

of \$1,300,000 will be provided conditional to the principals raising \$900,000 and if the site and supporting facilities are satisfactory. The likely capacity is 2,500 sheep and 250 cattle per day.

- (e) **Wesmeats** — Wesfarmers/Farmers' Union have a stated intention to construct an export abattoir either in the metropolitan area or in a country centre. If a decision is made for a metropolitan site, Baldivis will be available. The likely capacity would be 6,000 sheep and lambs and 250 cattle per day together with some capacity for pigs.

- (f) **Wanneroo** — Abattoir construction is under consideration as a private enterprise project but no finality has been reached although preliminary discussions have been held with the Department of Development and Decentralisation and the Meat Industry Advisory Committee. It would appear that no Government assistance is being sought for this project. It has a stated capacity of 5,000 sheep per day as well as cattle and pigs.

I turn now to paragraph (5) of the motion which I refrained from answering earlier. An U.F.G.A./T.L.C. project which provides for the establishment of three export abattoirs at Boyup Brook, Northam, and Geraldton has been submitted to the Department of Development and Decentralisation. The total capital cost is estimated at \$23,000,000. The capacity of each of the works is stated to be 6,000 sheep and lambs per day as well as 120 cattle (Boyup Brook) and 500 pigs (Northam).

A feasibility study is currently being examined by the Treasury and the Department of Development and Decentralisation. The study has not been assessed by the Meat Industry Advisory Committee.

Regarding paragraph (6) of the motion, present facilities together with additional facilities now under construction should be sufficient to meet the State's immediate sheep slaughtering requirements.

In particular it is believed that the next country abattoir in order of priority should be established at Esperance. If, additionally, a further abattoir were commenced within the next two years, the State's projected slaughtering needs would be met on a basis of a stabilisation of the State's sheep population.

I would like to table this report in compliance with the request of the member for Wellington. If he requires any further detail I will certainly be happy to endeavour to provide it for him. I trust that will satisfy his requirements under the motion.

The report was tabled

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Graham (Minister for Development and Decentralisation).

House adjourned at 10.34 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 13th April, 1972

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Postponement

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North-East Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [2.34 p.m.]: Mr. President, I ask leave of the House to reply to questions on notice after the afternoon tea suspension.

The PRESIDENT: Permission granted.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Investigation by Committee: Motion

Debate resumed, from the 30th March, on the following motion by The Hon. I. G. Medcalf:—

That in the light of recent experience of Daylight Saving in the Eastern States and bearing in mind the varied results and conclusions reached in those States this House is of the opinion that the Government should arrange for a properly qualified committee of persons to report on the likely effects of Daylight Saving on the Western Australian population having regard for health, sociological, climatic and meteorological considerations so that if some Eastern States propose to re-institute Daylight Saving next summer the Government may in the national interest of interstate trade, commerce and communications be in a position to produce some authoritative evidence to support a case for all States standardizing on a time adjustment which achieves an acceptable compromise in view of varying time factors and conditions in the several States.

THE HON. R. H. C. STUBBS (South-East—Chief Secretary) [2.35 p.m.]: I wish to inform the House that I agree to the motion moved by Mr. Medcalf. It is clear from the honourable member's speech that he has given much thought to the subject of daylight saving. I agree basically with his motion which is to the effect that the introduction of daylight saving in Western Australia should be investigated again this year.

It was the Government's intention to reassess the situation in 1972 had the Bill presented in the last session of Parliament been passed. Had it been passed and had daylight saving become a fact in the summer of 1971, then we would have had a lot more knowledge to draw on now. Last year was a trial period for daylight saving in Australia. At the meeting of Ministers last year, which I attended as an observer, it was obvious that all States were not in complete agreement; but they agreed to a trial period—not all Ministers did so at the actual meeting; they did so after investigation in their own States.

South Australia and Queensland were not enthusiastic, but considered they would be at a considerable disadvantage in regard to business if they did not go along with the other States.

In Western Australia the question was researched. Before legislation to introduce daylight saving in this State was introduced, the public were given an opportunity to express their views. Letters were received from all sections of the community—housewives, workers, sporting bodies, commerce, industry, entertainment, and the rural sector. Other inquiries were made on the effects daylight saving might have on communications with the Eastern States, interstate trade and commerce—including the short-term money market and the stock exchange—the environment, and the Government Astronomer.

During these inquiries it was claimed that those commercial enterprises whose business depended on quick and constant communication with Eastern States capitals would be operating at a considerable disadvantage if the time lag between the east and west coasts were increased to three hours by the nonintroduction of daylight saving in Western Australia, and that the State would suffer financially as a result.

The Bill was introduced in the interests of the State to maintain the standard time difference in Australia, as had been agreed with all other States in the national interest.

In 1972 the situation has somewhat changed. From recent Press announcements it now appears that Queensland will not introduce daylight saving again this year. Daylight saving is of more advantage in southern areas than in northern areas because of climatic conditions, and this is probably why Queensland will decline to participate in daylight saving next summer.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: If that is the case there might be five different times.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: There could be. We will have to face that problem when we come to it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You have said that Queensland will not introduce it. So that is a problem already.

The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS: It is a problem, and we will face it when we come to it. It is not known what position South Australia will adopt. Another meeting of State Ministers will be held this year. The 30th June has been set as a tentative date. At this meeting all States will again decide whether they will participate in daylight saving in the summer of 1972. Before that time I hope a committee will be formed to investigate the position in Western Australia.

The fact that Mr. Medcalf mentioned the various people who might become involved shows he has given careful thought to the matter, and I agree that these are the people who would be useful on an investigating committee of this type.

Most of the fields mentioned were covered in our previous inquiries, but more information should now be available and we should be able to obtain more facts from those sections of people who claimed they would be disadvantaged by the change.

I might add that I think it is fitting that people who claimed they would be disadvantaged at that particular time should convince the proposed committee to some extent that they had been disadvantaged. I heartily agree to the motion being passed; and if it is carried by this House I shall set in train the committee of inquiry, as suggested by the mover.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West)
[2.41 p.m.]: Whilst I am not disagreeing with the principle of the motion, I cannot altogether agree with what Mr. Medcalf or the Chief Secretary has said in regard to the people who are to constitute this committee. Eventually Parliament, and this House, will have to decide the issue.

On an issue such as this which involves so many fundamental principles the members of this House ought to be the ones to undertake the investigation, because there are so many facets to the question. Let us consider the 20 people who have been mentioned by Mr. Medcalf. Which three will be selected to undertake the investigation? The investigation will not be conducted in Western Australia only. The committee will have to go to the other States and examine individuals. Anybody taking on the task of inquiry will have to go to New South Wales and Victoria, and speak to the housewives there. They are the ones who have been required to stay at home with the children whilst their husbands were out playing golf or spending their time at hotels. As a result of daylight saving the housewife has been left home to mind the children for an extra hour of daylight.

These are the factors which should be examined and considered; not that some people will lose a few dollars as a result of the introduction of daylight saving. If

the right evidence is obtained it will be found that many people made money because Western Australia was not tied to daylight saving. However, we have to make inquiries to obtain this information. Some people in this State did make money because Western Australia did not adopt daylight saving. If we consider the geography of this State we will find we are nearer to the markets of the East than are the other States, and when daylight saving was adopted by the Eastern States we had an extra three hours of trading. This was advantageous to Western Australia; it was not a disadvantage, despite the fact that the Rural and Industries Bank might have lost a few dollars on the short-term money market—although I doubt that it did.

Many problems are involved, and Mr. Medcalf has mentioned them. I do not object to the information being obtained, but I believe that it is the job of members of Parliament to do this. If we are to have the proposed committee then at least three members of this House ought to constitute that committee.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Leader of the Opposition) [2.44 p.m.]: I agree with Mr. Logan that members of both Houses of Parliament of Western Australia will ultimately have to make the decision in respect of the introduction of daylight saving, but the principle of gaining the assistance of other people who are qualified to give advice in matters of this nature and of other kinds is accepted without question. Many matters come before Parliament upon which the Government seeks advice before introducing legislation.

I hope I am not correct, but I rather gathered from the speech of the Chief Secretary that he is inclined to suggest the House was wrong in making the decision that it did last year. He said the Bill was introduced in the interests of the State.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: Perhaps I should say the Bill is in the interests of the State. The important thing was that I wanted to obtain the fullest information for Parliament before the Bill went before the House.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I accept that statement. Another important factor is that the debate which took place in this House was, in the opinion of those who took part in it, in the interests of the State.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: Probably it was.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: After all, that is what we have been elected to Parliament for—to express our views and to come forward with ideas which we have in relation to legislation that is introduced.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: That is correct.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is never a one-sided story. We heard the Chief Secretary telling us last year that of all the representations he had received in relation to the introduction of daylight saving, there were more people opposed to it than were in favour of it.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: That is correct.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Despite that, the Government decided to go on with the legislation to introduce daylight saving. We all know what took place when the vote was taken. We were widely divided on the subject. That is not really correct, because members of the Labor Party were not divided on this subject although in their own hearts they might have been, but that was not reflected in the vote.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: Some people have hearts which are too dark to see.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am sorry to hear this, if that is the state of health of the Chief Secretary!

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: I was saying that some people have hearts that are too dark to see.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: My heart is not too dark to see through.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: How do you know?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have an open mind, and I have said so.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I am back to the heart factor.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There is nothing wrong with my heart.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Are you sure?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am quite sure.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: I am glad to hear that. I would like to see you here for another 10 years.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am sure the Leader of the House will; and I hope he will continue to live a healthy life for a long time, to continue with his wishful thoughts that constitute his makeup.

To get back to the point of the attitude of those of us who were opposed to daylight saving, I must confess that at the time I was open to be convinced and I stated the reason for my vote going the way that it did. Our attitude was to consider the experience in the rest of Australia, before we fell into line with the other States. I get rather tired of being pulled by the heels by the Eastern States, and being influenced by what is done over there. Let us consider what is the result of that experience. The Minister told us this afternoon about the result of that experience. Queensland will not now have a bar of daylight saving.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Tell us about the other States.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Minister should allow me to make my own speech. Next year South Australia does not know what it will do in this regard.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: Because it was on a trial basis.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That was exactly what we said. If Queensland does not fall into line next year, and South Australia does the same, and if Western Australia likewise does not also fall into line, then there will be only two mainland States in Australia that will be adopting daylight saving. If those two States do so there will be five different times.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: I think the other two States will.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I wish the Chief Secretary would use some intelligence.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: By Christ! I have just as much intelligence as you have, and I know how to use it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Apparently the Chief Secretary knows how to use bad and profane language.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: Is that bad language? I thought it was accepted Australian.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I had better forget about that; I do not want the Chief Secretary to burst a blood vessel! We are entitled to our views on this matter, but I am pleased the Government will appoint the committee. I merely started off on the point raised by Mr. Logan, that he doubted whether the committee will achieve any worth-while purpose. I do not know what else we can do. We must obtain more information on the subject, and I hope we will get it as a result of the proposed inquiry. However, the speech made by the Chief Secretary indicated that as a result of the experience in other States there was doubt in some parts of Australia of the wisdom of daylight saving.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: There is a doubt, and there is no question about that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am prepared to assert that once the decision was made not to adopt daylight saving, very few people worried about it.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Many people were pleased Western Australia did not adopt it last year.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, many people were pleased we did not have daylight saving. I am still open to conviction that daylight saving would be a good thing for Western Australia. I have risen to my feet merely to defend the situation of the Chief Secretary saying that the Bill was introduced in the interests of the State. I am sure it was. The Chief Secretary will

accept the fact that the debate which took place in this House was also in the interests of the State and even if we make mistakes from time to time, those of us who decide to go one way or the other on a matter believe in all conscience that we are doing the right thing.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: I have never queried that in this House.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not suggesting that the Chief Secretary is querying it this afternoon. However, I repeat: One votes on one side or the other according to one's beliefs. I believe we did the right thing in 1971, when we decided to wait until we saw what took place in the other States. We waited and we have seen what took place.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: We will know enough in 1973 if we conduct this inquiry.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Well the Chief Secretary did not think of holding any inquiry; it took a motion moved by Mr. Medcalf to convince him of the necessity.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: The Leader of the Opposition does not know; he is speculating.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: All right, I am speculating. Now the Chief Secretary can tell me: Did he have it in mind to hold an inquiry?

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: I intended to have a departmental inquiry into the matter. I have simply said that the idea put forward by Mr. Medcalf is very good and I am happy to go along with it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: But that idea was put forward by Mr. Medcalf.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must object to this question and answer across the floor of the House. Would the Leader of the Opposition please address the Chair.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I beg your pardon, Mr. President. However, the Chief Secretary is doing pretty well for himself this afternoon. Obviously, he had thought of having an inquiry and I think it would have been to his advantage had he put the idea forward earlier. I am pleased he thought of it. Obviously, the Chief Secretary is fortified by the fact that Mr. Medcalf thought along the same lines.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Great minds always think alike.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Not always. For instance, the Minister for Police and I often disagree, and I ask him not to comment further because I know what he has in mind!

I content myself by saying that I sincerely hope the committee which the Chief Secretary will appoint will be representative of the people, as Mr. Medcalf has suggested.

The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs: I think I have already indicated that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, the Minister has. I hope we have another opportunity to have a look at this because I will be most interested to see what happens in South Australia. We are aware of the attitude of the Queensland Government. I think we will have a different view from that held in Queensland, but for totally different reasons.

Mr. Medcalf is to be congratulated for introducing a motion of this nature because at the time of the introduction of the Bill there was an attempt on the part of some people to make this a political issue rather than an economic issue and, as the Minister has said, that was not in the best interests of the State.

I would like to assure the Minister, if he needs assurance, that those of us who voted against the Bill did so in the conscientious belief that that was best for Western Australia, not only in the rural interest, but in the interests of the workers, and in the general interest. We felt it was not a good thing to force something on people before we had conclusive evidence that they wanted it.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Minister for Police) [2.55 p.m.]: I would like to make a few comments. Reference has been made to the fact that Queensland has indicated that it is opposed to daylight saving, and that it will not be introduced next year. What about the other States? From my reading—and that is all one can go on—New South Wales is sold on the idea.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Only a certain portion.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: So is Victoria, and so is South Australia and Tasmania. The latter State has had daylight saving for a number of years and it is still going along with it. From my reading, four States—Victoria, Tasmania, South Australia, and New South Wales—intend to go along with it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Chief Secretary said he did not know what South Australia intended to do.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I do not know what the Chief Secretary said; he knows no more than I know from my reading.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We were listening to his speech.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: That is right; he only anticipates the position in Queensland. Queensland will have an election and that State has perhaps expressed an opinion a little early. I am sure that the other States will express opinions nearer election time. We are in the position where we are not convinced one way or the other. A lot of us are convinced as to whether

or not daylight saving should be introduced. That is all right and nobody can be criticised for that. However, from the experience gained by some States last year, they are prepared to go along with the proposal next year.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Mr. Medcalf gave the Gallop poll figures.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: I listened to everything that was said, and I agree with Mr. Medcalf. That is why I intend to support the motion, which is also supported by my colleague, the Chief Secretary. The more information we can get, particularly along the lines indicated by Mr. Medcalf, the better it will be and the more we will benefit.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I think the Chief Secretary did very well.

The Hon. J. DOLAN: Mr. Medcalf is to be commended for introducing the motion, as is the Chief Secretary for supporting it. I also support the motion.

THE HON. W. R. WITHERS (North) [2.57 p.m.]: I would not like to be left out of this act; I also support the motion.

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan [2.58 p.m.]: I was very relieved to see Mr. Withers sit down so quickly! I thank members for their contribution to the debate on the motion which I have moved. As I said when I introduced the motion, I hoped this would not become a debate—and it has not—on the merits or demerits of daylight saving. The motion is purely intended to request that a study be made by the Government.

The Legislative Council has no authority to require the Government to make any such study and I am indeed grateful that the Chief Secretary has quite clearly indicated, in his comments, that the Government is prepared to accept my request, providing, of course, that this motion is passed by the House. I appreciate that it has not yet been passed. Subject to the passing of the motion the Government will appoint a committee and I am grateful for the attention which the Chief Secretary has given to the various points raised.

I would like to comment, briefly, on Mr. Logan's reference to the constitution of the committee. I readily agree with him that there are a great number of people who could have an interest in this subject. I think Mr. Heitman interjected and suggested that the Director of Agriculture be appointed, but that suggestion was rapidly rescinded and somebody else was suggested in his place.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: The Farmers' Union and the C.W.A. could have been named.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: That is so, but I believe we should impose a limit. We could include the entire community but we must try to select those who have the most significant interest. It is not for me to say who they should be and my motion, in fact, leaves the selection to the Government.

The motion simply asks the Government to appoint a properly qualified committee and I merely made some suggestions. I readily agree with Mr. Logan that the constitution of the committee will be a matter of opinion. I thank the Minister for indicating that he is in substantial agreement with the terms of the motion.

Question put and passed.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by The Hon. J. Dolan (Minister for Police), and passed.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 12th April.

THE HON. N. McNEILL (Lower West) [3.02 p.m.]: As the Minister indicated when he introduced the Bill it really is quite minor, and I think it is introduced by the Government in deference to the wishes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Western Australia. Its purpose is, in fact, threefold, in that there are three small amendments being made to the principal Act.

The first of these amendments is to correct what is obviously an omission in the principal Act of 1970 where there was, in fact, no reference in section 3 of that Act to the General Assembly—that is, to the governing body of the Presbyterian Church in this State.

The Act, as it was printed, refers to the Presbyterian Church in Western Australia and it is concerned with the property which that church administers, but it does not acknowledge the fact that the governing body—that is the General Assembly—not only is charged with the responsibility but that it has an interest in and controls the property of the church.

Accordingly it has been found necessary to include in the Bill this reference to the General Assembly. The remaining two amendments I think can be referred to as drafting corrections to section 4 of the principal Act, because there is obviously an incorrect reference.

Once again the property of the church is referred to and the reference in the Act refers to section 3 where, in fact, it should refer to subsection (1) of section

2 of the Act. This has been corrected. There is a further amendment in that same subsection in which there is also an incorrect reference. This has been put right in the Bill before us.

These amendments are of legal interest I would imagine and probably quite important from the legal point of view, as they relate to the affairs of the Presbyterian Church. I think they are desirable and I support the Bill.

THE HON. J. DOLAN (South-East Metropolitan—Minister for Police) [3.04 p.m.]: I thank Mr. McNeill for his support and his comments and I commend the Bill to the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 30th March.

THE HON. I. G. MEDCALF (Metropolitan) [3.07 p.m.]: This Bill does four things. It proposes to vary the conditions of drivers' licenses which are issued after a refusal by the Commissioner of Police to issue or renew a license.

At the present time there is no opportunity where the Commissioner refuses a license or suspends a license to have the conditions varied.

The first proposal in the Bill is to give power to have a cancelled or suspended license varied under section 24 of the Traffic Act, in the same way as persons whose licenses are suspended by the courts may now have their licenses varied.

The Minister has already pointed out that a person may lose his license in two ways: Either by action of the court after a conviction, in which case he can apply to have it varied; or by action of the Commissioner himself who may cancel it. In the latter case there is no appeal.

This Bill proposes to provide an appeal whereby a license can be varied. I think this is a good move, and I notice the Minister has indicated that it has been proposed or supported by the Law Society.

The second provision in the Bill is also a sensible proposal. Where a person has been granted a license subject to the payment of reduced fees for particular reasons and he subsequently transfers a vehicle he must, at the present time, hand in the plates. Clearly it would be advantageous if he were able to transfer the vehicle in the same manner as any other driver who

has paid the full fees without handing in the plates, provided the difference is paid to the licensing authority.

The proposal now is that the purchaser may pay the difference in the license fee; that is between the reduced fee payable by the first person and the full fee which the normal purchaser must pay. This is a sensible inclusion which I believe will improve the Traffic Act.

Another equally sensible and commendable provision in the Bill is that which proposes there will be a reduction in fees for pensioners licensed to drive a vehicle other than a passenger vehicle, and this reduction will be from \$3 to \$1.

It has been mentioned by the Minister that the only reason he has kept the fee at \$1 is for statistical purposes, because otherwise it would get out of hand and would need quite a lot of additional clerical work in order to keep track of the licenses issued. I am sure that provision will be welcomed. I support those three clauses of the Bill.

I regret to say, however, I cannot support the proposals contained in clause 4. I ask the Minister to look at this clause again. I believe it merits closer study because of the overall effect of transferring the responsibility of appointments from the Minister to the Commissioner of Police. In fact, the commissioner, under this legislation, has greater power than the Minister for Police has at present. I believe it deserves further attention and I will now deal with the clause in more detail.

Clause 4 of the Bill provides for the repeal of section 22 (6). Section 22 of the Act deals with the appointment of traffic inspectors by the local authority and also by the Minister. Traffic inspectors may be appointed by the local authority and the powers of the traffic inspectors so appointed are set out in section 22 (2) of the Act.

This section states that the inspector may "Exercise all such powers and shall perform all such duties as are vested or imposed in or upon him by this Act." That means, of course, by this Act or the regulations, because the regulations are included in the Act. The traffic inspectors' powers are given to them by virtue of this Act, and the regulations laid on the Table of Parliament.

Section 22 (4) of the Traffic Act reads as follows:—

It shall be the duty of every police officer to aid and assist inspectors in the exercise and discharge of their powers and duties, and members of the police force may exercise such powers and shall perform such duties of inspectors (except the granting or transfer of licenses or the effecting of registrations) as the Commissioner of

Police may by general or special order published in the *Gazette* think fit for the time being to vest in or impose upon them.

Members will notice that the commissioner must publish in the *Gazette* special orders which he imposes on police officers. However, he only imposes those requirements on police officers—members of the Police Force under his control. He cannot impose orders on traffic inspectors. The traffic inspector's duties are laid down in the Act and the regulations.

Subsection (5) reads as follows:—

Every such member of the police force and every such inspector may exercise all such powers and shall perform all such duties as are vested or imposed in or upon him by this Act in respect of any road open to public traffic. . . .

That brings me to the proposed repeal of subsection (6). I referred to the earlier subsections so we could view this subsection in its proper context. Subsection (6) reads as follows:—

The Minister may appoint any person to be an inspector who shall, in respect of any road to which his appointment extends, have such powers and perform such duties of an inspector as the Minister may from time to time direct.

Members will see that traffic inspectors may be appointed by the Minister as well as by the local authority. The traffic inspectors appointed by the local authority have their duties laid down by the Act and the regulations, but the traffic inspectors appointed by the Minister will perform such duties as the Minister directs. It is this provision that we are proposing to change. The new subsection (6) will read as follows:—

The Commissioner of Police may appoint any person to be an inspector who shall, in respect of any area or road to which his appointment extends, have such powers and perform such duties as the Commissioner may from time to time direct.

I believe there is quite a big difference between the existing law and the proposed amendment. It may be summarised by saying at the present time the Minister appoints the traffic inspectors but it is proposed that the commissioner will now perform this duty. At the present time the Minister lays down the duties of the inspectors but the proposed amendment allocates to the commissioner the authority to lay down the powers and duties of the traffic inspectors.

Members will note that the subclause ends, "as the commissioner may from time to time direct." In other words, the commissioner may periodically change his mind. He may have one group of inspectors to perform certain duties and another

group to perform duties in another place. I appreciate that this allows the commissioner added flexibility but it does become difficult for the general public to understand the duties of any particular inspector. We are well aware that 99 per cent. of the people appointed as inspectors carry out their duties efficiently and as carefully as possible. However, there are occasions when inspectors—and even police officers who are much more important people in the grading of this Act—exceed their duties. How will an inspector know initially what his duties are unless they are laid down and described in some manner? For this reason I ask the Minister to have a further look at this clause.

It is in the interests of the Commissioner of Police, the Police Force and the public, to know what the duties of an inspector are. I am quite sure if this legislation is passed the commissioner will say to the inspectors, "Your duties are so and so," and they will be given a letter of instructions setting out their duties. I do not doubt the commissioner will set out their duties precisely. I am not querying the commissioner's ability or his knowledge of the task, but I do say these should be prescribed properly as they are prescribed by the local authority or by the Minister in the *Gazette*. I suggest these duties should be laid down as regulations, and this would not be particularly difficult.

In his second reading speech the Minister said the commissioner would appoint crosswalk attendants and vehicle examiners, and that these people could then be appointed as inspectors. However, the Bill does not mention crosswalk attendants or vehicle examiners. The Bill provides that the commissioner may appoint any person. If the intention is to appoint crosswalk attendants and vehicle examiners, it should be stated.

The Minister said one of the reasons for delegating this power to the commissioner is the great number of appointments which are now made. I have no doubt that statement is correct—undoubtedly there would now be many more appointments because of the greater number of vehicles on the road, the greater number of pedestrians, and the extra care we now exercise over the safety of schoolchildren and people using crosswalks. This is a good thing. However, this is surely a good reason why the appointments should be left to the Minister; that is because of the large demand for the type of service provided by the inspectors. I cannot see why the Minister cannot make the appointments.

I would be prepared to agree to the commissioner having this power if consideration is given to regulations setting out the duties and powers of traffic inspectors. A person appointed as an inspector should know his rights and his duties. The point I wish to stress is that

the duties should be prescribed, and this would require only a minor modification of subclause (6). Further on in the subsection there appear to be inconsistencies which will require the attention of the Minister in any event.

Subsection (8) which immediately follows, and which is part of the section we seek to amend, has the following proviso—

Provided that within the metropolitan area the regulation and control of traffic shall, subject to the next following proviso, be administered solely by the Commissioner of Police and the members of the police force; such area to be defined by regulation and in addition, in any part of the metropolitan area. . .

What we are saying there is that in the metropolitan area, subject to a proviso which allows the Perth City Council inspectors to act, the commissioner and members of the Police Force will have the sole regulation and control of traffic. Very simply, therefore, it means that the inspectors whom the Minister proposes to appoint are to be appointed for country areas because they are unable to operate in the metropolitan area, as I see it, in view of the fact that the proviso restricts the control and regulation of traffic in the metropolitan area to the commissioner and members of the Police Force, and I take it that these inspectors would not be members of the Police Force.

The Hon. J. Dolan: They would be these old chaps you see at crosswalks.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: But they would not be members of the Police Force.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Some of them are exercising, without authority, the powers of members of the Police Force, and are becoming too officious.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I thank the Minister for that frank comment.

The Hon. J. Dolan: There are exceptional cases, of course.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: If there are some of these inspectors who are likely to be officious I think that is all the more reason for these regulations to be prescribed. I again draw the attention of the Minister to the proviso I have already quoted. If any of these inspectors are to play any part in the regulation and control of traffic—as indeed they must, because the crosswalk attendant must stop the traffic—it looks as though that proviso needs a little attention, otherwise they will not be able to regulate the traffic. Perhaps they have been exceeding their powers in the last few years.

The Hon. J. Dolan: I would not say that, but you do get the odd one who does exceed his powers.

The Hon. I. G. MEDCALF: I think the Minister should look at that proviso, bearing in mind that it is a proviso to the subsection which deals with an inspector producing a certificate of his appointment. It may be said, therefore, that that proviso is limited to that subsection, but it is expressed in such terms that I think it could cause a great deal of trouble if someone took the matter up and suggested that the inspectors had no power whatever in the metropolitan area.

I am sure the Minister would not like to restrict in any way the inspectors whom this Bill proposes to appoint. If the Minister can satisfy me that the proviso to subsection (8) that I have quoted is not inconsistent I will not object to the commissioner taking the place of the Minister, but I believe the powers and duties of traffic inspectors should be laid down by regulations. In other words, when the commissioner lays down their powers and duties he should do it under regulations which have to come to Parliament and be approved in the normal way under the Interpretation Act.

In closing, I support the three first-mentioned parts of the Bill, but I make the foregoing qualifications in regard to the appointment of inspectors, and ask the the Minister to look at the relevant clause with a view to improving it as indicated.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West) [3.25 p.m.]: I have no objection to two of the clauses in the Bill, but I take some exception to clause 4. To a certain extent Mr. Medcalf has outlined his objection to it, but in his second reading speech the Minister told the House that it was intended to use this Bill to enable the commissioner to appoint crosswalk attendants and vehicle inspectors. Like Mr. Medcalf, I do not think crosswalk attendants should be appointed as vehicle inspectors.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Not to appoint them, but to appoint them with limited powers.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Why is that not clearly set down in the Bill; that the intention is to appoint crosswalk attendants and vehicle inspectors? That is what I am objecting to. If a crosswalk attendant is, perhaps, ill and cannot attend to his duties at any time, I think it is fair enough to call in a traffic inspector to take his place for the time being. That would be all right, because a traffic inspector is trained. However, under the provision contained in the Bill a crosswalk attendant can take over the duties of a traffic inspector

The Hon. J. Dolan: He can't.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes he can. A crosswalk attendant can be appointed as a traffic inspector.

The Hon. J. Dolan: We are giving crosswalk attendants limited powers. That is what the commissioner wants here.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Bill will make crosswalk attendants traffic inspectors; that is what is being provided.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: They will have limited powers of a traffic inspector.

The Hon. J. Dolan: Some of them are now taking on the powers belonging to a traffic inspector, and I think Mr. Medcalf's point is well taken; namely, that their powers and duties should be prescribed so that we know exactly what those duties are. Therefore, I am quite prepared to have a look at his suggestion.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Bill provides that the Commissioner of Police may appoint any person to be an inspector, and the definition of an inspector under the Traffic Act means that he will be a traffic inspector; nothing more and nothing less. There is no reference to a crosswalk attendant or anything else whatsoever. Once a man becomes a traffic inspector, he is a traffic inspector and nothing else, with all the powers of a traffic inspector, unless the Commissioner of Police, somewhere along the line, says, "You are a traffic inspector and you shall do this or do that." This is an impossible situation and I think the Minister should have another look at the relevant provision in the Bill and incorporate in the Traffic Act a provision which will grant the right to the commissioner to appoint crosswalk attendants with limited powers, and vehicle inspectors with limited powers, so that the issue will not become confused. At the moment, whilst supporting the other provisions in the Bill, I am not prepared to support clause 4.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. S. J. Dellar.

MAIN ROADS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 11th April.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Upper West) [3.28 p.m.]: I have given some consideration to the Bill before the House. It deals with two main issues, both of which, to a certain extent, will give the Commissioner of Main Roads certain powers. I think it is fair enough that the commissioner should have power over main roads, but when we look at the implications behind proposed new section 15A, I think members will agree that it needs careful consideration, because it reads as follows:—

15A. (1) No person shall cut, break, bark, root up or otherwise damage, destroy or remove the whole or any part of any timber, tree, sapling, shrub, undergrowth, or wildflower in or upon any main road without the prior consent in writing of the Commissioner.

Many miles of boundary fences adjoin main roads, and on many occasions trees are blown down or uprooted and thrown across boundary fences.

Why should it be necessary for the owner of a property to obtain written permission from the commissioner before he can remove such trees? This is what this provision stipulates. Although I know the Commissioner would not be so silly as to worry about such a request, why should we include this provision in the Act?

Many thousands of miles of road verges contain noxious weeds. Why should it be necessary for an owner or an occupier of a nearby property to obtain written permission from the commissioner before he can remove those noxious weeds? Again, the commissioner would not worry about such a request, but under this Bill such a provision will be included in the Act. This is entirely wrong. We are including provisions which will be absolutely impossible to enforce.

Mr. MacKinnon referred to trees being blown over onto the road, and I have referred to trees and shrubs over fences and also to noxious weeds. Under the provisions in this Bill the trees, shrubs, and noxious weeds could not be touched without written permission from the commissioner. I say again that this is wrong.

I understand the local authorities have reached agreement with the commissioner that he should have control over signs and hoardings on main roads. They attended a meeting with the commissioner and accepted his guarantee concerning what will occur under his control, and they are prepared to accept his word. However, we do not know whether the present commissioner will remain in office for a long time or for only a short time, and a new commissioner may not be bound by the present commissioner's undertaking.

I would like the Minister to tell me whether a by-law under this provision will override all the other by-laws promulgated and laid on the Table of both Houses. Many local authorities have by-laws dealing with this very question, but it seems to me that if one is promulgated under this Bill, the by-laws of the local authorities will be wiped overboard.

I think the Minister should ascertain just how many of these by-laws there are, and then, instead of trying to deal with the amendments on the notice paper he should take the Bill back to the draftsman to have another look at it. I am sure that he could probably come back with a much tidier Bill dealing with the questions I have raised in regard to clause 4 and in regard to the number of amendments on the notice paper dealing with clause 6. I would much rather vote against the Bill and let the Minister introduce another one covering all the points raised in the House.

THE HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [3.34 p.m.]: I have pleasure in supporting the remarks of the previous speaker because I also feel several provisions in this Bill should be reviewed.

I am rather shocked at times at the way different shires give away their roads to the Main Roads Department. I do not believe the shires should be placed in the position where they find it necessary to do this because farmers are placed in the embarrassing situation of not knowing who owns the roads outside their properties. Sometimes the farmer will have two different owners of roads adjoining his property.

I would point out to members that the road outside a farmer's property is the equivalent of a neighbour and, as everybody knows, it is possible to have good and bad neighbours. I just wonder what sort of a neighbour the Main Roads Department will make because this Bill will be responsible for many things.

One of the provisions deals with the clearing of fence lines. I have been clearing some new country and have to erect a new fence. I have had to plough up the whole area where the fence will be erected. Obviously, if the provision in the Bill was law, I would have been breaking the law because I did not seek written permission from the commissioner to carry out this work. In addition, I am erecting an electrified fence. If one little piece of re-growth touches the two wires—the positive and negative—my fence will be shorted and so I must keep the growth down on both sides of the fence. Again under the provision in this Bill I would have to keep seeking the permission of the commissioner before I could do any clearing.

In the past I planted some 12 miles of trees along the roadsides after having obtained the permission of the shire. I wonder what will be the position if suddenly the shire gives the road away to the Main Roads Department.

The Hon. S. T. J. Thompson: They will give you some more trees to plant.

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Will the department rip my trees out? Must I allow the weeds to grow up and not cultivate the area?

Mr. Logan and Mr. McNeill referred to weeds, and this is a very important matter. No reference is made to who will be responsible for the control of the weeds on the main roads outside the farms.

A lot is involved in this Bill. Another point concerns the granting of permission for firebreaks. Many shires have stipulated that firebreaks can be placed on the roadside outside farms. This saves the farmer having to plough the firebreaks within the farm itself and is very important when sheep are run on the property for wool because they have a bad habit of camping in the dusty firebreak. The placing of the

firebreak on the other side of the fences is, in these circumstances, very advantageous.

Drainage is another problem. I mention this because the Main Roads Department has constructed a new road for the shire right beside my property and I was rather amazed to see that although the road has a fall of at least one in four for over a quarter of a mile no effort whatever was made to take the water out of the table drain and thus it will flow right through, over sandy country to the bottom. The obvious solution will be for me to provide a drain myself because it is the only way I can ensure my fence line will be left there. The present situation is that I could quite easily provide such a drain after having a word with the local shire because those on the shire quite often understand these matters. Usually a councillor lives in the area and he can give permission or ensure that someone else does. I wonder what the position will be when in such circumstances I must write to the Commissioner of Main Roads to obtain permission before I can carry out such work.

These are the type of problems I believe should be investigated. I had the pleasure of attending the Menzies lecture at the university earlier in the week and the well-known legal authority, the Vice-Chancellor of the Queensland University (Professor Zelman Cowan) dealt with the subject of making laws which cannot possibly be administered. He spoke on the effect it has on the breaking down of law and order when the authorities must try to administer those laws. I consider the Bill fits into this category and I also endorse the suggestion that it should be withdrawn and rewritten.

THE HON. R. F. CLAUGHTON (North Metropolitan) [3.41 p.m.]: I have listened carefully to previous speakers in an attempt to determine what the change from the existing Act really is. Section 15 already refers to—

- (a) all main roads and materials thereof and all things appurtenant thereto;
- (b) all ornamental trees and shrubs, and, subject to the provisions of the Forests Act, 1918, the timber upon any main road;

and the Commissioner shall have the care, control and management thereof.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There is not much difference between that section and the new provision.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: This is what I have been trying to work out.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We have all said that.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Members who have spoken have suggested they will have to write to the commissioner. Do they write to the Main Roads Department

seeking permission when they want to work on road reserves under the control of local authorities which are outside their properties? I think these matters are largely determined on the basis of common sense.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: But whose common sense? That is the question. Is it his or the other fellow's?

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: What is the level of common sense?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I cannot see any real difference between what has pertained previously and what will obtain under the present amendment.

The Hon. N. McNeill: The difference is that it will now be necessary to get the prior consent in writing of the commissioner. This is not specified in the principal Act.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: Where is that specified?

The Hon. N. McNeill: In clause 4.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: In looking at clause 4, I see there is an obvious difference. I would agree with Mr. MacKinnon that we must be realistic in our desire to preserve vegetation on the verges to our roadsides. Our desire must be tempered by the needs of road construction and the provision of services. For some time I have considered that we should adopt this attitude and look closely at exactly what we are trying to achieve with the preservation of road verges.

Verges are important to the travelling public—especially to tourists visiting our State—as a display window of our unique vegetation. If we adopt this point of view we must decide on what parts of our main roads this can be a reality. Obviously it cannot be observed over the whole length and breadth of all main roads. We should single out areas over which tourists will travel and care for and maintain the verges in those areas. I think this is a better idea than attempting to do it over the whole length and breadth of the State. We should have some means of determining this and dedicate those areas in a more rigorous way than we do now. For the balance, we are concerned with making main roads safe traffic arteries with, perhaps, a pleasant landscape on each side.

If we take both these considerations into account treatment and control would vary. I suggest the Government or the Minister concerned should look at the suggestion of determining what areas along main roads are important as a window or showcase for our unique flora. The rest should be set up simply as safe and pleasant places to travel through. Of course there must be some concern shown for the land on either side which might belong to farmers who have to care for and fence their properties.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.02 p.m.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I was speaking about clause 3 of the Bill which deals with the re-enactment of section 15 of the Act.

Clause 4 provides that no person shall cut, break, bark, etc., any vegetation without the prior consent in writing of the commissioner. In considering this section we should remember that main road property is vested in the Main Roads Department, not in the local authority. For example, on a section of the Mitchell Freeway outside Parliament House the Main Roads Department has gone to a good deal of trouble to plant trees and beautify the road reserve, and the department is responsible for maintaining the reserve and repairing any damage that may be done. The number of main roads of this nature is likely to increase. We have the Kwinana Freeway and rather wide reserves on the Mitchell Freeway in the north. The buffer zones on either side of the freeways will be the responsibility of the Main Roads Department, and it should have some authority to enable it to maintain the reserves and ensure that no damage is done to them.

We should credit the Commissioner of Main Roads with possessing a modicum of common sense. He will not require anything more than has been the experience in the past. He will be just as reasonable as local authorities are when farmers want to do work outside the boundaries of their properties.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Is it not a little easier to get to talk to the local authority than to the commissioner?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I am not sure that the farmer does go to the local authority when he wants to do work outside his boundary fences. I do not know whether the commissioner can still delegate some of his power to the local authority.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You had better read the Bill.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not think there will be much variation of the past practice.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Then why have the Bill?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I thought I had just gone over that. There are sections of main roads, such as the Mitchell Freeway and the Kwinana Freeway, where the Main Roads Department accepts a great deal more responsibility for upkeep and maintenance than has been the practice in the past. I should think this would be a reason for the inclusion of this matter in the Bill.

In the control of advertising, the power of delegation in the existing Act will remain, and the power of the Main Roads Department will be extended to areas beyond the boundaries of the main roads.

When dealing with high speed traffic on main arteries, it is reasonable to give to the Commissioner of Main Roads and his staff—who are experts in traffic management and the safety aspects of traffic—authority to say what should be in the line of sight of a motorist on any major road.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Do you not think this would be better administered by the local authority itself than by the Main Roads Department?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: At present the Main Roads Department has this control through the local authorities. Although local authorities ostensibly have control in this matter, if they want signs erected they must obtain the permission of the Main Roads Department.

The Hon. N. McNeill: I am referring to the established traffic authority; that is, the Commissioner of Police.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: The Main Roads Department has the specialists in this field. It sets the standards and stipulates where the signs will be placed. The task of the Police Department is to administer the traffic laws, not to place signs.

The Hon. N. McNeill: Why does section 58 of the Traffic Act empower the Commissioner of Police to give approval for signs?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I cannot answer that. The Minister will no doubt enlighten the honourable member. To my mind, there is a case for the Main Roads Department to have control of the placement of signs not only on road reserves but also in other areas beyond their boundaries which are in the line of sight of motorists and may cause traffic hazards. This does not mean that all signs will be abolished or abandoned. I agree with Mr. MacKinnon that signs are an important source of information.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I go along with you that there is room for some regulations covering signs but I will not agree that the commissioner is the man who should handle them. There must be people who know more about signs than he does.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: What would the process be? Would the local authority decide the matter or would it simply refer the matter to the Main Roads Department, where the specialists are?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The Main Roads Department could prescribe danger areas on the road but in the local government area the local authority should operate within the framework of some general plan.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not think it would be much different from the way it is now. There are regulations controlling the type of sign that may be erected.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Why are you fellows so crazy about centralising everything?

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: I do not think it is something we have on our own. It went on under the previous Government and it is likely to continue under this Government. As a matter of organisation, it may be the most efficient way to get things done.

I go along with Mr. MacKinnon that there is a need for signs, particularly to let the travelling public know when there is a turn-off to a town, a crossing, motel accommodation, and such information. However, there are signs and signs. A sign could be large and flamboyant without providing any more information than a smaller sign would provide.

I am not critical of the placement of signs. Mr. Clive Griffiths has said this on a number of occasions. When I was returning from Crestwood recently, not knowing the road well, I was looking for a sign indicating the road to Fremantle. It was not until after I had gone past it and came back that I saw the sign. It was placed behind a lamp post so that when one was travelling towards it it could not be seen. Obviously, the Main Roads Department is not always perfect in its placement and design of signs.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The sign might have been there first.

The Hon. R. F. CLAUGHTON: It might have been. With those remarks I support the Bill.

THE HON. CLIVE GRIFFITHS (South-East Metropolitan) [4.14 p.m.]: I rise to make some brief remarks because Mr. Cloughton mentioned my name in the course of his contribution to the debate. I am quite sure the Main Roads Department is not the appropriate body to make decisions about where signs should go. I believe the Main Roads Department is not competent to do so, and there are numerous examples around the metropolitan area which lead me to believe that the Commissioner of Main Roads or his department has not much idea what a sign should indicate to people.

Some absolutely fantastic signs have been erected to indicate to drivers where they ought and ought not to go as far as getting on and off the freeway and the Narrows Bridge is concerned. However, those signs are placed adjacent to the spot where the driver is required to turn. The driver must make a decision when he gets to the sign, and then he finds that the sign tells him he should have turned.

There is an amazing sign on Riverside Drive which indicates the lanes to take if the driver wishes to travel to Crawley or, on the other hand, across the Narrows Bridge. This sign has been there for over 12 months, and it is propped up on two 44-gallon drums with a nice steel post right

in front of it. To a driver some distance away, the steel post looks like a line down the centre of the sign. On one side of the line the driver sees the words "Narrows" and "Crawley" together with an arrow pointed in one direction. The driver has to make a split-second decision as he reaches the sign, and bear in mind that he has about 1,000,000 cars behind him.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Would you like to correct that figure of 1,000,000?

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: Well, the number seems like 1,000,000 when all the drivers are tooting their horns at one. The driver suddenly sees the sign with the word "Narrows" and an arrow pointing in one direction; by this time he is alongside the sign and then he sees that on the other side the signs says, "Bridge" with an arrow pointing in the other direction.

We are being asked to support legislation which will give the control of signs to people who erect signs like that which I have mentioned and which give such confused instructions about their own roads.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You have made your point.

The Hon. CLIVE GRIFFITHS: There are many examples of this within a quarter of a mile of Parliament House. I refer to the signs along the Mitchell Freeway. From that point of view I support the argument put forward that the Main Roads Department is not the authority in which to vest the power to control signs.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. R. Thompson.

QUESTIONS (3): ON NOTICE

1. RURAL RECONSTRUCTION SCHEME

Applications: Approvals

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) (a) When was the first approval for a Rural Reconstruction Loan granted; and
 - (b) on what date was this payment made?
- (2) Since the Board's inception—
 - (a) what has been the number of approvals in each month; and
 - (b) how many of these approvals in each month have actually been paid?
- (3) (a) Is this delay due to lack of staff to carry out the necessary documentation; and
 - (b) if so, what efforts have been made to get extra staff?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) (a) 31st May, 1971.
 - (b) 5th January, 1972 (but settlements first commenced 30th November, 1971).

1971

(2) (a) May	3
June	12
July	16
August	65
September	55
October	45
November	53
December	31

1972

January	12
February	28
March	23
April (to date)	12
Total	355

(b) 103 have been paid.

No records monthly split-up.

- (3) No. It is largely due to 200 applications being approved before proclamation of the Act enabled a start to be made upon documentation.

Staff numbers have been added to as circumstances dictated, but the Member evidently does not appreciate the difficulties involved in the type of security required for majority of loans under the Reconstruction Scheme, and the scarcity of specialist Securities Staff.

2. TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Leonora Agency

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Has land been allocated in Leonora for the construction of a Totalisator Agency Board agency?
- (2) If so, when is it expected that—
- tenders will be called; and
 - construction will commence?

The Hon. J. DOLAN replied:

- (1) The Board has been advised by the Shire Clerk that Lot 836 can now be made available for use by the Totalisator Agency Board.
- (2) As soon as the transfer of land has been finalised, tenders will be called for the erection of an agency.

It is expected that tenders will be called within one month and construction commenced shortly afterwards.

3. EXMOUTH HOSPITAL

Parking

The Hon. S. J. DELLAR, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) As parking facilities provided for patients and visitors attending the Exmouth Hospital are very limited, will the Government increase the size of the parking area?
- (2) If not, why not?

The Hon. W. F. WILLESEE replied:

- (1) and (2) No previous request has been received for increased parking at Exmouth Hospital. This matter will be investigated. Any decision would be subject to availability of funds.

House adjourned at 4.21 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 13th April, 1972

The SPEAKER (Mr. Norton) took the Chair at 11.00 a.m., and read prayers.

CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. J. T. Tonkin (Premier), and read a first time.

HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara—Minister for Housing) [11.04 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to bring the Act up to date to enable funds guaranteed under the Act to continue to assist borrowers in the low and moderate income group who are marginally ineligible for State Housing Commission and State Builders' Fund assistance, yet are unable to service a loan provided through other sources of finance.

The amendments contained in the Bill affect section 7B only, which prescribes the maximum advance that can be made with funds guaranteed under the Act.

The last amendment to the Act was in 1968 when maximum advances and house values—excluding land—were prescribed for certain areas. The maximum advance for the metropolitan area and country areas south of the 26th parallel, is set at \$10,000 with the value of the house not to exceed \$10,000 and \$11,000 respectively.

North of the 26th parallel, the maximum advance is \$13,000 with the value of the house not to exceed \$17,500.

The amendments contained in this Bill are a departure from previous provisions as there is no maximum house value. The maximum advance prescribed for the metropolitan area and country areas south of the 26th parallel will be \$12,000 and \$13,000 respectively.

The maximum advance in the north-west division will be \$17,500, whilst the maximum advance for the Kimberley division