Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 1st September, 1959

CONTENTS

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

SUPPLY BILL, £21,000,000

Assent

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT

Repairs to Watches and Other Timepieces

1. The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE asked the Minister for Mines:

   In view of the fact that during 1958-59 it cost the Railway Department £3,174 3s. to repair 1,003 watches and £1,381 to repair 150 other timepieces, will the Minister for Railways conduct an investigation with a view to effecting savings ?

   The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

   Yes; the Minister for Railways will have the matter examined further.

DAIRYING INDUSTRY

Artificial Insemination Service

2. The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT asked the Minister for Mines:

   (1) Is it correct that the Superintendent of Dairying attended a meeting in the South-West this week in connection with the artificial insemination service ?

   (2) Have any complaints about the artificial insemination service been received; if so—

   (a) What is the nature of the complaints;

   (b) what steps can be taken to overcome them ?

   (3) What is the total number of units operating?

   (4) When were these units first formed (month and year for each unit) ?

   (5) What have been the final conception rates in artificial insemination units established prior to 1959 ?

   (6) What has been the percentage of conceptions in these units for—

   (a) first service;

   (b) second service;

   (c) third service ?

   (7) What percentage of cows have returned for more than three services, and of these how many ultimately conceived?

   The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

   (1) Yes, to form the District Liaison Committee for the Balingup-Greenbushes sub-centre.

   (2) No complaints have been received regarding the operation of the service but some farmers have expressed disappointment with conception rates in their herds.

   (a) Delayed conception or lack of conception in some cows has apparently caused concern.

   (b) Continuous checks have been made to ensure that conception failures are not due to defects in techniques used. In some herds where conception difficulties persisted veterinary investigation has been arranged. Where disease in individual cows exists it is the responsibility of the farmer to arrange for treatment by a veterinary practitioner.

   (3) Eight.

   (4) Harvey—May, 1956.
   Coolup—May, 1956.
   Mundijong—June, 1957.
   Margaret River—June, 1957.
   Boyanup—May, 1959.
   Greenbushes—May, 1959.
   Busselton—May, 1959.
   Manjimup—May, 1959.

(5) Final conception rates cannot be assessed.

(6) (a) The proportion of cows which did not return to service within 30 days of first insemination in the various units is as follows:—

	1957	1958
	Per cent.	
Coolup	62.8	64.7
Mundijong	62.9	68.4
Harvey	66.3	67.7
Margaret River	55.3	58.4

(b) Not available.

(c) Not available.

(7) In 1958, 8,310 cows were inseminated. Of these, 546—or 6.7 per cent. returned after three inseminations. In 1959 the figures were 9,743, 595, and 6.1 per cent.

SCHOOL BUSES

Spurs on Country Runs

3. The Hon. C. R. ABBEY asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Has a definite policy on granting of spurs on country school bus runs been formulated?

(2) If so, what is that policy?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) and (2) Subject to a terminal route not exceeding 38 miles and a circular route 48 miles, and that no spurs be provided for those who reside within three miles of a school or less than 1½ miles from the route, and that none shall run within one mile of the property of the parent, a spur for one child may be granted, particularly where young children are concerned, not to exceed two miles; for two, three, or four children not to exceed four miles, and five children or over not to exceed five miles, subject in the last-mentioned case to consideration of a feeder service.

ONION BOARD

Employment of Inspecting Company, etc.

4. The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Is the Minister aware that the Onion Board is reputed to be employing the W.A. Night Patrol in respect of the policing of the onion industry?

(2) (a) What are their duties?

(b) Is it for the purpose of policing onion growers in respect of black marketing and other operations?

(c) What is the remuneration paid for these services to this company?

(d) Has the board's policy been amended to do away with its own inspectors and to employ the W.A. Night Patrol in their stead?

(e) What type of information does the Onion Marketing Board expect to gain from the operations and reports of the W.A. Night Patrol?

(f) What is the cost per ton to the grower for employment of this organisation by the board?

(3) Would the Government give consideration to releasing from the provisions of the Marketing of Onions Act, those growers who are prepared to build and maintain their own cool storage equipment for the storage of onions to be marketed between the 1st day of June and the 1st day of November in each year?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) The Onion Marketing Board is employing the Australian Watching Co. (W.A.) Pty. Ltd., which is a different organisation from the W.A. Night Patrol.

(2) (a) Their duties are as required by the board, as occasion warrants, to visit retailers' shops and growers' gardens for inspection purposes.

(b) Their observations cover trafficking in onions by growers or traders outside the provisions of the Marketing of Onions Act.

(c) The remuneration paid to the company is for work done from time to time as required, and is based on wages and mileage incurred.

(d) The board has never employed inspectors for this purpose.

(e) The type of information expected is in relation to possible breaches of the Act by growers or traders.

(f) The cost of employing the company was 5s. 3d. per ton on onions pooled in the 1957-58 season and 10s. 4d. per ton on onions pooled in the 1958-59 season, excluding onions sold less dockages.

(3) Consideration is given by the board to proposals which comply with the Act and which do not interfere with the prescribed operations of the board.

SCHOOL BUSES

Reopening and Establishment of Spurs

5. The Hon. J. MURRAY asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) In view of the statement concerning school bus services, and attributed to the Minister for Education, which was broadcast over the National station on the 17th August, and the further statement on this subject in the *Daily News* on the 19th August, will the Minister inform the House whether we can accept the broadcast statement as official? This stated, *inter alia*—

> The spurs on school bus routes, which were previously closed down, are to be reopened, and spurs previously denied will be authorised.

(2) If so, who was responsible for this statement given to the Australian Broadcasting Commission?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) and (2) I propose to make available to the honourable member a copy of the statement in question as it was handed to the Press for publication.

TRANSFER OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned

Returned from the Assembly without amendment.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING

1. Filled Milk.
2. Fatal Accidents.

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

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third Reading

Bill read a third time and passed.

BILLS (3)—REPORT

1. Municipal Corporations Act Amendment.
2. Road Districts Act Amendment.
3. Museum.

Adopted.

ART GALLERY BILL

Recommittal

On motion by the Hon. J. G. Hislop, Bill recommitted for further consideration of clauses 6 and 26.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (the Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; the Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 6: Constitution of Board:

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

> Page 2—Delete all words in subclause (1) after the word "shall" in line 32 and substitute the following:—
>
> be appointed by the Governor and shall consist of seven members including the chairman and vice chairman.
>
> (2) One member shall be appointed from a panel of three persons nominated by the Perth Society of Artists and one from a panel of three persons nominated by the Art Gallery Society.

This is a matter in which there is considerable public interest. In the Museum, most of the work is of a research character and there is not the amount of committee work that there is in the Art Gallery. There are two societies in Perth which are very active in respect of the Art Gallery; and, in my opinion, the Art Gallery would fail if it did not have public support. Therefore, I feel these societies should have some representation on the board.

On the old committee there was a representative of, I think, the Perth Society of Artists. On this occasion the administration is being revised; and I think that the committees that have done so much in the interests of the Art Gallery should have the opportunity of appointing someone to the board. I do not ask that they be allowed to make a direct appointment, but that they shall be permitted to nominate three persons from whom the Minister shall choose an appointee.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am obliged to ask the Committee not to accept the amendment, which seeks to direct that one representative shall be chosen from a panel of three names submitted to the Minister from the Perth Society of Artists. The provision was placed in the Bill, in the manner in which we find it, so that preference would not be given to a particular organisation. Another active society, known as the W.A. Society of Artists, would be just as entitled to representation as is the Perth Society of Artists; should we accept the fact that the Perth Society of Artists is entitled to representation.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Is there a Goldfields society of artists?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There could easily be. Also, other organisations could be formed in the future, and they would be entitled to claim representation on the board.

If Dr. Hislop will accept the Bill as it stands, it is highly likely that one of the members of the board will be a person chosen from the Perth Society of Artists; it may be the desire to choose more than one. I am assured by the Attorney-General that the greatest care will be taken to have placed on the board, persons who will be in the best position to serve both the board and the State. I would be glad if the honourable member would not persist with his amendment, because I cannot accept it.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: It is my intention to persist with the amendment, and to put it to the vote. I do not think the Bill gives justice to those people who have contributed so much in the interests of the Art Gallery. A board of five is proposed for the control of the Art Gallery, and three of those five shall form a quorum. This means that any two persons can decide what shall happen in the Art Gallery. I cannot concede that this form of administration is wise. A lot of public interest is shown in the Art Gallery. The money to be used will be public money. It is surely not wise to have this organisation administered by a small body of people appointed by the Government.

I do not know of any Bill that has come before us that has not given representation to the interested parties. On the Health Education Council, all sorts of people were included in order to stimulate interest in the work. I do not agree with the provision in the Bill.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I support the amendment because I think it is eminently fair. We should make sure that the people who are interested in the two societies mentioned will have representation on the governing body. The previous board consisted of 10 members, and it is now proposed to reduce the number to five. Of course, the activities of the board will be halved. I think a board of seven members is reasonable; and if we provide that at least two of the members shall come from public bodies actively associated with the work of the Art Gallery we will be doing the right thing.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: On many previous occasions, argument has been adduced in connection with the large numbers that have been put on boards. Some members have said that there are too many members on boards.

To suggest that two members, under the present set-up, can make a decision, is absolutely correct. But what has been put forward pre-supposes that the two members who are going to make the decision, will be the two people whom, apparently, Dr. Hislop fears will be there. It is logical to assume that the two members who will make the decision could be chosen from the Perth Society of Artists; or one could be; or one could be chosen from the other society. I do not think that argument has any weight.

If the Committee agrees to the amendment, the decision could still be made by the two members that Dr. Hislop does not want on the board; or whom he suggests should not be there to take control of the situation. If we increase the number and provide that five members shall form a quorum, then three of them could make a decision; and two of them could be the people to whom Dr. Hislop referred previously.

This presupposes that the choice of the five members will be bad in some respects. If the choice of the members is not bad, then it will not matter so long as the statutory number is present to make up a quorum. It is reasonable to assume that these people will be well chosen.

There could easily be two members from the Perth Society of Artists. I do not think there is much in Dr. Hislop's argument.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I cannot see either society being given an increased membership on the committee if my amendment is agreed to.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You don't know.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I am not at all certain that the society the Minister mentioned has anything to do with the Art Gallery; it simply spends its time putting on musical shows. These two societies are interested in the Art Gallery. But leaving them out of the picture altogether, surely if we do not want to name the societies concerned, why not make the committee seven in number with a quorum of five; because if there is a quorum of three, two could dominate the work of the Art Gallery? In any committee there is always a percentage of people who cannot attend meetings, and, therefore, I think a committee of five could lead to domination by two members only.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I think Dr. Hislop's last remarks offer a solution to the problem—that is, confine the amendment to the fact that the committee shall consist of seven, including the chairman and the vice-chairman. In other words, subclause (2) in the amendment should be struck out. It seems to me that a committee of five is rather light for one administering an institution such as the Art Gallery, whereas a committee of seven, with a quorum of five, should be quite suitable. My own opinion of most committees is that they should consist of two members with one away sick!

If we nominate who shall be the members of the committee, we will have a somewhat similar position to the one we had in regard to the Bill dealing with the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. We had to listen to our brethren from the Goldfields advocating the case of the Kalgoorlie society. I think it would be unwise to leave subclause (2) in the amendment. I move—

> That the amendment be amended by striking out proposed subclause (2).

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I would be prepared to accept that amendment.

Amendment on amendment put and passed.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: To be co-operative, I will accept the amendment as it has now been amended; but members must realise that this is another Minister's Bill. The points put forward to me were that any increase in the number on the committee would make it ungainly. However, I will accept the amendment and refer the views of this Chamber to the Attorney-General, because I will be given another opportunity at a later date of dealing further with it.

Amendment, as amended, put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 26—Selling, or exposing for sale, works of art in Art Gallery prohibited:

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

Page 11—Add the following proviso:—

> Provided that nothing contained in this Act shall prevent the Director giving advice concerning or assisting in the purchase of any object of art, picture, reproduction or print of any picture or object of art exhibited in the Gallery provided such picture, reproduction or print is available for sale.

It is accepted in principle by all public galleries that no person exhibiting in a public gallery shall exhibit for sale; but, on the other hand, we have had exhibits in the gallery which have been for sale, and I do not want to see that practice stopped. The magnificent French prints which were exhibited were for sale. They created tremendous interest, and hundreds of people went to see them. Many people have regretted since that they did not buy a print because they were for sale at such reasonable prices. The clause, as it stands, would prohibit exhibitions of that sort.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: It would not be in the best interests of the artists.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: At the last exhibition for the Perth Art Prize, someone took a great fancy to one of the exhibits and did exactly what is done at other art galleries—she went to the director and asked whether it would be possible to purchase the picture which she had admired. The director said he would make inquiries, and he gave his advice. The picture was purchased. The clause as it is at present worded would prevent the director even giving advice to those who were interested in art.

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: It certainly would.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: My amendment will overcome that position. I think the director should be able to assist a person who asks for his advice. After all the Art Gallery is there to provide an interest for the general public, and the amendment simply allows the director to assist people when they ask for his advice; and this is normally done in all other art galleries.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This amendment would put the director in a most unenviable position for the simple reason that potentially every subject exhibited at the Art Gallery would be for sale. What would be the situation if the director was asked a question about one work of art, and he did not mind answering the question, but if he was asked a question concerning another piece of art he did not care to pass an opinion? By this amendment he would be obliged to answer every question, and so the gallery would become a potential sale place.

Most works of art are sold as a result of a special public exhibition of the artist's work. Surely the Art Gallery of Western Australia is not to be a place where commerce shall be practiced! It is for the purpose of the public viewing of works of art. For the reasons I have given, I think this amendment should be defeated.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: It is obvious from what the Minister has said that he does not know much about the Art Gallery, or what has happened in the past, because this sort of thing has been going on for years. There is no question of the pictures exhibited in the Art Gallery being for sale. The pictures exhibited are those chosen by the board of the gallery for exhibition, and the vast majority of them are not for sale. Many of them have been exhibited in other States. If a person wanted to buy a picture, I think the director would be in an unenviable position if he had to say, "I cannot offer you any advice." The position is the reverse to what the Minister has stated.

I cannot imagine that everybody would run around the Art Gallery trying to buy pictures, because pictures being exhibited there are seldom for sale. But there are those odd occasions, such as arose in connection with the French prints I mentioned, when pictures are for sale. Some of the United Nations pictures recently exhibited could also have been purchased through the Art Gallery.

It is far too expensive for private galleries to exhibit pictures such as those, because of the necessity to guarantee the safety of them, but the Art Gallery has the means to do that. A private gallery would be very loth to take on the responsibility of exhibiting those pictures, yet the pictures were for sale.

We should not place our Art Gallery in an unfavourable position in relation to the galleries in the other States. In South

Australia's Art Gallery, prints, and reproductions of exhibitions on the walls, can be purchased. The same thing can be done in Melbourne and Sydney. If the clause in the Bill is agreed to, the Art Gallery in this State will be prohibited from adopting the same practice; and that will not assist in the furtherance of art.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: When the board approaches any person with a view to exhibiting a picture in the Art Gallery, the board would know whether that picture, or a print of it, could be produced for sale. It would be quite easy for the board to control the pictures which may be exhibited to the public in the Art Gallery. Only infrequently would the director of the Gallery have to be concerned with discussions on business matters relating to the sale of pictures.

An artist may exhibit a picture in the Art Gallery with no intention of selling it; but during the time it is exhibited he may change his mind and desire to sell the work. In those circumstances the artist should be able to ask the director to offer it for sale.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The clause will prohibit the director from giving advice to any person regarding the sale of a picture or a print. Had this provision been previously in existence, the French pictures and the United Nations collection would not have been exhibited in the Art Gallery.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am advised that the director would be subject to too much pressure by certain persons desirous of selling their paintings, if this provision was not implemented. The Art Gallery is a place where works of art may be exhibited to the public. The clause was not prepared without thought. The idea was that pictures should be exhibited in the Art Gallery, but should not be offered for sale there. In other words, there should not be a blatant "For Sale" notice hung up with a picture on exhibition. The Art Gallery is similar to the Museum, wherein the exhibits are not for sale. It is not desirable to have artists taking advantage of the Art Gallery for the purpose of selling their pictures; and if this clause is not agreed to the director will be subjected to great pressure from certain artists seeking to sell their work.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: No director of the Art Gallery in the past has worried about any such pressure. The Minister must bear in mind that not every artist can exhibit his pictures in the Art Gallery. The board decides which pictures may be exhibited. The board may be offered a series of works for exhibition; and, as is often the case, not one may be for sale. However, if an artist should request the director to make inquiries about the sale of one of his pictures, the director would be prohibited from giving advice to that person.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The wording in the clause is very far-reaching. It provides that no person shall sell any work of art which belongs to him. If an artist was invited to exhibit his pictures in the Art Gallery and a connoisseur offered, say, fifty guineas for one of the pictures, the artist would be liable to a fine of £50 if he accepted the offer. Under this clause, the artist cannot make a sale of any picture exhibited in the Art Gallery. If the offer and acceptance are made in the Art Gallery, that constitutes a sale; although delivery of the picture may take place somewhere else. The wording in the clause is too restrictive; and the provision seems to be very frustrating.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: Much can be said for the viewpoint that the Art Gallery should not be converted into a stock exchange where works of art can be bought and sold. In the main, the gallery is a place for the exhibition of works of art. I appreciate the point raised by Dr. Hislop with regard to the recent exhibition of French paintings. The pictures were exhibited by an organisation and not by an individual, and they were offered for sale.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: On many occasions in the past, pictures were bought through the Art Gallery.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: In that event it would be a pity if the public were to be deprived of the right to make a purchase there; it would also be a pity to place the director in such a position that the works of one artist may be favoured to the disadvantage of other artists. Rather than be placed in such an invidious position, the director may prefer to have no say in the matter of the sale of works of art. He could then say that he was not permitted to advise as to the price of a picture being exhibited.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The provision in this clause was requested by the director.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: It was opposed by both societies.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It may have been. I know that the honourable member is a champion of one of those societies, and he wants it to have representation on the board. I am informed that the provision in this clause was requested because some artists are continually asking the director to exhibit their works of art in the gallery with a view to sale. Up to the present such requests have been resisted.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: Mr. Watson compared the Art Gallery to the stock exchange. It is not a good comparison, because the stock exchange is established for the purpose of selling and buying stocks and shares. A discretion is given to the board, through the director, to decide what pictures may be exhibited in the Art

Gallery. If an artist was inclined to make the Art Gallery a medium for the exhibition and sale of his pictures, the board could take action to prevent that.

Surely if a great artist wishes to exhibit a picture and is invited to do so, and somebody takes a fancy to it and approaches the director to ascertain whether it is for sale, we are not going to pin the director down so that he is not able to give any information whatsoever! It does not mean that he has to make the sale, but that he will be allowed to give advice or assist in the purchase. If he does not desire to do so, he does not have to. He should be given the opportunity, in the first instance, to find out whether the picture is for sale; and, secondly, to advise accordingly, and assist further if possible. The sale would be contracted outside the Museum or Art Gallery. I believe this is a good proviso, and we should at least give it a trial.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think that the proviso and the clause as printed in the Bill are entirely at variance. The clause as printed in the Bill makes it clear that the sale of prints and works of art in the gallery should not be permitted. Then the amendment states that sales may be permitted. To overcome the situation raised by Dr. Hislop, the clause itself should be defeated because the amendment is not compatible with the clause. The proviso would nullify the very point in the clause. I suggest we are somewhat at cross purposes on the matter. I can see a lot of merit in the points raised by Dr. Hislop, but I cannot fit them in as a proviso to the clause.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I would be quite happy if both my amendment and the clause were defeated. Nothing would give me greater pleasure, because then we would allow the board authority to exhibit for sale. However, I did not think for one moment that if I tried to defeat the clause without giving an explanation, I would get the support of the Committee. I again emphasise the fact that if this clause had been in action at the time the French prints were brought to Perth, they could not have been exhibited. Also many of the United Nations' exhibits would not have been able to be shown, because they were for sale. If I remember rightly, we were told that the prints could be obtained from a certain place. In that case, the public would not have seen those pictures. The French prints were magnificent pictures.

However, as I say, I will be quite happy if both the clause and my amendment are defeated. If another clause is introduced, I hope it will not be as far reaching as the present one, but will give the board the right, under certain conditions, to offer the pictures for sale. I could not agree to this Bill without some such provision.

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

Ayes—16.

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	Hon. R. F. Hutchison
	(Teller.)

Noes—6.

Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. R. C. Mattiske	Hon. H. K. Watson
	(Teller.)

Majority for—10.

Amendment thus passed.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: At the moment, I am not concerned with the principle; I am concerned with the points made by Mr. Wise. I do not want this Committee to send a Bill back to another place with an amended clause, which really faces north by south. I think it could be tidied up grammatically one way or another; or else the whole clause defeated. I believe it is a matter of ordinary common-sense practice. We should not allow the clause to stand in the Bill as it is. For that reason, I am going to vote against the clause.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would just like to say that I will not divide the Committee on this issue, because I agree with Mr. Watson that the contention made by Mr. Wise is a true one. The clause now provides that a certain thing cannot be done. Then follows a proviso that it can be done. That is a pretty silly state of affairs! Realising that the Bill still has to be read a third time, and then has to go to another place for consideration, I would much rather see it pass in a more sensible way than at the moment.

Clause, as amended, put and negatived.

Bill again reported with further amendments.

JUDGES' SALARIES AND PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 20th August.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE (North) [5.42]: The Bill contains the proposed increases of judges' salaries—the Chief Justice from £4,150 to £5,250; the Senior Puisne Judge from £3,650 to £4,750; and for the other judges from £3,500 to £4,600. It also provides that the increases shall be retrospective as from the 1st January, 1959.

The increase in each instance is £1,100 per annum, and has been found necessary to keep pace to a degree with the amounts paid to the judges' contemporaries in other States. It is of interest to note that the

retrospective clause honours a promise made by the previous Government to the then Chief Justice.

The judges' salaries have been rising constantly since 1947 when they were raised from £2,000 to £2,300 per annum; in 1950 they were raised to £2,600; in 1953 to £2,900; in 1955 to £3,500; and now the current proposal is to increase them to £4,600. Generally speaking, it can be said that Parliament watches the situation of our judiciary fairly carefully, and deals with it in a comprehensive manner. I feel that other important appointments could be given similar consideration in the embodiment of, perhaps, one Bill.

One calls to mind the Governor, and his private secretary; and, logically, the position of the magistrates will now need some consideration in view of the £1,100 increase sought for the judges. In a similar position would be the Clerk of the Executive Council; officers of Parliament; Ministers and members of Parliament; the Agent-General; the Public Service Commissioner; the Auditor-General; and there are many others. I think they might well be embraced by some outside organisation reporting to Parliament, so that the various increments or decreases from time to time might be dealt with on a uniform basis and made consistent. With those few remarks I support the Bill, as I find nothing in it at which one could cavil.

On motion by the Hon. H. K. Watson, debate adjourned.

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 20th August.

THE HON. H. K. WATSON (Metropolitan) [5.46]: This is a Bill to make it very clear that any person who opens a bank account and then starts passing phoney cheques is liable under the Police Act. The Minister pointed out, when introducing the Bill, that at the moment, under the Criminal Code, it is an indictable offence to issue a cheque in respect of which there is no bank account.

For a person who draws a cheque on a non-existent account, the penalty is up to three years' imprisonment where the amount involved is £500; and up to seven years where the sum involved is more than £500. I find it difficult to appreciate the comparative lightness of the penalties imposed in the Bill now before us, when compared with those laid down in the Criminal Code; because, as a matter of hard, practical fact, I do not think there is any real distinction between a person drawing a cheque for £300 on a non-existent account, and a person drawing a cheque for £300 on an account which he has opened with £1 for no purpose other than to issue a fraudulent cheque.

The Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: The latter is worse, because it is premeditated.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: Yes. To my mind there is nothing to merit any concessional treatment to the person who opens an account for the purpose of issuing fraudulent cheques; and yet the penalty proposed is only £50 or imprisonment for six months, which seems to be somewhat inconsistent. Another point in the Bill, about which I am not particularly happy, is the provision in respect of onus of proof. If a man draws a cheque on a non-existent account and is charged under the Criminal Code, he is innocent until proved guilty; but under the Bill the onus of proof is not on the Crown, but on the person charged. Instead of the ordinary principle, which is almost traditional in British justice, that a person is innocent until proved guilty, the Bill proposes to declare him guilty until such time as he proves himself innocent. The onus of proof is on the person charged.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: Why the change ?

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I would like the Minister to explain that in his reply. I notice, also, that no prosecution for the offences defined in the Bill shall be commenced without the written consent of the Commissioner of Police. I assume that provision is there as a precaution—to prevent a creditor, in the case of an accident, or some such thing, using the Police Department as a debt collecting agency.

I have no desire to ease the lot of any trickster who tries to obtain goods or credit by passing false cheques; but, as I say, I am not particularly happy about a straight-out declaration that he is guilty unless he proves that he had reasonable grounds for believing that the cheque would be paid in full on presentation, and that he had no intent to defraud.

I think that so long as the offences were made clear in the Bill, there would be no difficulty for the Crown to prove that an offence had been committed; and, that being so, why shift the onus of proof? The two points on which I would appreciate enlightenment when the Minister is replying to the debate are the shifting of the onus of proof; and the disparity between the penalty for drawing a cheque on a non-existent account and the much lighter penalty for drawing a cheque for the same amount on an account opened with, perhaps, only a few shillings.

THE HON. G. BENNETTS (South-East) [5.52]: This question was brought under my notice towards the end of last session, by a hotel-keeper in Kalgoorlie. I understand that the banks are at present advertising and encouraging people to open cheque accounts. A person need lodge only a small deposit with a bank in order to open an account and get a cheque book.

He does not have to be vouched for as a man of good character, but can go in with a few pounds and open a cheque account.

The hotel-keeper to whom I have referred —I think he is the secretary of some business organisation—told me that persons of bad repute can lodge £5 of £10 with a bank and receive a cheque book; and then they can go to a hotel or some other business and cash cheques which, upon presentation, are returned by the bank. This man told me there are hundreds of such people about; and businessmen often have to wait for their money and put the collection of it in the hands of debt collectors.

I do not know whether the matter can be dealt with under the Act; but I think that, before any bank issues a cheque book, there should be deposited in the account a sum of perhaps £25 or £50; and a cheque book should be issued only to a person who can bring forward two witnesses of his good standing in the community.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The Bill seeks to give the very protection you are asking for.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: That is all I want. I will be pleased to support the measure if it gives the necessary protection to business people.

On motion by the Hon. R. C. Mattiske, debate adjourned.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate adjourned from the 19th August.

THE HON. J. D. TEAHAN (North-East) [5.55]: I wish to voice my desire that fire brigade employees be given representation on the Fire Brigades Board. As has been stated during the course of the debate, an attempt to provide for such representation has been made three or four times in the past few years. I know of at least one instance where a more harmonious relationship would have existed in fire brigades generally had such representation been provided for; because the board would have had knowledge of the discontent that was arising.

As has already been pointed out, the representative of the employees on the board need not necessarily be a member of the union, or the union secretary; but someone who could transmit to the board the desires of the employees and air their views. If it is possible to provide for such representation, it should be done.

I come now to the matter of reimbursement to brigades which attend fires in the case of uninsured properties. Unless that provision is administered wisely it could inflict hardship; in fact I know of instances where that has happened. A person might own house property or vacant land, and, for financial or other reasons, might not have it insured. The brigade may turn out, in the event of fire, but the property is destroyed; and the result is that a person who has already suffered that hardship receives a bill from the fire brigade.

In the instance I have mentioned, hardship was caused to the person concerned because he received a bill for £17 from the fire brigade; and that only rubbed salt into the wound. That principle is now sought to be extended to vacant land. It is true that fire brigades should not have to turn out unnecessarily; but I hope that when the measure is passed, it will be administered with discretion and in a humane way.

It must be remembered that portion of municipal and road board charges are for fire brigade protection; and, if for no reason other than that, when a person's property suffers some damage by fire, and —perhaps through omission—he has not insured it, I think discretion should be used in dealing with the case. I support the measure.

THE HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [5.58]: There are quite a number of worth-while amendments contained in the Bill, but unfortunately, as Mr. Teahan has said, there is no provision in it for fire brigade employees to be represented on the board —not by one of themselves, but by someone who would be regarded as their representative, just as is provided under the State Electricity Commission Act.

There is one provision in this measure, to which I take strong exception. It is a matter to which Mr. Teahan referred; and it is the compulsory insurance, as I might term it, of uninsured premises. If the fire brigade has to be called out to a fire at uninsured property or premises, a charge is levied by the brigade on the unfortunate people concerned.

To my mind, the reason why people insure their premises or property is to provide compensation if, unfortunately, the premises or property are destroyed by fire. But when the fire brigade turns out to attend a fire at insured property, that is often to the advantage of the insurance companies; because instead of the whole of the insured property being destroyed, a considerable amount of it may be saved, and only part of the full insurance has to be paid. I am not overlooking the fact that the insurance companies make a contribution of five-ninths to the Fire Brigades Board, for the provision of fire brigades.

I point out that some people may have the idea that, because a person does not insure his property, he does not make any contribution to the Fire Brigades Board. That idea is wrong, because all owners of property, both in municipalities and road board districts, are called upon to pay a

fire brigade rate. The total amount paid by municipalities and road boards to the Fire Brigades Board last year amounted to £88,010 11s. As I think it is of some importance and value for people to know the amounts that are paid by the various municipalities and road boards, they are as follows:—

Local Authority	Annual Values Supplied by Water Authority	Apportionment		
	£	£	s.	d.
Municipalities:				
Claremont	203,438	1,680	7	8
Cottesloe	205,964	1,701	4	8
East Fremantle	124,227	1,026	2	0
Fremantle City	668,637	5,522	17	4
Guildford	53,525	442	2	4
Midland Junction	169,818	1,402	13	8
Nedlands	491,668	4,061	2	4
North Fremantle	92,149	761	3	0
Perth City	4,208,401	34,760	18	8
South Perth	593,677	4,903	14	0
Subiaco	416,608	3,441	2	8
Road Boards:				
Bassendean	139,788	1,154	12	8
Bayswater	291,783	2,410	2	0
Belmont Park	288,873	2,386	1	4
Canning	280,548	2,317	6	0
Melville	683,367	5,644	10	8
Mosman Park	138,879	1,147	1	8
Mundaring	32,865	271	9	4
Peppermint Grove	56,828	469	8	0
Perth	1,458,398	12,046	4	0
Swan	55,732	460	7	0
	£10,655,173	£88,010	11	0

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Did you say £88,000?

The Hon. E. M. DAVIES: Yes, £88,010 11s., together with the Government's contribution of £88,010 11s., out of a total of £396,047 9s. 7d. If Mr. Watson would care to have the figure, the insurance companies contribute £220,026 7s. 6d., which represents five-ninths of the total amount.

Whilst I appreciate that the insurance companies are making the greater contribution, I do not see why, when a fire partly demolishes an uninsured property, the owner should be called upon to pay for the services of the fire brigade. A fire brigade represents one of our public utilities; and it is an essential service for the preservation of property. It exists, also, to give service to those people who take the precaution of insuring their properties so that they can be recouped from the insurance companies for whatever loss they might incur.

Some time ago a case was brought to my notice concerning a person who lit a fire at the rear of his premises to dispose of some rubbish. The fire caught some dry grass and it ran through to the adjoining property, the owner of which called for the fire brigade. Because he did not have his property insured he received an account for calling out the brigade although he was not responsible for lighting the fire. To my mind that was rather unfair. This person deputed me to take the matter up with the Fire Brigades Board, and I was informed that at that time the charge made by the board was £3 for the fire engine and £1 for each fireman who attended the fire.

After some consideration, the board decided to reduce the amount involved, but the person who called the brigade out still had to pay a charge despite the fact that he did not light the fire and was not responsible in any way. I consider that a fire brigade exists to perform its duties as a fire-fighting force. Regardless of whether a fire breaks out or not, it is still existent; and it is no more costly for the brigade to be sent out to attend a fire than it is, say, for it to go on a practice run. Therefore I consider it is an imposition to make a charge on those persons whose properties are not insured.

The ratepayers both in municipalities and road board districts are called upon to pay a fire brigade rate, and it is this charge that makes up the amount of £88,010 11s. contributed by local governing authorities to the Fire Brigades Board.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: What year was that?

The Hon. E. M. DAVIES: These are last year's figures. Some consideration should be given to this aspect. As I have said, I fully realise that the contributions made by the insurance companies represent the greater proportion of the cost of maintaining the fire brigades, but I still cannot see what benefit this clause would be to the insurance companies other than that it may be an attempt to compel people to insure their properties regardless of whether they desired to do so or not. It is definitely unfair to impose a charge on the owner of an uninsured property if he calls out the fire brigade; because if his property is destroyed by fire he has to bear the complete loss.

There is another point that has to be considered. Due to the fact that the fire brigade is called out to attend a fire on one property that is uninsured, it may save one or more properties that are insured. Therefore, I fail to see why a person who does not insure his property and who suffers loss by fire without any payment of compensation, should still have to pay a charge to call out the brigade which may, ultimately, be the means of saving insured properties that are adjacent. Therefore, whilst I support the Bill in principle, I take strong exception to this clause.

THE HON. H. K. WATSON (Metropolitan) [6.12]: If the total cost of maintaining a fire brigade in or outside the metropolitan area was a charge upon general revenue—as so many people consider it ought to be—there would be much merit in the argument advanced by Mr. Davies. One could then say, "I pay my taxes, and, in the same way as I expect police protection from any wrongdoer without having to pay a guinea or two guineas a visit, so I expect protection by the fire brigade against damage to my property by fire."

However, we have not reached the stage where the fire brigade is a charge upon general revenue. The fact of the matter is that only two-ninths of the total cost of running the fire brigades is a charge on Government revenue. Another two-ninths, as Mr. Davies has just explained, is provided by the local authorities; or, in other words, by the owners or householders of properties in the various local authority districts. The remaining five-ninths of the cost is provided by the insurance companies. Mr. Davies has explained that, roughly, the amounts contributed are £88,000 by the Treasury; £88,000 by local governing authorities—that is, by the ratepayers in those local authority districts—and £220,000 by the insurance companies.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. K. WATSON: Before the tea suspension I was explaining that, of the total contributions to the cost of running the Fire Brigades Board, the local authorities contributed approximately £88,000, the Government approximately £88,000, and the insurance company some £220,000. As a matter of interest I may mention also that the £220,000 represents 25 per cent. of the total relevant premiums collected by the insurance companies. In other words, of every £100 they collect in respect to these premiums, £25 goes to the Fire Brigades Board, and the remaining £75 is left to meet losses and to cover administrative expenses.

In those circumstances I feel that the person who does not insure should reasonably be expected to pay the charge which is required of him under the Bill. I do not think he suffers any injustice. If he prefers not to insure his property, or even if he has a property which is uninsurable, and the fire brigade attends a fire on his property, then it is reasonable that he should pay a fee. So far as one's own insurable property is concerned, I think one's mentality ought to be questioned if one does not insure against fire. Then again, if a person is prepared to take that risk and carry his own insurance, he can have no complaint if, when the fire brigade is required to put out a fire on his premises, he is asked to pay a fee for that service.

The Bill also proposes to give to the Fire Brigades Board power to compel an owner or occupier of any premises, to install water taps, water pipes, equipment, apparatus, or appliances, for the purposes of preventing the outbreak of fire; or the purpose of extinguishing fire; or preventing injury or damage to a person or property by fire.

The import of the last phrase is not quite clear to me, because I should have thought that if one installed apparatus which would prevent the outbreak of fire, or which would be there for the extinguishing of fire, it would automatically follow that one would look after or prevent injury to persons or property by fire. It seems a bit superfluous. I am concerned with the general principle of the clause; with the principle behind the clause one can have no quarrel.

If there is an owner of a property whose property is a fire hazard, and he refuses to do anything about the matter, I think one would readily agree that there should be some power to compel him to take reasonable precautions. But, as the measure stands at the moment, it seems that the clause would permit of an order for practically anything. It is one thing to talk about installing portable fire equipment of the foam variety, which is really the modern form of local fire protection —the fire hydrant and the hose seem to have given way to the various mobile forms of fire-fighting appliances which are installed on the floors of various premises; and which are effective—because those appliances can generally be installed in quite a substantial building at a cost of a few hundred pounds. No proprietor of a building would object to spending a few hundred pounds if, in doing so, he were protecting his property from fire and protecting persons from damage by fire.

But under the provision I have just read, it is conceivable that the board could instruct an owner, or occupier, to install a sprinkler system in the building. When we talk of sprinkler systems we do not talk in tens of pounds, or in hundreds of pounds, but in thousands and tens of thousands of pounds. I think that an owner or occupier should have some say when it comes to the expenditure of thousands of pounds on a sprinkler system. I think it will be found that the average proprietor or occupier of a factory or building, if it is a business proposition from the point of view of fire protection, or otherwise, will, of his own accord, put in a sprinkler system.

I know of one factory that has been erected within the last year or so where the sprinkler system alone cost £30,000. But the company that built that factory did not hesitate to put in a sprinkler system; as a matter of fact, it also in its own interests put in a water supply for fire protection. I think it will be found that where a sprinkler system is reasonably required, a proprietor will put it in of his own accord, for his own protection; and because it also has a bearing on the

rate of insurance premium he pays. But I would hesitate to give power to a board in such wide terms that the board could, willy-nilly, tell everyone to put in a sprinkler system; because the official mind sometimes works in a curious way.

When introducing the Bill, the Minister mentioned the Adelphi case in which the court held that the Act, as it then stood, and the regulations as they then stood, did not empower the board to give any instructions at all. It may be interesting to recall the actual circumstances in the Adelphi case. That was the case where the Adelphi Hotel had fire hydrants and hoses on every floor. But the Fire Brigades Board, in its wisdom, instructed the proprietors of the hotel to put in portable fire extinguishers of the foam variety, in addition. The proprietors of the hotel felt that the equipment they had was quite adequate; it had been put in under architectural direction and in consultation with the fire brigade authority in the first place; and, naturally, they considered it quite adequate.

It would be interesting to speculate as to whether the Fire Brigades Board would have instructed the proprietors of the hotel to install hydrants and hoses if the hotel already had fire foam extinguishers; because we do find, when we give wide powers like this, someone decides—wide and all as the powers are—that it is an invitation to exercise them.

I am a bit concerned with the wideness of the powers. I have on the notice paper, an amendment which would serve to emphasise that the power which is granted is to be confined to ordering the installation of portable equipment rather than of equipment running into a cost of tens of thousands of pounds. An amendment like that is desirable; or, alternatively, if the clause is to go through as it is, then there could well be some provision in the Bill for an appeal by the aggrieved owner or occupier, against the order.

I would commend these observations to the Minister. I have no fixed ideas on the question, except that I do feel that the provision as it stands at the moment is dangerously wide; it should be cut down in one way or another, without completely diminishing its real effectiveness. Subject to those remarks I support the Bill.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [7.45]: Like Mr. Watson, I am wary about the wideness of this clause. There has been considerable discussion amongst some people in the city; and some architects and members of the legal profession have expressed the opinion that this clause is far too wide. I wonder whether the board already has power to make regulations in order to cover this position. If the board does not have power to make regulations, perhaps it might be possible to provide that power so it can make regulations in respect to water taps, pipes, connections, fittings, equipment, and so on.

In proposed new section 25A on page 4 of the Bill, the expression "premises" does not include premises which consist of a private dwelling house designed for the use and occupation of one family. If some person subdivided a house into two flats, that person could be told to install extra water pipes, and so on. But after all is said and done, the house would have been subdivided with the consent of the Perth City Council or some other local authority which would have had something to say about the method by which the house was to be fitted in this regard.

I intend to vote for the amendments on the notice paper, but I am not altogether happy about them; and I doubt whether they will really do what is required. However, the clause as it stands gives too wide a power for me to vote willingly in its favour. Therefore, I hope there is room for a considerable amount of discussion so that I at least can make up my mind.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines—in reply) [7.47]: First of all, I would like to thank members for their contributions to the debate, and for their support of the Bill up to the second reading stage. Two or three items have been referred to by several members. One of these was mentioned by Mr. Jeffery when he asked for information regarding the power of the Fire Brigades Board to charge for fire attendances at uninsurable properties. In this regard, I have some advice to give him. I am advised that the Fire Brigades Act has always provided for a charge to be made for the brigade's attendance at fires involving uninsured properties. The Bill preserves this principle; and it clears up the legal position regarding charges for attendance at grass and rubbish fires.

Since 1942, until the "Seaton" case in 1953, it had also been customary for a nominal fee to be charged for grass and rubbish fires under powers regarded to be in the Act. There is a doubt as to whether that power really is in the Act. The grass and rubbish attendance charge was levied as a fire prevention measure to encourage owners, etc., to clear blocks of inflammable matter; and in practice, the charge was only levied when it was apparent that the brigade's attendance could have been avoided had the owner taken prior steps to remove the dry grass and provide a block of land in such a state that it was not a menace to adjoining properties.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: It is not charged automatically.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No; it is not charged automatically. It is levied when it becomes apparent that the fire could have been caused by the negligence of the person who owned the block of land. The expression "uninsurable" stems from the words "whether or not same is insurable." That is in line 29, page 5 of the

Bill. The words in line 29 are included as a drafting measure to make it clear that grass and scrub, etc., whether insured or considered uninsurable shall be covered by the clause.

In the "Seaton" case, the defence admitted that the grass and bush scrub on a vacant block of land were uninsured; and successfully argued that the grass and scrub were, in fact, not insurable. That is an understandable state of affairs.

It is not practicable to endeavour to itemise uninsurable property, as it is generally felt most things can be insured. I think members will agree that the owner of a block of land, which is situated between two nice residences, has some obligation to put that block in such a state that it is not a danger to the residences on either side.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: You are correct there.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If an owner is not prepared to do that and the brigade has to be called out too quell a fire which has been occasioned by the owner's negligence, I think it is reasonable that he should be asked to pay the necessary fee to the brigade.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: The Crown is the biggest offender in that regard.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: What do you do with an absentee owner if he cannot be found ?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. Davies has said that the Crown is the biggest offender. I am not going to deny that; but that surely does not remove the merit from the Bill! As regards the query raised by Mrs. Hutchison, land is quite valuable these days as compared with 20 years ago; and, if a block were bought at Belmont or some other part of the metropolitan area, the owner could easily be located.

I think it is reasonable to suggest that some obligation be placed on the person who owns the land. If the person who owns the land removes dangerous scrub and leaves the land in a safe condition, the question of obligation will not arise.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: I think a road board or council has power to do it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I remember talking to a man in Carlisle one day, and a vacant block next door to his property was in such a bad condition that he asked me whether anything could be done about it. The land was overgrown with high grass. I told this chap I would endeavour to see what could be done. After making inquiries I ascertained that the land was owned by the Perth City Council for the purpose of a drainage sump. I approached the Perth City Council about the matter, and the land in question was cleared up promptly.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: Local authorities should enforce it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I hope members will agree that the particular clause in the Bill is a reasonable one. Some members have brought forward the point of view that the Bill does not provide for a union representative on the board. In addition to the fact that this mattter has been argued in the House for a long time I say, with respect to you, Sir, that you were tolerant in allowing members to discuss this matter, because I suggest it does not come within the ambit of the Bill. The section of the Act which appoints the board is section 7, and the Bill does not seek to amend that section. I think, Sir, you were very tolerant to members in that respect.

The other point which I regarded as important was that traversed by Mr. Watson when he dealt with clause 5. I think this is a very wide clause but, I can see that the honourable member's amendment, which appears on the notice paper, will, if it is accepted, have the reverse effect to that which the clause now provides.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Dr. Hislop does not think so.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will tell the honourable member what I think about it; and I have no doubt that he will give me his opinion when I have finished. If clause 5 is allowed to stand as printed, the board will undoubtedly be given authority to call upon persons, owners and occupiers to do certain things; and the certain things are laid down. As I see Mr. Watson's amendment, it will not provide for a lot of things; but it will provide for all those things in the way of fire-fighting equipment which are portable. Therefore, the board will not be able to order any owner or occupier to install a sprinkler system. Up to that point, am I right?

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Yes.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I suggest that that is too great a contradiction to the clause as it is printed in the Bill. There could be a way of getting over that. I have given to the clerk an amendment which will be on the notice paper tomorrow. Forgetting Mr. Watson's amendment for the moment, the amendment I propose—in the event of clause 5 remaining as printed—will provide for the right of appeal, against the board's direction, to a court of petty session.

That is the only way I can think of to get over the position. If the clause were amended acccording to the manner suggested by Mr. Watson, I do not think the board would have sufficient powers. The Bill now becomes one for Committee. I would like the second reading to be passed on the understanding that the Committee stage will not be taken until tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT: That is entirely in your hands.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is in my hands so long as members will allow it to be. In certain cases I am at their bidding. We can deal with the various phases of the Bill, and any objections, during the Committee stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

CATTLE TRESPASS, FENCING, AND IMPOUNDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Order of the Day read for resumption of the debate from the 12th August.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

House adjourned at 8 p.m.

CONTENTS—*continued*

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 1st September, 1959

CONTENTS

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

SUPPLY BILL, £21,000,000

Assent

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

BLACK ROCKS DEEP-WATER PORT

Approval of Site and Cost of Inquiry

1. Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister for Works:

   (1) Did Sir Russell Dumas, when Director of Works, approve of Black Rocks as a suitable site for a deep-sea port in the Derby area?

   (2) What is the likely cost to the State Government of the inquiry by Maunsell & Partners regarding the location of a deep-sea port in the area?

   Mr. WILD replied:

   (1) Yes.

   (2) The cost of a report by Maunsell & Partners on the location and type of structure best suited for a deep-water port to serve the West Kimberleys is likely to be about £3,000.