of 27,885 tons of rock phosphate was imported, while in 1968, 75,155 tons were imported. This constitutes an increase of 169.2 per cent. In the case of sulphur there was an increase of 69.8 per cent. over the period I have mentioned.

Petroleum products also play a very important part in the development of the agricultural areas, and we find that for the year 1958, 31,215 tons were imported. For the year 1968, the tonnage was 77,780, which represented an increase of 149.2 per cent.; and for the years 1958 to 1968, the total tonnage was 242,720 tons. For the year 1958 the percentage increase was 12.9 per cent.; for 1963 it was 24.85 per cent.; for 1966 the increase was 30.25 per cent.; and for 1968 it was 32 per cent.

Minerals have also played their part, and will continue to do so, in the activities of the waterfront at Esperance. The figures I have before me indicate the percentage increase. For the year 1963 the percentage increase was 39.8 per cent., while in 1966 it was 5.7 per cent. There was then an upsurge in 1968, which showed an increase of 54.5 per cent. These figures will indicate the development and expansion that have taken place in the area for the period I have mentioned.

I would now like to refer to the number of ships that entered the port and draw a comparison between those that entered in 1957-58 and the number that entered in 1968. In 1957-58 only 13 ships entered the port, whereas in 1968, 49 ships entered the port, which is an increase of 276.9 per cent. I think these percentage increases over those years, in conjunction with the other facts I have stated, prove conclusively that the establishment of the port authority at Esperance is fully justified.

While recently at Esperance I was confronted by certain members of the local authority who expressed their pleasure at the establishment of the port authority. They also expressed concern, however, when they realised that the port authority had borrowing powers. They expressed this concern, because they felt it could have some effect on the borrowing powers of the local authority. This, of course, is not the case at all. I naturally assumed that to be so and I told them they had nothing to worry about in this regard, because the source of funds for the one would be different from the borrowing sources of the other.

Accordingly, as the Minister told Mr. Lavery, the authorities can borrow to the extent that they are guaranteed by the Treasury. This is certainly a step forward in an area which has made great advances in recent years.

The Bill before us signifies the progress we are making in the southern part of the State as well as in the northern part of the State and it augurs well for the future of Esperance and the surrounding areas. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

THE HON. E. C. HOUSE (South) [9.21 p.m.]: I rise to support the Bill and express my congratulations to the district of Esperance for the progress and expansion which has brought about this port authority.

Mr. Jack Thomson and I only recently became members for this area through the redistribution of seats. We took over from Mr. Stubbs and Mr. Garrigan, and I would like to pay a tribute to the work done in that area by Mr. Stubbs, particularly, and by Mr. Garrigan. They were very well thought of, and they have certainly set Mr. Jack Thomson and myself a challenge to keep up the representation they have provided in the area.

There was a time when the State was almost divided, the east from the west, because of the area of land lying vacant, and our thoughts were directed mainly towards Albany and Bunbury. Now the position is completely reversed. We have good bitumen roads and almost a continuous succession of developing properties right through from the west to the east, centring particularly around Esperance.

Mr. Jack Thomson gave some figures which showed the growth in the agricultural products of Esperance. I would like to say that the main advantage of Esperance is its versatility. It is quite amazing how all grains and all stock thrive and do so well in the area.

This, of course, is partly due to the climate and also to the work done by the Department of Agriculture in the use of new techniques and pasture management. There is no doubt at all that cattle have a great future in the area. I have never seen cattle in such numbers; they are so thick in their numbers that they look like flocks of sheep in their density, ewes with lambs amongst the cattle almost appearing to be underneath them. That is possibly an exaggeration but I use it merely to illustrate the numbers of cattle in that area.

I have never seen country so heavily stocked and yet so thriving. We find the production of wheat, barley, and oats increasing; and so far as oats are concerned the production can be as high as 100 bushels to the acre. Linseed crops are also money spinners and the production is double the value per acre of that of the

wheat crop. All these features are sure signs that the district cannot help but go ahead.

The mineral output through the Port of Esperance is also increasing, and I have no doubt it will continue to increase over the years. One cannot tell what really lies under the ground in the area around Ravensthorpe. For myself I would say there is untold wealth in that area, but we must not lose sight of the fact that minerals, like everything else, are subject to scientific and technological changes, and it is possible that their value may disappear overnight. At the same time we know that because of the increases in the world population we cannot go wrong because of the food that is required.

The whole foundation of our State is well based, and we should continue to encourage and expand this production and ensure that the agricultural industries prosper; because it is the outlet of wheat and other produce, plus the intake of phosphatic rock, and so on, that are making up the tonnages which are helping the Port of Esperance to progress as it has done.

Esperance, however, has the disadvantage of being a long way from the main central markets, and the freight rates therefore are a prime concern. Road transport of wool to Albany is possible but fairly expensive; and the transport of stock through Kalgoorlie to Midland is almost prohibitive at today's prices of stock. Shipping, which has always been reasonably cheap, should therefore be encouraged to help reduce the freight rates for our imports and exports. If we do some promoting in this field, and, with the demand for meat and wool and other products, in the Asian field, I am sure we will be able to increase our profits, our turnover, and our output from our ports, and this will in turn help continually to increase the population of towns like Esperance.

Some concern has been expressed at Esperance as to exactly what the establishment of the port authority means, and how it might affect the town financially. It is nice to know that the people need have no fears. Each of the port authorities throughout the State has had to build up from the bottom; they all made a loss at the start, but their turnover has gradually offset that loss, and some ports are now making good profits. The money is taken into the Treasury where it can be used to offset the losses incurred by ports like Esperance while operating in their infancy. It helps average port charges over the numerous ports.

Provision is made for a sum of $300,000 a year to be borrowed, and this is a great help, especially as it relates to the Public Works Department. Over a period of three years nearly $1,000,000 could be borrowed and this could be sufficient money to provide another wharf or other facilities which would otherwise not be possible because of the shortage of loan funds which the State has had to face, and will continue to face, over the years.

With the establishment of this port authority at Esperance, and the appointment of men with local knowledge to serve on the authority, it will be possible to bring forward suggestions and ideas as to how trade can be promoted and diverted to ensure ever-increasing import and export tonnages.

Because Esperance is far removed from the main markets, and because of the cost of transport, I hope manufacturers will take full advantage of the shipping facilities by providing adequate storage space, so that goods which come either from the Eastern States or Perth can be stored in quantity to provide a continuity of supply to the farming and business communities. This is a most important factor if the district is going to benefit to the full from this port.

I am of the opinion that Esperance could experience some of the difficulties that have been found to exist in other towns that have a port. I refer to the transport of the products to the port. To get to the Port of Esperance it is necessary to go through the centre of the town; and, with the expansion that is taking place now, and will take place in another 10 or 20 years, there will be a distinct hazard to the town itself unless something is done soon. A good deal of thought should be given now to the zoning of a road system that will allow transport vehicles to get to the port without their being a nuisance to the residents, particularly children, who live in the centre of the town. This is a problem that will increase, and it would be a good thing if some thought could be given to it now.

Mr. Strickland mentioned the spreading of representation on the authority; and I hope this will be so at Esperance. We had a good example of this with the Albany Harbour Board where there was representation from the northern section of the land that fed products to the Port of Albany, through to the middle area, and so on. The advantage of this was that people who came a long way from the port did a great deal to encourage the use of the port and suggested to various bodies, and to the Government, ways and means that would help to divert various products to that port and bring imports back into the district. This definitely hastened the development of the Port of Albany.

There is no doubt that the tonnage of shipping will increase at Esperance and we will be able to bring about a closer association with the various ports of the State, which will promote the various products that go from port to port within the State, as well as from overseas, and the Eastern States.

I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill and in congratulating Esperance on the step that is being taken. I know it will be a distinct advantage to the town in that the authority will be able to borrow $300,000 a year, as has been permitted by the Government in regard to other authorities such as the Government Employees' Housing Authority. This increases the money that can be fed into various works or installations in many districts.

Esperance has a real problem in regard to its aerodrome. Each year the shire council has borrowed to its limit of $300,000 in order to keep pace with progress. Although aerodromes are a Commonwealth matter, I think it would be very good if something on similar lines could be done in regard to these facilities.

I apologise for getting off the subject, but transport provides a vital link in a State of this size. In many cases air ports have been handed over to the control of shires and they are unable to borrow sufficient money to provide them with first class facilities. If there were an authority similar to the port authorities, the air ports at Esperance, Albany, and Geraldton, and those in the north-west, could be greatly improved. If we had eight decent air ports with all-weather bitumen strips it would be of great benefit to the transport system of the State and would make it much better than it is today, although we can all be proud of the progress that is being made.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West—Minister for Local Government) [9.38 p.m.]: I would like to thank Mr. Stubbs for his contribution the other evening. As he explained he has lost territory which included Esperance, but he saw fit to use this measure as a passing gesture. I also thank Mr. Jack Thompson and Mr. House for their contributions to the debate. They are to be congratulated on the interest they have taken in the area in the short time in which they have represented it.

The facts and figures presented to us tonight show clearly the wisdom of the Government in setting up this authority. If any further proof were needed, what those two members have said should convince all members that the Government has taken the right step.

This Bill is a replica of the one we considered previously; and, as it contains something like 84 clauses, I shall not weary the House any further.

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.

LIQUID PETROLEUM GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 5th September.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan) [9.49 p.m.]: Every time I get the adjournment of a Bill which contains only one clause to be amended I feel there is a story behind the Bill. Having had a good look at this one, I find there is also a story attached to it—and a very interesting story, too.

Even in the title I notice something rather unusual. We have had a number of Bills before us this year but this is the first time I have seen one which states that it is an Act to amend a special section—section 6 of the Liquid Petroleum Gas Act, 1956.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It is not unusual.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: It is the first time it has occurred this year so, to that extent, it is unusual. If it were not unusual we would have struck this previously. The Act which this Bill seeks to amend was assented to on the 27th December, 1956, and this is the first time since then that an amendment has been proposed.

The parent Act was introduced just a few months after liquid petroleum gas had been produced as a by-product at the Kwinana refinery. This gas was originally distributed throughout the State by an arrangement between British Petroleum Ltd., the Commonwealth Oil Refineries Ltd., and Westralian Farmers Co-operative Ltd.

Previous to this 1956 Act there were two Acts in operation in the State which were concerned with gas. The first was called the Gas (Standards) Act, of 1947, which deals with the standard of gas which is used. The second was the Gas Undertakings Act, 1947, which controlled the companies which were distributing town gas and which had a monopoly for that purpose. That is where the State Electricity Commission, which is referred to in the Bill as the commission, comes into the picture. It was about that time that the State Electricity Commission acquired the rights to supply gas to the City of Perth.

The standards relating to the gas quality of liquid petroleum gas were laid down in England and the United States of America, and the Act of 1956 provided that the State Electricity Commission, which administers the two Acts mentioned, should first of all have the power to declare the standards for gas; and then, having declared the standards, it was given the power to police them. That is where the parent Act came under the control of the commission.

It was understood, of course, that the standards to be fixed would be in accordance with the standards set by the British

and American authorities, and they dealt both with the quality of the gas and the safety of this liquid petroleum gas.

Difficulties were experienced, first of all in finding containers for the distribution of the gas to country centres. The right type of steel for the making of these containers was not available in large quantities, but this difficulty has now been overcome. Anybody who likes to go along High Road can see the distribution centre for liquid petroleum gas, and they will see how enormous it has become.

In 1956 there were only three regular users of this product. They were, country homes, launches, and caravans. The owners of launches and caravans found that they could carry with them some of the comforts of home in the form of gas-operated appliances.

The record of safety in America, with regard to liquid petroleum gas, has been found, over the years, to be exceptionally good. Of the types of gas which are used—liquid petroleum gas has a lower fire risk than either natural gas or coal gas.

It was found necessary to incorporate a certain chemical known as ethyl mercaptan into the gas, which is odourless. By putting the chemical into the gas it was possible to smell the gas and this, of course, was an extra safety measure; and the Act provided that the liquid petroleum gas should have an odour, and that is the subject of the amendment which is sought this evening.

Liquid petroleum gas is more efficient in terms of British thermal units than coal gas or natural gas. Its British thermal unit rating is 3,125 a pound as against 475 a pound, which we insist on in our ordinary coal gas. The incorporation of the aroma-producing ethyl mercaptan into the gas has become an embarrassment. In the Eastern States, where this provision is not incorporated in the legislation, we find embarrassment has not occurred in the manufacture of certain propellants used in some of our petrols. Members have no doubt heard of butane boosted petrols which are reputed to make a motor vehicle fly along the road.

It is found that to a certain extent we are prohibted from preparing such products because, when this chemical is included in petroleum it produces a smell which immediately detracts from the value of the product and is of no competitive use.

The various uses for liquid petroleum gas have expanded considerably. Originally it was used only for heating homes, especially country homes. It may be of interest to recall that the Minister for Local Government was one of the first to have liquid gas installed in his home in Geraldton in 1956 for the purpose of heating. I have already referred to its use in caravans and launches, but the uses of liquid petroleum gas today are so wide they are a story in themselves.

Liqud petroleum gas is used at present for domestic cooking; water heating; space heating; lighting, as a supplement to enrich normal gas supplies; heat treatment of metals, including soldering, brazing, flame hardening, steel-cutting, non-ferrous metal welding, and bright alloy annealing; vitreous enamelling; ceramic baking; textile singeing and drying; food processing; farm application, including tobacco curing, weed eradication, and crop drying; lighting of marine buoys and coastal lighthouses; fuels for internal combustion engines; fertilisers, particularly ammonia; manufacture of methyl alcohol; formaldehyde; carbon black; blending agents for motor and aviation fuels; and production of electricity.

Members can realise that if we keep the present provision relating to odour in the Statute it will be an embarrassment to the development of our liquid petroleum gas industry. Cracked refinery gases provide a source for the liqueflable gaseous fuels propane and butane, the domestic and industrial uses of which are developing rapidly.

This amendment will permit gas to be sold without an odour for some industrial and commercial uses. In fact, that is the purpose of the Bill. Members will appreciate how important the amendment is and the scope for expanding the many fields of industry that will be thrown open. I can see the importance of this amendment to the State in the future by the development of the uses of liquid petroleum gas. 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.

House adjourned at 10.1 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 11th September, 1968

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

QUESTIONS (52): ON NOTICE

PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

Guildford Road

1. Mr. HARMAN asked the Minister for Traffic:

   In view of the fact that a large shopping complex is now under construction in Guildford Road,