as I am concerned. When I first came to this House I heard, "Forever and ever, Amen. I have a message." I thought the Speaker was on the right frequency that time.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): You have another five minutes.

Mr. Bovell: It has been said that when the Speaker enters the Chamber he looks at the members and prays for the people.

Mr. BICKERTON: Yes; the Minister might have something there. I will use the remaining five minutes on one other matter. I have thrown plenty of brickbats, but I would like to thank the Premier concerning the question of air fares. I have mentioned the matter in this House before, and I have grizzled enough about it, because north-west members used to get only two air fares paid each year; and of course, it was extremely difficult to make them go around. The Premier did increase the number to three—and recently to five—a year, for which I am grateful, and I am sure all other north-west members are grateful for it, too.

The application we made through the Rights and Privileges Committee was for 10 each year; but personally I sometimes think—and I have discussed this matter privately with the Premier—that a member should not be denied access to his electorate at any time.

Mr. Jamieson: Hear, hear!

Mr. BICKERTON: The number should be unlimited; but I realise that all sorts of problems could be involved with that idea. However, I would like the Premier to know I am grateful for the increase that has been made. Also, the member for Beeloo brought up the question of air fares for other members of Parliament when he spoke to the Address-in-Reply the other evening. That was another matter brought forward by the Rights and Privileges Committee—that members of Parliament should be able to obtain air fares to go to certain parts of the State, even if it was only one trip a year. I think it is essential that members of this Parliament see other people's electorates and get some appreciation of the State as a whole.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. D. G. May.

House adjourned at 11.22 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 26th August, 1964

CONTENTS

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

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

FLOODING IN WOLSELEY STREET, MORLEY

Remedial Measures

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Will the Minister treat as urgent the plight of residents in Wolseley Street, Morley, due to flooding?

(2) If so, what steps will the Minister take to relieve the distress of the families concerned in view of the apparent health menace due to septic systems being flooded?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) and (2) There is at present no metropolitan main drain within reasonable distance of the affected area which would provide an outlet for immediate temporary alleviation.

There is at present under construction a main drain which, when complete, will provide a suitable outlet to whatever water may be pumped. However, this would involve the local authority in the area constructing a considerable length of open drain and providing a pump.

QUESTION ON NOTICE

SHEEP FROM EASTERN STATES

Infestation with Burr

The Hon. G. BENNETTS asked the Minister for Local Government:

(1) Is the Minister aware that, although it is necessary for consignments of sheep to carry a certificate to the effect that stock are free from burr infestation, sheep are in fact arriving in this State with burr infestation?

Shearing before Consignment

(2) Would it not be beneficial to the State for sheep to be shorn in the Eastern States prior to consignment?

(3) If so, will the Government take what steps are necessary to ensure that stock arriving from other States are in a clean condition?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) All recent burr infestations have been associated with sheep shorn in the Eastern States prior to consignment.

(3) The Government is taking all practical steps to ensure that stock arriving from other States are in a clean condition before being released.

BILLS (3): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Administration Act Amendment Bill.
2. Public Trustee Act Amendment Bill.
3. Wills (Formal Validity) Bill.

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

SALE OF LIQUOR AND TOBACCO ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Justice) [4.42 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. President, as you will no doubt recall, Mr. Heenan introduced an amendment to the Licensing Act in order to relieve gallon licensees of the obligation of keeping a record of the names of persons purchasing liquor. When explaining the purpose of the Bill the honourable member expressed the opinion that the keeping of such records was an inconvenience to the licensee and the provision was objectionable to the general public.

Originally it was provided in the Act that one's name should be given to enable the police to keep a check on the activities of licensees who hold gallon licenses. Under the particular section of the Licensing Act, the police were required to police sales of liquor, and they were not enamoured with the amendment. Naturally enough hoteliers were not happy with the amendment, because they felt it might do their trade some damage. Even so, the amendment proposed in Mr. Heenan's Bill was passed by both Houses of Parliament and became law.

As a consequence, it was thought by all concerned that with the passing of that measure there remained no obligation whatever on gallon licensees to record the names of liquor purchasers. However, it has since been brought to the attention of the Government that the Sale of Liquor and Tobacco Act of 1916 contains a provision almost identical to that formerly contained in the Licensing Act requiring gallon licensees to record after every sale under such license the date of the sale, the quantity and kind of liquor sold, and the name of the purchaser.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Robert Gordon Menzies has signed for a lot he does not know anything about.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think that was mentioned in the debate. So in spite of the amendment passed last session there still remained the possibility of a prosecution being maintained should the Police Liquor Inspection Branch proceed against a gallon licensee for a breach of the Sale of Liquor and Tobacco Act; and this, regardless of the Licensing Court's views that Parliament removed the obligation from the Licensing Act and as far as the Licensing Court was concerned it had finished.

It may be of interest here to recall a legal view expressed earlier in the year to the effect that if at the time of the Licensing Act Amendment Act (No. 3), 1963, section 3 of the Sale of Liquor and Tobacco Act 1916 was still extant, then the former Act would not have had the effect of impliedly repealing the stated provision of the latter Act.

Conversely it has been pointed out to us that the *modus operandi* of section 134 of the Licensing Act Amendment Act, 1922, is so singular and its intention with regard to the future existence of section 3 of the Sale of Liquor and Tobacco Act so obscure, that it is possible to argue that part of its intention was to repeal the provisions of the latter Act while re-enacting them as provisions of the Licensing Act.

It appeared to me there was a definite conflict beween the two Acts which should be remedied at the earliest opportunity.

Having regard to the express wish of Parliament, the Government felt itself obliged therefore to take the matter up with the Commissioner of Police with a view to discretionary influence being exercised over the Liquor Inspection Branch pending the introduction and passing of this measure to remove the inappropriate section from the Sale of Liquor and Tobacco Act.

As a consequence of the action taken it was decided to forgo enforcement of the conflicting requirement for the time being. The main purpose of this Bill, then, is to repeal section 3 of the parent Act, because, as previously explained, this section conflicts with the Licensing Act, section 39 of which contains the relevant law. Section 3 is one of several sections repealed under clause 4 of the Bill.

All of the other sections being repealed contain matters which are conflicting with, or redundant to, the Licensing Act. To explain briefly: Section 2 contains conflicting trading hours under the Liquor Regulation Act, 1915, which expired in 1922. Section 4 prohibits the sale of liquor to persons under 18 years of age. The Licensing Act now stipulates 21 years. Section 5 refers to Australian wine licenses, now covered by section 33 of the Licensing Act. Section 6 likewise refers to eating house licenses for which provision is made in the other Act. Section 7 has reference to Australian wine bottle license. Again the Licensing Act applies in section 34 (2). Section 8 deals with assignments, etc., of lease under an Act which has already expired, namely, the Liquor Regulation Act of 1915. Section 9 makes provision for the absence of a licensee on armed service, but this is now part of section 111 of the other Act.

Upon the passing of this measure there will remain in the parent Act provisions relating only to the sale of tobacco, such as it being an offence to sell tobacco, etc., to persons under 18 years of age. As the amended Act will deal only with tobacco and related matters it is desirable to indicate just that in the title of the Act.

The final clause in the Bill has been inserted in view of the peculiar mode of adopting some of the sections of the 1916 Act in a reprint of the Licensing Act of 1911, as provided by section 134 of the Act No. 39 of 1922. This clause has been drafted in order to resolve any doubts that may arise that provisions of any repeal effected by the repeal Act do not affect the provisions of the Licensing Act, 1911-63, as they exist on the coming into operation of the repeal Act.

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

LOCAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Justice) [4.50 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The local court's jurisdiction is limited at the present time in actions for recovery of possession of land to land in respect of which the rent payable does not exceed £500 per annum. The purpose of this Bill is to grant the local court jurisdiction in actions for recovery of possession over properties, the rental value of which is not greater than £800.

Although most actions for recovery of possession of land in the local court are routine and virtually undefended, there are, nevertheless, a great many residences having a rental value in excess of £500 per annum these days, and it is considered that those up to a rental value of £800 should be dealt with in the local court. It is pointed out there is no intention of increasing the general jurisdiction of the local court except in respect of actions for possession of land already referred to.

The only other aspect dealt with in this Bill is in connection with the appointment of bailiffs. The Act makes provision for bailiffs to be appointed by the Governor. However, by Order-in-Council made no less than 60 years ago, certain minor appointments, including bailiffs, were vested in the Minister for Justice, and it is considered it would be more satisfactory if the Local Courts Act were amended to comply with the Order-in-Council made in 1904.

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

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Justice) [4.52 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

As members are aware, there have been a number of happenings in recent years, both in Australia and other countries, which have shown that special provisions are needed in our criminal law to protect the safety of passengers and crews of aircraft, and also the safety of the aircraft itself both when grounded and in flight. At times both crews and passengers have been assaulted; grounded aircraft have been stolen; aircraft have been hijacked; and there have been bomb scares in relation to aircraft.

It became apparent, in view of some such happenings in Australia, and affecting aircraft on routes operated by Australian aircraft services, that the laws promulgated under existing Statutes were inadequate for dealing with such offences, which could well occasion the most serious consequences to both passengers and crews of passenger flights.

Several of these incidents, among which were bomb hoaxes, had clearly shown there was an urgent need for making specific provisions to deal with the safety of passengers and crews of aircraft, and also of the aircraft itself both on the ground and in flight.

Last year the Commonwealth Government passed appropriate legislation making special provisions relating to those happenings to which I have previously made reference. The title of the Act passed is the Crimes (Aircraft) Act, 1963. That legislation concerns flights that are not wholly and exclusively intrastate flights.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Notwithstanding the Prime Minister's letter of last week to the Premier on aviation and Commonwealth control?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Let me finish, and it might give you the answer. It now rests with the States to legislate along similar lines for the protection of aircraft and services which may be termed intrastate services. The Commonwealth requested that such action be taken, and at the Melbourne and Adelaide meetings of the Standing Committee of Federal and State Attorneys-General on the 5th April and the 19th July, 1963, respectively, State Ministers present agreed, subject to their separate Cabinets' approvals, to introduce the necessary legislation. Victoria and Queensland have already done so and the others are in course of complying with the Commonwealth request.

The foregoing explanation of the events which led up to the introduction of this measure is submitted as a very good reason why complementary legislation should be operative in this State, but stronger reasons lie in our own experience here of a plane being stolen from Maylands aerodrome and flown up north. Then there was the bomb scare by a hoaxer at the Perth Airport.

I shall briefly describe under nine headings the form which this amending legislation takes. The Bill—

(a) empowers the captain of an aircraft on a flight, or person authorised by him, for the purpose of maintaining good order and discipline on board the aircraft, to use such force as he believes on reasonable grounds to be necessary and as is reasonable under the circumstances;

(b) prohibits the carrying on, delivery to, or possession of dangerous goods on board an aircraft, unless with the consent of the owner or operator of the aircraft who has knowledge of the nature of the goods, or under the authority or permission of some law of the Commonwealth or the State—penalty seven years;

(c) makes it an offence to intentionally endanger the safety of persons travelling in an aircraft—penalty life imprisonment.

(d) makes it an offence to assault members of the crew of an aircraft while on board the aircraft, so as to interfere with the performance by the member of his functions and duties—penalty 14 years. It is realised that the Criminal Code already provides for the offence of assault, but to assault a member of the crew of an aircraft, whilst on board the aircraft, is a very serious assault and the penalty has been made 14 years;

(e) provides for a penalty of 10 years for stealing an aircraft—it will be remembered that not long ago in this State an aircraft was in fact stolen, as I have already said;

(f) makes the unauthorised use of an aircraft an offence, with a seven years' penalty, but if another person is on board at the time, apart from an accomplice, the penalty will be 14 years, and if the offence is committed in company, or with violence, or whilst being armed, the penalty is for life. This is the offence of aircraft piracy, or what is commonly known as hijacking an aircraft;

(g) provides for a penalty of 14 years for wilfully or unlawfully destroying or damaging an aircraft or anything connected with the navigation, control or operation of an aircraft;

(h) provides for the offence of threats to safety of an aircraft and false statements relating to aircraft. These offences are what might be called bomb hoaxes, etc. This type of offence has been frequent in Australia in recent years and not only causes expense and inconvenience to aircraft operators and passengers, but gives rise to much anxiety and apprehension. The penalty will be two years; and

(i) provides for the arrest of persons found committing offences on aircraft and for search warrants, and empowers the captain of an aircraft, if he has reasonable grounds for suspecting that an offence involving the safety of the aircraft has been, is being, or may be committed on board the aircraft, to

search persons on board the aircraft or about to board the aircraft, or to search in luggage or freight and to seize anything that will be evidence of the offence or is likely to be used in the commission thereof. It is important to emphasise that the legislation calls for a search of a female by a female.

I think it will be readily agreed that the dire consequences attending the destruction of a large modern passenger aircraft in flight call for the most severe penalties consistent with those now imposed in the Criminal Code for similar offences. The penalties set out in this Bill are consistent also with those provided in the Commonwealth Act and other State Acts. The fines set out in the Bill are the maximum penalties. Naturally, the actual penalties inflicted in the event of a conviction for this type of offence will depend on the particular circumstances as set out in evidence when the case is being heard.

We have been requested to introduce this measure as an integral part of an Australia-wide response by legislators with a view to protecting aircraft passengers and crews from wanton destruction and the threat of it by criminal and irresponsible persons.

Quite apart from the Commonwealth scene, we have ample evidence of the need for this type of legislation in Western Australia. It is in our own interests to give this Bill our willing approbation and I commend it to members.

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

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban —Minister for Mines) [4.59 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill now be read a second time.

The purpose of this brief measure is to add to the definition of Crown land in the Mining Act, land which is reserved for public utility.

The object of this amendment to the parent Act is to ensure that land so classified by the Lands Department will come under the category of Crown land available for mining purposes as defined in the Mining Act. The necessity for introducing this Bill arises out of a Lands Department procedure in force in recent years through which the purpose of a number of reserves has been changed from "commons" to "public utility". The existing term "Crown land" in the Mining Act includes "commons" but does not include "public utility".

As a consequence of the Lands Department procedures already mentioned, miners now have to go to the trouble and expense of applying for authority to mine on land reserved for public utility because such land does not come within the category of Crown Land as defined in the Mining Act.

The decision to reclassify certain reserves from "commons" to "public utility" was made in order to facilitate the granting of pastoral or grazing leases. It is now considered equally desirable by passing this Bill to facilitate mining pursuits. The Lands Department has no objection to this.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. D. P. Dellar.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban —Minister for Justice) [5.1 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In introducing this Bill to amend the Justices Act I desire to say that its main purpose is to enable a judge of the Supreme Court to order a new trial on any grounds the judge thinks fit and notwithstanding that a plea of guilty was entered in the lower court.

At present, under section 197 of the Justices Act, a judge has only limited powers on an appeal against conviction in the lower court. Similar provisions apply in Victoria and Tasmania. However, the Justices Acts operating in N.S.W., Queensland, and South Australia grant a right of appeal under any circumstances where a person feels aggrieved by a conviction or order of justice.

There was a case on appeal last year before a judge of the Supreme Court where it appeared that a plea of guilty had been made in the lower court without full understanding on the part of the defendant of the relevant law, and what the plea entailed. The judge pointed out that he had no power to set aside the plea of guilty, and he suggested that consideration might be given to amending the law to give the Appeal Court the necessary power.

Already section 688 (1) (b) of the Criminal Code allows a person convicted on indictment to appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal with the leave of the court, or upon the certificate of the trial judge on any ground "which appears to the court to be a sufficient ground of appeal".

The matter of amendment of the Justices Act to give similar power to a judge on an appeal from an inferior court has been examined departmentally and by the

Law Society, and all are in favour of granting wide powers to a judge on such an appeal. I commend the Bill to members for their approval.

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

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban —Minister for Justice) [5.4 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

There are contained in the Evidence Act, Mr. President, as you will be aware, sections outlining a wide range of Acts, proclamations, documents, and suchlike, which are admissible as evidence in any court, or before any person acting judicially. The Act also stipulates the manner by which the authenticity of such documents produced shall be established and verification of reputed copies proven.

A simple example in respect of which section 65 applies, for instance, is the production in court of a certified copy or extract from land Titles Office registers. Such a document is admissible as evidence if it purports to be signed and certified as a true copy or extract by the officer to whose custody the original is entrusted. Not only is the document admissible in this instance but, furthermore, there is an obligation upon every custodian of any book or document of such a public nature to furnish a certified copy to any person requiring it and willing to pay the nominal fee for its production.

The Evidence Act, nevertheless, contains no provision enabling the State Library or the State Librarian to certify any copy of a document of which the original would be admissible as evidence.

A case in point occurred some little time ago which emphasised the need on occasion for the State Librarian's certification of copy documents of originals held in his custody and required as evidence in court. It transpired that a country shire council required from the Library Board a photo copy of an extract from an old *Government Gazette*. The photo copy was supplied but returned to the board with a note saying that as it was required to be produced as evidence in court, a certificate would be required to the effect of its being a true copy of the original of the *Government Gazette* held in the Battye Library.

There is no reason why the State Librarian should not furnish such a certificate, and there are no doubt many purposes for which such a certificate would suffice. It is simply that his certificate, as the Justices Act stands at present, has no effect where the rules of evidence as administered in courts of law are concerned. This problem may be readily resolved by the passing of this measure.

The Library Board, which is the custodian of a great deal of valuable and historical material would naturally be reluctant to part with valuable originals, even for short term usage in court, and should be authorised to certify photo copies, so rendering a desirable public service. Though the occasion to use this authority may not often arise, its implementation will very likely have an increasing significance as the material in possession of the board becomes older and rarer. This Bill is framed in straightforward and clearcut terms and I think its purpose will be generally acceptable to members.

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

DAMAGE BY AIRCRAFT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban —Minister for Justice) [5.8 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Two principles are enunciated by this Bill. The first is that no action lies for trespass or nuisance arising out of the flight of an aircraft over any property at a height that is reasonable in the existing circumstances if the Commonwealth air navigation regulations are complied with in relation to the flight.

The other principle is that a person who suffers damage to his person or property caused by a person in or by an article, animal, or person falling from an aircraft while in flight, taking off, or landing, can recover damages from the owner of the aircraft without proof of negligence; that is, provided that the person is not guilty of contributory negligence.

In 1958 the Commonwealth Parliament ratified the Rome Convention of 1952 on damage by aircraft engaged in international navigation. The main purpose of the convention was to ensure adequate compensation for persons who suffered damage on the surface by foreign aircraft. The convention was based on a system of strict or absolute liability on the part of the aircraft operator except where the victim had himself been guilty of contributory negligence.

The convention came into force in 1957, and the 1958 Commonwealth legislation extended the convention's purposes in respect of international air travel to Australian aircraft on the domestic portion of an international flight and to foreign aircraft in flight over Australian territory. Appropriate legislation was passed in the United Kingdom in 1959.

With respect to purely intrastate flights, New Zealand had passed legislation much earlier—that was in 1948, to be followed

by New South Wales in 1952, and Victoria in 1953; and last year Tasmania enacted similar legislation.

This Bill is similar to the New South Wales, Victorian, and Tasmanian Acts. It has been mentioned on several occasions at the various meetings of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, particularly in relation to the proposed uniform Bill known as the Aerial Spraying Control Bill; but that opens up quite a different matter and I shall have further to say about it later on.

In the preparation of legislation of this nature, a great deal of thought has to be given as to when liability for trespass or nuisance through the operation of aircraft might arise. It was important to establish whether or not negligence need be proved in establishing liability for damage. For instance, should a person be guilty of contributory negligence, he could not claim damages under this Bill but he could claim by virtue of the Western Australian Law Reform (Contributory Negligence and Tortfeasor's Contribution) Act of 1947, and the amount of damages to which he would be entitled would be reduced according to the extent of the contributory negligence. It will be seen, therefore, that while this Bill enunciates two clear principles, which do not necessarily alter the law, the passing of the measure will clarify the law in these matters.

While it may be argued that flight over land is a trespass equally as motoring across it, it is submitted in this Bill that planes enjoy the use of the highway of the air without creating any liability for trespass or nuisance if navigation regulations are observed and reasonable height maintained; or, in other words, there is a natural entitlement to the use of the air as highways for transport subject to any restrictions imposed by Statute or provided by common law with a view to protecting the rights of the community. This Bill gives statutory protection to this principle. On the other hand, it does not authorise any act of nuisance, or dispose of liability brought about through aircraft damaging persons or property by contemplated or unforeseen happenings.

Nevertheless, in the event of such happenings, it should not be necessary for a claimant to prove negligence on the part of the owners or those operating the aircraft in order successfully to pursue a claim for damages. As previously mentioned, if the claimant himself has been negligent, he would need to have recourse to the Contributory Negligence Act of 1947, because any contributory negligence at all of the plaintiff would disentitle him to claim under the provisions of this Bill.

This Bill then resolves any doubt or suggestion that a claimant need prove negligence which, in actual practice, would most likely be quite impossible for him to do, particularly in the case of an aircraft crash in which all occupants perished and the plane was destroyed by fire.

In turning to the Bill, it will be seen in subclause (1) of clause 5 that damages are recoverable from the owner of the aircraft; and under subclause (2), should a legal liability be created in some person other than the owner, the owner would be entitled to be indemnified by that person against any claim in respect of loss or damage. Under subclause (3) which covers hired aircraft, the person to whom the aircraft has been chartered or hired would become responsible if no pilot, commander, navigator, or operative member of its crew was in the employment of the owner. From the preceding it will be seen that if a passenger, for instance, negligently or deliberately throws his luggage overboard, a claim for damages would still be made against the owner, who would be entitled to be indemnified by the passenger concerned.

The only remaining point in the Bill which should be explained at this point of time is the reference to "liquid and liquid spray" in the definition of "article." The intention here is to dispose of any doubt that such substances are covered by the provisions of the Bill.

It might be mentioned in passing that the New Zealand Bill was judicially considered in connection with aerial spraying in 1961 and though the New Zealand Court of Appeal held that, in the circumstances of the case, the word "article" included liquid and liquid spray, although they were not mentioned in the interpretation of "article" in the New Zealand Act, there are no known Australian authorities on the point and, accordingly, there are advantages in placing the matter beyond doubt by including those substances in the interpretation of the word "article." Furthermore, this interpretation may be a useful reference at a later date should it be desirable to introduce special legislation dealing with aerial spraying control.

As previously mentioned, several other States of the Commonwealth have considered it desirable to introduce legislation of this nature. If I recollect rightly, there was a case in our courts in 1952 in which the judge pointed out that structural and mechanical faults, not necessarily attributable to the pilot, are as patent a cause of air disasters as negligent navigation, and to which this type of legislation might conceivably have applied had legislation of this nature then been in existence.

This Bill is commended to members as a useful piece of legislation of a type necessary to deal with problems arising out of the ever-increasing popularity of air transport.

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

House adjourned at 5.16 p.m.