

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 31st October, 1962

CONTENTS

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—

	Page
Albany Regional Hospital Nurses : Hot Drinks with Meals	2204
Civil Service : Granting of Three Weeks' Annual Leave	2203
Commonwealth Games Village : Cost of Homes	2203
Eastern Goldfields High School : Provision of New Gymnasium	2203
Federal Hotel : Purchase by Government	2203
Flies and Mosquitoes : Control Measures	2204
Fruit Fly : Control Measures	2204
Grain—	
Rail Delivery to New Fremantle Terminal	2202
Zonal Handling of Future Crops	2202
“Hillston” Boys' Farm—	
Inmates	2201
Teaching Staff : Qualifications, etc.	2201
Kalgoorlie Domestic Science Building : Plans for the Future	2202
Kent Street High School : Provision of Tennis Courts	2200
Kindergartens—	
Attendance of Native Children : Government Subsidy	2203
Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act : Provision Relating to Adultery	2203
Mandurah Water Supply : Bore Tests	2200
Painters' Registration Board—	
Members, Fees, etc.	2201
Proclamation of Act	2201
Payroll Tax : Amount Paid by State Government	2202
Railway Crossing at Gosnells : Installation of Lights	2204
Railway Dam at Tambellup—	
Improvements and Capacity	2202
Trains Watered	2202
Railway Property at Bassendean : Resumption and Sale	2205
State Housing Commission : Terms of Appointment of Mr. J. Coram	2202
State Shipping Service Freights : Concessions on Bricks for Derby, etc.	2205
Unemployed Children : Number, and Government's Intention	2201

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—

Albany Regional Hospital Nurses : Hot Drinks with Meals	2206
Commonwealth Games Areas : Control of Flies	2206
Liquor License Fees : Increase	2207
Main Roads Department : Availability of Annual Report	2206
Painters' Registration Board : Number of Members	2205
Unemployed Children : Number, and Government's Intentions	2207

BILLS—

Electoral Act Amendment Bill—	
Returned	2242
Council's Amendment	2242
Health Act Amendment Bill (No. 3) : Returned	2242

CONTENTS—continued

Page

BILLS—continued

Housing Loan Guarantee Act Amendment Bill—	
Receipt ; 1r.	2242
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	2242
Com. ; Report ; 3r.	2243
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance Surcharge) Bill—	
2r.	2237
Com. ; Report ; 3r.	2241
National Trust of Australia (W.A.) Bill—	
2r.	2217
Com.	2236
Stamp Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) : 3r.	2207
Supply Bill (No. 2), £22,000,000 : Returned	2242
Vermin Act Amendment Bill : 3r.	2207

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

KENT STREET HIGH SCHOOL

Provision of Tennis Courts

1. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Education:

As there are no certain plans for the provision of tennis courts at Kent Street High School, through lack of finance, will the Government give consideration to providing the courts and recouping the cost by charging the students 1s. per playing session, which is the charge they have to pay at present for the use of private courts?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

Tennis courts at Kent Street High School are listed for 1963-64 and will be constructed if necessary finance is available.

The proposal to charge students for the use of the courts would not be acceptable to the Education Department nor would it resolve the difficulty which is due to lack of loan funds to undertake the work.

Mr. Davies: They don't mind students paying for them now.

MANDURAH WATER SUPPLY

Bore Tests

2. Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

If the bore at Mandurah recently completed proves unsatisfactory, is it intended to bore at other localities in the Mandurah area?

Mr. WILD replied:

Water from the recently completed bore at Mandurah is unsatisfactory for a domestic supply. Possible location of a further site is under consideration.

PAINTERS' REGISTRATION BOARD

Members, Fees, etc.

3. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Have the members of the Painters' Registration Board yet been appointed?
- (2) If so, who are they?
- (3) What fees and other payments or expenses are payable to members?
- (4) What payments or fee will be payable to the registrar and secretary?

Proclamation of Act

- (5) When is it anticipated the Act will be proclaimed?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Albert Ernest Clare, C.B.E., L.F.R.A.I.A., F.R.I.B.A., M.A.P.I., Chairman of the Builders' Registration Board.

Norman William Wasley, J.P., Master Painters', Decorators' and Signwriters' Association of W.A.
James Rex Millar, West Australian Chamber of Manufactures.

Walter Leonard Green, A.R.A.I.A., Principal Architect.

William James McKillop Patterson, B.Sc., A.M.I.E. (Aust.) Dip. P.T.C., Superintendent of Apprentice Training, Perth Technical College.

- (3) Fees payable will be as prescribed by regulation. No prescribing regulation has yet been made.
- (4) The remuneration has not yet been fixed.
- (5) As soon as the provisions of the amending Act of 1962 in connection with the appointment of the board have been implemented.

"HILLSTON" BOYS' FARM

Inmates

4. Mr. DUNN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Child Welfare:

- (1) How many inmates is Hillston Boys' Farm designed to accommodate?
- (2) What is the number of inmates at present in the institution?
- (3) Has the institution been filled to capacity over the past year?

Teaching Staff: Qualifications, etc.

- (4) Apart from the Education Department personnel, what are the qualifications required of the staff?
- (5) Is any difficulty experienced in maintaining the staff at full capacity with qualified personnel?
- (6) Does the educational staff observe only the normal teaching hours?
- (7) Do the security measures suffer when the educational staff goes off duty?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) 56.
- (2) 53.
- (3) The 22nd October, 1961 to the 18th March, 1962—No.
19th March, 1962 to the 13th May, 1962—Yes.
14th May, 1962 to the 9th September, 1962—Weekly average 9 boys over capacity.
10th September, 1962 to the 21st October, 1962—Yes.
- (4) Successful completion of special training course conducted by Technical Education Division.
- (5) Yes, but difficulty is being progressively overcome by series of courses conducted annually.
It is necessary to engage untrained staff in temporary capacity in the interim.
The staff turnover in the latter category is particularly high owing to unsuitability.
- (6) No. The teaching staff is occupied daily Monday to Friday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., and Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday evenings 6 to 8 p.m. on a 52 week per annum basis.
- (7) No.

5. This question was postponed.

UNEMPLOYED CHILDREN

Number, and Government's Intentions

6. Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister for Labour:

- (1) How many boys who left school last year were registered for employment at the 30th September, 1962?
- (2) How many girls who left school last year were registered for employment at the 30th September, 1962?
- (3) Does the Government intend to organise employment in the very near future for these young people?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) to (3) This information is not available.

PAYROLL TAX*Amount Paid by State Government*

7. Mr. HAWKE asked the Premier:

What was the total amount of payroll tax paid by the State Government to the Commonwealth Government during the last financial year?

Mr. BRAND replied:

The amount was £1,208,466 8s. 7d.

STATE HOUSING COMMISSION*Terms of Appointment of Mr. J. Coram*

8. Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

What were the terms of appointment applicable to Mr. J. Coram when he was appointed a member of the State Housing Commission in 1946?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

Mr. J. Coram was invited to become a board member as a representative of the Industrial Unions of Workers by the then Premier (The Hon. F. J. S. Wise, M.L.A.). Mr. Coram accepted the invitation, and the appointment was confirmed by Executive Council on the 15th March, 1946.

RAILWAY DAM AT TAMBELLUP*Improvements and Capacity*

9. Mr. MITCHELL asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) When were improvements to the railway dam at Tambellup completed?
- (2) What amount of water does the dam hold when full?

Trains Watered

- (3) How many trains per week are watered at Tambellup?
- (4) What is the average amount of water required to service each train?
- (5) Has water from this dam been transported to any other point for railway use during the last two summer seasons?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Improvements to the catchment were carried out in 1954.
- (2) 21 million gallons.
- (3) The number of trains watered per week is dependent on the period of the year, and this year has varied from 115 trains in the week ended the 12th May to 44 in the week ended the 27th October.
- (4) 2,000 gallons.
- (5) Yes. During the summer 1960-61, 37,000 gallons of water were hauled from Tambellup to Gnow-

angerup whilst in the summer of 1961-62, 140,500 gallons were transported between these points.

GRAIN*Rail Delivery to New Fremantle Terminal*

10. Mr. GAYFER asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) In view of the Government's decision that Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited should build the new grain terminal at Fremantle instead of Kwinana as suggested by the company, will the Railways Commission be in a position to maintain delivery of grain to the new £3-million terminal at the designed rail intake rate of 800 tons per hour as soon as the terminal is completed early in 1964?

Zonal Handling of Future Crops

- (2) In view of the anticipated increase in grain production in Western Australia which could mean a crop twice the present one in the foreseeable future, do the Railways Commission's plans allow for satisfactory handling of this in all zones?

Mr. COURT: I have not the written answer to the question directed to me by the member for Avon, but I can give it verbally, pending receipt of the answer, if that is satisfactory, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Yes.

Mr. COURT: The answers are as follows:—

- (1) The railways can handle the tonnages involved. A special committee examined all aspects of the Fremantle site, including the ability of the railways to handle the required volume.
- (2) Yes.

KALGOORLIE DOMESTIC SCIENCE BUILDING*Plans for the Future*

11. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Education:

Further to the answer to my question, No. 16 on the notice paper of the 15th August, 1962, can he now state whether any proposal has been adopted in respect of the future of the domestic science building in Cassidy Street, Kalgoorlie?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

As is the practice with surplus Government buildings, the home science building at Kalgoorlie has been handed over to the Public Works Department for disposal.

EASTERN GOLDFIELDS HIGH SCHOOL

Provision of New Gymnasium

12. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Education:

Is he now in a position to indicate when it is likely that a new gymnasium will be provided at the Eastern Goldfields High School?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

No. The department is unable to allocate funds for the erection of gymnasia at high schools whilst there is such an urgent demand for classrooms.

COMMONWEALTH GAMES VILLAGE

Cost of Homes

13. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

On the 1st August last, he advised, in reply to a question, that the final figures of the cost of Commonwealth Games Village homes would be known by late October, 1962. Will he now—

- (a) supply the figures in detail; and
- (b) indicate whether this is to be the sale price or upset price of the homes?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (a) and (b) All accounts have not yet been received. The commission is at present checking through all items of expenditure on the Village. It is expected that final figures will be available in the near future.

LAW REFORM (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT

Provision Relating to Adultery

14. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Does the Commonwealth Matrimonial Causes Act 1959 contain any provision whereby the effect of section 4 of the Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1941, of W.A., in respect of the exception as to damages on the ground of adultery, is continued?
- (2) If not, does he consider it necessary in order to retain this particular exception to amend section 4 of the Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act in so far as it relates to the Supreme Court Act, 1935, section 94?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) No. See section 44.
- (2) No. It is thought that common law would apply.

CIVIL SERVICE

Granting of Three Weeks' Annual Leave

15. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Premier: When is it anticipated that the Government will grant three weeks' annual leave to all members of the Civil Service?

Mr. BRAND replied:

The matter is still under consideration.

FEDERAL HOTEL

Purchase by Government

16. Mr. HEAL asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) On what date did the Government purchase the Federal Hotel, Wellington Street, Perth?
- (2) For what reason was the hotel purchased?
- (3) What area of land was involved?
- (4) On what basis was it valued?
- (5) What was the purchase price of—
 - (a) land;
 - (b) buildings;
 - (c) plant, furniture and fittings;
 - (d) stock in trade;
 - (e) goodwill and/or ingoing?
- (6) What amounts of compensation were paid to owners and occupiers?
- (7) Would he please state all other items of purchase costs?
- (8) What was the total cost to the Government?
- (9) From which funds were payments made?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) 15th May, 1961.
- (2) Western switch road.
- (3) 1 rood 8.1 perches.
- (4) Market value as a licensed hotel.
- (5) (a) and (b) £47,500—no allocation was made as between land and buildings.
(c) to (e) Nil.
- (6) Purchase price of £47,500 was paid to the owner. No payment was made to the occupier by the Government.
- (7) None.
- (8) £47,500 plus £2 transfer fee.
- (9) Metropolitan Regional Planning Authority funds.

KINDERGARTENS.

Attendance of Native Children: Government Subsidy

17. Mr. H. MAY asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) Regarding the question of a Government subsidy for native children attending kindergarten schools, has any definite policy concerning this matter been decided upon?

- (2) If no decision has been made will he indicate when one may be expected?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) and (2) The question of a subsidy for kindergartens for native children is now under close investigation and a decision can be expected shortly.

ALBANY REGIONAL HOSPITAL NURSES

Hot Drinks with Meals

18. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) Have efficiency experts advised nursing sisters at the Albany Regional Hospital to do without hot drinks with their main meal?
(2) If such a recommendation was made, what form of efficiency would be achieved by such action?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) All staff are served with morning and afternoon tea. Tea is also served with all meals, excluding the midday meal, and this is the policy in most hospitals.

RAILWAY CROSSING AT GOSNELLS

Installation of Lights

19. Mr. D. G. MAY asked the Minister for Railways:

In view of the fact that on the 22nd August, 1962, he indicated that crossing lights would be provided at the Fremantle Road crossing, Gosnells, within two months, will he advise the reason for the delay and when the lights will be installed?

Mr. COURT replied:

Previous advice given the honourable member on this matter was that the installation would be effected within a few months. Material is now available and it is anticipated that the lights will be completed within three weeks.

FLIES AND MOSQUITOES

Control Measures

20. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) Are any special arrangements being made in the current financial year to reduce the menace of—
(a) house flies;
(b) mosquitoes?
(2) Will he state what arrangements, if any, are being made?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) Attempts to reduce the prevalence of flies are co-ordinated by a planning committee which includes representatives from the Department of Public Health, the Local Government Association and the Shire Councils' Association, the Health Inspectors' Association, the Department of Agriculture and the Health Education Council. Under the auspices of this committee the following activities are already in progress, or are contemplated:—

- (1) The education of householders and members of shire councils in regard to the prevention of fly-breeding and mosquito breeding. This is already in progress and is being done through a movie film, leaflets, exhibitions, lectures and radio talks.
(2) The training of selected personnel in methods of fly control. Some 50 health inspectors and 20 gardeners employed by public authorities have recently attended refresher courses organised by the Public Health Department; and arrangements are in hand for the training of up to 100 auxiliary fly control officers who are to be employed on a temporary basis by local authorities later in the year.
(3) Special investigations are being carried out to determine the best methods of control in public parks and gardens, market gardens, abattoirs and stables.
(4) An additional TIFA fogging machine has been purchased by the department and two senior departmental health inspectors have been assigned whole-time to the task of co-ordinating day-to-day activities.

FRUIT FLY

Control Measures

21. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Are any special arrangements being made in the current financial year to reduce the menace of fruit fly?
(2) What arrangements have been made?
(3) Which area is believed to be the most difficult for combating this pest?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes, a comprehensive programme will be pursued.
- (2) In addition to the routine measures of inspecting orchards (including backyard orchards) and fruit being marketed by regular fruit-fly inspectors, arrangements are being made for the following special activities, some of which were in operation last year—
 - (a) A compulsory fruit-fly baiting scheme is being inaugurated at Albany to operate for the first time this summer.
 - (b) Road blocks will continue to operate at regular intervals at Kirup and Cranbrook to stop the movement of fruit into southern districts.
 - (c) A road block is being set up at Norseman from the 5th to the 23rd November to intercept overland travellers to the Commonwealth Games. This will cover the possible entry of the Queensland fruit fly from the Eastern States. This fly is not established in this State.
 - (d) Research will continue on the breeding of fruit fly for experimental purposes to provide for the testing of insecticides and also to study the life history of the fly to provide basic information for future investigations.
 - (e) A publicity programme will be carried out over the radio, by printed leaflets, articles in the departmental journal, and notices in the Press emphasising the fruit-fly problem, methods of control and restrictions on the movement of fruit.
 - (f) Seven seasonal inspectors additional to the permanent inspection service will be employed for the summer period.
 - (g) A visit by Dr. Steiner, who is in charge of fruit-fly investigations for the United States of America Department of Agriculture in Honolulu is being sponsored and it is hoped he will visit this State to view the fruit-fly problem and discuss overseas trends in control methods.
 - (h) Fumigation of all fruit sent to southern areas will be continued at the Metropolitan Markets this summer.
- (3) The incidence of fruit fly is heaviest in conditions of mild climate and a wide range of host

fruits also under conditions of close habitation and small plantings of fruit. These conditions apply particularly in the metropolitan and hills areas centred on Perth. However, provided proper measures are carried out effective control of fruit fly can be obtained.

22. *This question was postponed.*

RAILWAY PROPERTY AT BASSENDEAN

Resumption and Sale

23. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Has the railway property at Bassendean which was resumed for the chord line to Welshpool been sold?
- (2) If so, who were the purchasers, and what price was received?
- (3) Were tenders called or private negotiations arranged?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Apart from re-transfers to former owners, only one lot has been sold.
- (2) The purchaser was Mrs. S. L. McDonnell at the price of £765. This lot contained a partially-erected dwelling.
- (3) Tenders were called.

STATE SHIPPING SERVICE FREIGHTS

Concessions on Bricks for Derby, etc.

24. Mr. RHATTIGAN asked the Minister for the North-West:

Is it correct that concessional freights are to be allowed by the State Shipping Service on bricks manufactured in Perth for use in buildings at Derby and concession rates on the return from Derby of the containers?

Mr. COURT replied:

It has been agreed to carry the bricks and all other materials for the nurses' quarters at Derby at the existing freight rates because the contract for the job was signed before freight increases were announced and there is no provision in the contract for adjustment.

The containers belong to the State Shipping Service.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE PAINTERS' REGISTRATION BOARD

Number of Members

1. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Works:

In reply to the first portion of question No. 3 on the notice paper the Minister gave the names of

five persons who have been appointed to the Painters' Registration Board. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that just recently the Act was amended to make doubly certain that three was the number, and I am aware of the fact that five persons were proposed to be appointed; but their appointment did not, in fact, take place on account of its being found that the Bill as passed was counter to what had been decided or to what we thought had been decided by Parliament. Therefore, I ask the Minister how is it that he has now appointed five persons when the amending Bill introduced by him cleared up the point that there should be three persons and no more?

Mr. WILD replied:

In reply to the honourable member, I recognise the point he has raised, and I will have a check made. As a matter of fact, the question came down only a few moments before I left the office, and I confess that I did not check it. However, I know the honourable member is right, and I will try to straighten it out.

COMMONWEALTH GAMES AREAS

Control of Flies

2. Dr. HENN asked the Minister for Health:

Will the Minister ensure that the Public Health Department takes all possible steps to see that the fly menace in the Commonwealth Games area at Floreat Park and City Beach is reduced to a minimum before and during the Games, and thus prevent the possibility of the spread of disease at this time when so many visitors will be congregating?

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

Yes. A special committee comprising representatives from the Public Health Department and the Perth City Council, together with the Government Entomologist, was appointed some time ago to consider this problem. As a result the following measures were planned:—

- (1) The application of a residual or long-acting insecticide to parts of the buildings at the Games sites.
- (2) The fogging of the bush in the vicinity of the venues with insecticide at appropriate intervals.

- (3) Special action by local authorities to minimise fly-breeding in private yards and gardens in suburbs adjoining the venues.

The application of these measures is already in progress and should be complete before the Games commence; but plans are being made for further action if required during the Games period itself, to ensure minimum inconvenience to both spectators and competitors.

ALBANY REGIONAL HOSPITAL NURSES

Hot Drinks with Meals

3. Mr. HALL: As a consequence of the answer received to question No. 18 on today's notice paper, I would like to ask the Minister for Health whether he is aware of an article appearing in *The Albany Advertiser* stating that no soups or hot coffee could be had with any main meal.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: No; I am not aware of the article. But in regard to the hot drinks mentioned in the honourable member's question, this is a policy that has been adopted throughout all hospitals and has regard for the employment of staff and so on. In most hospitals provision is made for the members of the nursing staff to make tea at almost any time in their own quarters and in various parts of the hospital.

MAIN ROADS DEPARTMENT

Availability of Annual Report

4. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Works:

Can the Minister inform the House when the annual report of the Main Roads Department for the year ended the 30th June, 1962, will be available?

Mr. WILD replied:

I thank the honourable member for letting me know yesterday about this question. I am advised that the report will be available about the 15th November. The Commissioner of Main Roads is away in the East at a conference, and on his return I will try to expedite the report so that the honourable member can have it before the House rises.

UNEMPLOYED CHILDREN*Number, and Government's Intentions*

5. Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister for Works:

This question has relation to question No. 6 on today's notice paper. In that question I asked the Minister how many girls and boys who left school last December were registered now for employment, and what steps the Government was taking to provide employment for at least some of those young people. The Minister replied that the information was not available. Could he elaborate on his reply and tell us whether he made any effort to obtain the information; and, if so, what is the reason why the information could not be obtained?

Mr. WILD replied:

This is a Federal matter—

Mr. Hawke: We know that.

Mr. WILD: —and the information can only be obtained from the Department of Labour and National Service in Wellington Street. On inquiry this morning, my office was informed it would require a tremendous amount of time to extract the information because each individual was recorded on a separate card; and, furthermore, before they could give the information they would have to obtain the permission of their Federal Minister. However, if the Leader of the Opposition continues to press for the information, I can have it made available; but it will take some days to obtain.

Mr. Hawke: Thank you; I would like it.

LIQUOR LICENSE FEES*Increase*

6. Mr. CORNELL: This question to the Treasurer is in regard to the increase in license fees. During the course of his comments on the Bill, the Treasurer said the increase would be in the vicinity of 50 per cent. A cross-check that I have made at various clubs shows that the increase, based on last year's licensing returns, is more in the order of 75 per cent. Would the Treasurer be good enough to check these figures to see whether my figures or his are correct?

Also, in view of the fact that the price of beer is a good deal cheaper in the standard States

than in Western Australia, would he say the wishes of the Grants Commission are being gratified?

Mr. BRAND: Dealing with the last part of the question first, I will talk to the Grants Commission about this.

In respect of the first part I will have the figures examined. The 55 per cent. increase to which I referred is the total income which will be derived as a result of this increase compared with the £500,000, approximately, which was received last year.

I did say, I might add, that there were certain circumstances where the tax on beer would be substantially higher than 55 per cent., and that in the case of wines and other liquors it could be very much less. However, I will get the information.

STAMP ACT AMENDMENT BILL**(No. 2)***Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Brand (Treasurer), and transmitted to the Council.

VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL*Third Reading*

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [4.56 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. H. MAY (Collie) [4.57 p.m.]: I purposely refrained last night from making any comment on the Bill, and I think my reason for not speaking is very obvious to those members who remained in the Chamber. I felt, listening to the debate, that members had the situation somewhat mixed because, in my opinion, there were two phases under discussion last night: One was the question of wild rabbits; and the other, rabbits that are grown to be sold for human consumption.

I cannot imagine that anybody who has any idea of what goes on in the country in regard to wild rabbits would disagree with the fact that they should be destroyed. Personally I am all for it; and that should have been the end of that part of the Bill on which there was so much discussion last night.

I want to say, however, in almost the same breath, that I consider those people who are farming tame rabbits, as I would call them, or tame animals, as another member called them last night—and that, perhaps, is the better term—are carrying on an industry which needs some protection, and I feel the debate last night proved that point. Let us forget all

about the wild rabbits at the moment; we have done with them. I will destroy every one of them that I can because I believe they should be destroyed on account of the damage they do.

Now we come to the other side of the question, and there are at least two farms, almost within the metropolitan area, breeding tame rabbits for human consumption, and they have undoubtedly built up a fair trade. From what I heard last night from the members of the Opposition—in particular—who have inspected these farms, I am satisfied that every safeguard is being taken to ensure that the rabbits will not get away and become more or less wild.

The member for Stirling said he knew where, on the south coast, there were burrows of these white rabbits. But obviously those rabbits are not the same kind that these people in the metropolitan area, or close to the metropolitan area, are breeding and producing for sale for human consumption; because if the rabbits he was talking about are the same as the ones that are being bred for consumption, they would not exist—they could not exist. That, I think, clears up another point which was thrown into the ring last night by the member for Stirling.

After listening to all that was said yesterday evening on this Bill, I formed the opinion that there were two parts to it—one dealing with the extermination of wild rabbits, and the other dealing with the breeding of rabbits for human consumption. I am quite satisfied that the people who are breeding these rabbits for human consumption are taking every safeguard to ensure they will not become a menace and will cause no disadvantage to anyone in this State.

MR. OLDFIELD (Maylands) [5.1 p.m.]: When the Minister moved that the Bill be read a third time this afternoon I was rather hopeful he would come forward with some explanation which he was unable to give during the Committee stage of the Bill yesterday evening and early this morning. However, apparently the Minister has not seen fit to go out of his way to find the answers to the queries that were put to him last night by members of the Opposition, and he has formally moved the third reading of the Bill knowing full well that he has the weight of numbers to put it through.

I have never witnessed such a spectacle as I did last night when the debate in the Committee stage of the Bill went on for some five hours on the question of whether an industry for the breeding of Belgian hares should be allowed to prosper or be put out of existence; and at no stage did the Minister advance any reason for the introduction of the Bill. He spoke only twice—the first time to tidy up an error in drafting; and the second to read from half a foolscap piece of paper containing

notes prepared by the department, which the Minister thought gave the complete answer to the questions and amendments put forward by members of the Opposition.

It is a poor show for any Minister to adopt such an attitude by leaving a debate in the air and giving no satisfaction to any member who speaks to it. We are now debating the third reading stage of the Bill still completely unaware of the reason for its introduction. The only reason the Minister put forward was that it was the wish of the Farmers' Union that the Bill be introduced. That seemed to be sufficient reason for his forcing the Bill through the Committee stage last night.

Mr. Nalder: It is easy to see that you did not pay much attention to the debate on the Bill.

Mr. OLDFIELD: That was the only reason the Minister put forward: that the Farmers' Union wished it to go through.

Mr. Nalder: You read *Hansard* again.

Mr. OLDFIELD: The Minister's attitude shows that the Government is sectional in its outlook and interests. It is quite obvious the Minister was concerned only with the welfare of the farmers and was not interested in any other industry that may be brought into being or the success of an industry that is already operating.

If the Minister's intention is to safeguard those interested in fat lamb growing, I would point out to Government members that there are many allied industries which will also suffer. This rabbit-breeding industry is a revenue producer and could be developed into a much larger industry; it could be extended to include large export sales. An average-sized rabbit farm purchases about £3,000 worth of pellets every year which are manufactured by flour millers or stock-feed companies. If there are 200 registered rabbit breeders in New South Wales, it is quite obvious that, at some time or other, Western Australia could handle 20 or 30 rabbit-breeding farms. One can easily imagine the extent to which the pellet-manufacturing industry could grow if the number of these rabbit farms was increased.

If the introduction of the Bill is not to protect the fat lamb industry, the poultry-growing industry, or some other industry already in existence, which the Farmers' Union claims it represents, then what is the real reason? No evidence has been advanced that these rabbits have ever been a menace to agricultural areas as vermin; and I am forced to come to the conclusion that if the Minister is not prepared, even at this late stage, to reply to the debate on the third reading of the Bill and tell Parliament the real reason for the introduction of this measure, it is only because he dare not tell the House that the Bill is introduced in the interests of fat lamb breeders; or else the Minister is unable to grasp the real facts of the situation

or the meaning of the arguments that were put forward by Opposition members last night, proving that he is completely out of touch with the situation and is being blindly led by the nose by his departmental officers.

MR. DAVIES (Victoria Park) [5.7 p.m.]: I have very little left to say on this measure. I will not admit that I do not want to delay it; because, in fact, I would like to delay it as long as I could because of the submissions I made last night; namely, that in my opinion this Bill is the most sectional piece of legislation that has ever been brought to this House during the short time I have been a member of it.

I have risen to speak on this occasion because I understand that several members of the Government paid a visit to this rabbit-breeding farm at Beechboro this morning. I appreciate the interest they have shown, particularly after the late sitting we had last night, which extended into the early hours of this morning. Apparently they were sufficiently interested to make the journey to the backblocks to see for themselves what was the true position of this industry.

I have expressed my appreciation of their visit and I now want to suggest that they might like to acquaint the House of their opinion of that rabbit farm, following their visit, particularly on the question of hygiene and the safeguards that are provided against the escape of the rabbits. I think these are the two most important aspects of the industry about which the Government may be concerned. As Government members were good enough to make this visit, which I greatly appreciate, I thought perhaps they might now be good enough to express their opinions to the House.

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [5.9 p.m.]: I will be extremely brief with the remarks I wish to make. Because the member for Victoria Park has drawn attention to the fact that some Government members visited the Beechboro rabbit farm this morning, I would like to make one or two comments on that visit. I was one of the members who went there, and I was extremely impressed with the establishment. Everything I saw confirmed my previous opinion of this industry. I feel certain that, provided the breeding of rabbits is confined to commercial establishments in Western Australia, without question no danger can arise from the keeping of such rabbits.

On the other hand, there would certainly be a great potential danger if backyard breeders were permitted to keep rabbits. Last night, in talking about Belgian hares, the members of the Opposition gave the House the impression that those hares were bred at this establishment at Beechboro. The fact is that all

the rabbits on that farm are New Zealand white rabbits; and, in the circumstances, I am surprised that members of the Opposition should have come here and misled members with such statements. I can understand why the Minister for Agriculture has doubted many of the statements made by members of the Opposition after hearing the arguments they advanced to show that this establishment is producing Belgian hares.

Those members even went further and said that Belgian hares were not rabbits and would not cross with rabbits. Such statements are all nonsense, because the Belgian hare is a rabbit. Its original name was Belgian hare rabbit, but it has been abbreviated to Belgian hare. The truth is that a Belgian hare is a rabbit and will cross with a rabbit. In view of those facts the members of the Opposition yesterday evening misled the House in regard to that point. I reiterate, however, that I was greatly impressed with the industry, and I am certain that any other member who visited this establishment would be equally impressed. I feel quite sure that if rabbit breeding were confined to commercial establishments no harm would result.

What I want to emphasise is that all the Bill does is give the people connected with the rabbit-breeding industry in Western Australia a respite of four years. At the moment they are depending for their existence on the whim of the Department of Agriculture, which can either issue a permit to them or refuse it. This measure, however, means that for the next four years they will be allowed to continue with their rabbit breeding. Those who are interested in the industry will know exactly where they stand for the next four years. Surely in that period, if no reason can be advanced why they should not be allowed to continue, someone will introduce legislation in this House for the continuance of rabbit breeding in Western Australia. In the circumstances, I can see nothing against the legislation and for that reason I support it.

MR. TOMS (Bayswater) [5.13 p.m.]: After hearing the member for South Perth speak I think he can be held up as the best example of someone having two bob each way that anyone has ever seen.

Mr. O'Neil: Tell us in what way the legislation affects the position of the industry.

Mr. TOMS: The honourable member can have his say later on; at present I have the floor. The member for South Perth has blatantly entered this House this afternoon and informed us that he visited the rabbit-breeding farm at North Bayswater and is greatly impressed with it. He will probably realise now that the extravagant words which the members of the Opposition were supposed to have used

yesterday and early this morning were not as extravagant as he thought at the time. Today the Minister has said that if we had listened to his second reading speech we would have learned all that there was to know about the Bill. I think all of us read that part of his speech on the second reading which deals with that particular matter. With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I will read it to the House, because it is very short. It is as follows:—

It will be recalled that last year, with the advent of the commercial keeping of rabbits, a decision was made that any permits issued under the regulations would be for five years and no longer. In view of the many protests and concern expressed throughout the State that the five-year limit might not in fact be enforced, it is intended to amend the Act accordingly and ensure that such domestic rabbits should not be kept except for scientific or zoological purposes after the 30th June, 1966.

Mr. Norton: What about Belgian hares?

Mr. NALDER: I think they will come within the same category as rabbits. If they do not, we can amend the Act accordingly.

Yet the member for South Perth supports the third reading after what he has seen this morning, and after saying he is perfectly happy with the commercial breeding of rabbits. He is prepared to support a measure introduced by the Government to ban this industry. Probably he will say that later the particular provision in the legislation will be amended.

It is ridiculous for any Government to pass legislation that in four years' time a ban upon the keeping of rabbits is to become effective. How does the Government know what the experience will be at the end of four years? I suggest that if after four years it is found such action is necessary, that will be the time to terminate the permit which has been issued to these people conducting the industry.

In view of the remarks made by the member for South Perth, there is no incentive for those conducting the industry at the present time to carry on and expand it on a commercial basis. Now they are to receive the death knell of their industry, and from 1966 it is to cease operations as a result of legislation passed in 1962. Never in the history of Parliament has such stupid legislation been placed on the statute book.

I ask those members who went out this morning to inspect the premises where the rabbits are bred to consider this matter without any bias. I am sure they were more impressed with what they saw than was the member for South Perth, who has a certain amount of bias in the matter. I would like to hear from those members their reaction on the visit this morning.

MR. GRAHAM (Balcatta) [5.18 p.m.]: I suppose it is too much to hope that the Minister for Industrial Development will make a contribution to this debate.

Mr. Court: I am not likely to enter into this one.

Mr. GRAHAM: Here is an infant industry in Western Australia, and a fellow Minister of the Minister for Industrial Development is introducing legislation to ensure that as at the 30th June, 1966, this new industry will go out of existence.

Mr. Court: I think he is being very fair in giving the people concerned proper notice.

Mr. GRAHAM: What about giving notice to a few other industries to close down? Is that the policy of the Government?

Mr. Court: Industries such as?

Mr. GRAHAM: Any at all. There is nothing offensive about the industry in question, or about the likelihood of that industry bringing about any danger to the community or the agricultural industry.

Mr. Brady: The Government should close the Swan Brewery. The people might be saved a few pounds if that were done.

Mr. Hawke: No big capital is involved in the rabbit-breeding industry, so the Government has decided it shall go out of existence.

Mr. GRAHAM: Were it not for this legislation there would be 12 to 20 more rabbit farms in existence in Western Australia, operating under licenses issued by the Department of Agriculture, which has the power to impose whatever conditions it thinks fit. I am pleased that some supporters of the Government went to the trouble this morning to make an inspection of the premises. It would appear there is no condemnation which can fall on them as a consequence of the visit.

Surely there is a double duty on the Minister for Agriculture—who is seeking to wreck the new and growing industry, and who has not sufficient interest in the matter to travel a few miles from this place to ascertain precisely what is taking place—to give reasons for this legislation.

Whatever be the attitude of the member for South Perth to this Bill, I am sure he will agree there is no chance or prospect whatever of any of these rabbits which are kept in captivity escaping. They have no more chance of escaping than rabbits kept in zoos, or in laboratories for experimental purposes. It is foolish in the extreme to place a ban on an industry by enacting legislation in 1962 for that industry to become inoperative in the year 1966. Apparently a few supporters of the Government have given second thoughts to this legislation and they have intimated that if anything occurs between now and 1966 the offending portion in the Bill could be repealed. The commonsense approach to the matter is this: When the

Government has evidence that this industry is, or is likely to become any sort of threat to Western Australia, that is the time to introduce legislation to ban it. This Bill involves Parliament when there is no occasion for so doing.

It is all very well for the Minister, through interjections, to create the belief that he has given reasons for this legislation. In fact, he has not given any. All we know is that certain people have asked for this Bill. If that is the case, then what are their reasons? The Minister is perfectly dumb in connection with this matter.

Mr. Hawke: Not perfectly.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would the honourable member suggest an adjective which is more appropriate?

Mr. Hawke: I do not think there is any need to use an adjective.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am of the opinion that the Government, through this legislation, is making Parliament look foolish. If there is a real problem then no doubt members on both sides of the House will join together and act in the interests of the welfare of the State. But there is no problem; there is no threat; and there is no menace. However, there appears to be a prejudice on the part of some people.

I suppose if I were producing a certain commodity I would have a vested interest in preventing other people from producing a rival commodity. It would appear that the fat lamb producers are afraid if this industry becomes established in Western Australia—as it has become established in other parts of this country—it might have an impact upon the sale of lamb. This Government, which is supposed to support free enterprise and to believe in healthy trade competition, and all the rest, is prepared to introduce this Bill. The Minister for Industrial Development who prates about all the industries which he has been responsible for establishing in Western Australia, and about the progress which this State has made accordingly, is supporting the legislation. Perhaps I should quote some basic Liberal principles. Some of them are—

To preserve the rights of the individual in a Free State. In which every citizen shall contribute to the security and welfare of other citizens, but in which the State shall be the servant and not the master of the people.

I wonder what the attitude of this Government is to the people who have sunk thousands of pounds into the rabbit-rearing industry, which is permitted in other parts of the Commonwealth and, as far as I know, in other parts of the world.

Mr. Hawke: There is one member on the opposite side who will not have a bar of the Liberal Party!

Mr. GRAHAM: I am quoting from a pamphlet which has been issued by H. K. Watson, of 85 Tyrell Street, Nedlands. It goes on to state—

To maintain an intelligent, free, and liberal democracy by: Freedom of citizens to choose their own way of living and of life, subject to the rights of others; looking primarily to the encouragement of individual initiative and free enterprise as the dynamic force of development, of progress, and of prosperity.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Oldfield: I used to write stuff like that.

Mr. GRAHAM: What blatant hypocrisy! Here in this industry there are people with initiative and enterprise, who are prepared to invest their capital in the establishment of it; yet this so-called free enterprise Government is introducing legislation, which no other country in the world has done, for the purpose of shooting these enterprising people off at the socks, and making it impossible for them to expand or develop their industry. They are not likely to pour further capital into their enterprise when the date of the death sentence is rapidly approaching. In other words, the industry is to be hanged by the neck until it is dead, on the 30th June, 1966.

Of course, no person or company is likely to consider for one moment venturing forth in this enterprise with such a limited life ahead. I agree with the Minister that it is proper for a Government and a Parliament to act by giving notice, if possible, to persons engaged in certain activities which the law desires to terminate. But there is this important qualification: There must be some justification or reasons for such action.

These people are doing nothing but producing food for the people of Western Australia, and ultimately for export. They are using the primary products of this State for feeding their stock. They are building up an industry which will provide employment for others. Nothing which they have done has contravened the law of Western Australia, and nothing which they are doing, or are likely to do, can interfere with the happiness and progress of Western Australia. There is no suggestion of a threat or menace to other industries, except on the basis of fair competition. It is within the power of the Minister and his department to impose further restrictions than those which these people have voluntarily imposed. So all the safeguards that are necessary are either in existence or can be imposed by the Minister.

Another observation I make is to restate the position that the Opposition is not the least bit concerned with the preservation of the wild rabbit. Indeed, we say that the Agriculture Protection Board and the Department of Agriculture,

instead of harassing people who seek to establish and develop an industry, would be far better employed in devoting their time to the real menace. I am certain the Opposition would go a step further and agree with the Government that if it is desired to impose a ban on the keeping of rabbits as pets, the necessary provision should be passed; because there is the danger of these rabbits escaping and changing hands, and people receiving them will not be as careful as the original owners.

Where rabbit farms are kept the premises occupy only a portion of an acre and the premises are roofed in. Walls surround the premises; and, if need be, security fences beyond the walls can be built. The people engaged in the industry have to be licensed and registered, and they are subject to any controls and restrictions which the Minister may care to impose. What possible danger or threat could there be with all those precautions?

Mr. W. Hegney: How silly can the Minister get?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am certain the Minister is not quite as silly as some of my colleagues have made him out to be. He realises that he has done the wrong thing in introducing this legislation, but he is being difficult and perverse in refusing to amend it. He feels it is a loss of face or dignity if he admits the legislation is based on false premises. Cannot we have a little honesty in this Chamber?

I issued a challenge last night that every single member of Parliament—and particularly the Minister for Agriculture—should take an hour off for the purpose of seeing in actual practice one of these rabbit farms and discovering whether there is any fault to be found. Every member should ask questions and seek information. I do not know how many members—apart from the member for South Perth—went to have a look this morning. No-one else has had the courage to speak. I am prepared to say now that not one of them could have found any fault with any aspect of the undertaking, and particularly that pertaining to security.

If the Minister went out with his senior officers he and they would be of the same opinion; and if the Minister did his job he would have a few terse words to say to the departmental officers who have misled him. The only other conclusion to which I can come is that the Minister and the Government are completely supine to interests outside. The Farmers' Union has said that it wants something; and without rhyme or reason or thought to the effect that implementing such a request would have, this Government will bend itself humbly in obeisance.

Surely Bills which are to become Statutes should be based on something more solid than that, more especially

when, as in this case, they seek to interfere with the rights of the individual. This Bill seeks to destroy an industry that has just begun. Therefore it does the Government and its supporters no credit. It would appear that so far as this industry is concerned, from the passing of this legislation it will come to a screeching halt. Indeed, it is possible that before that it will recede, because there is no incentive, as there are no prospects. Certainly no new establishment will be started. That is what this Government will do.

I suppose we have exhausted about everything it is possible to employ in an endeavour to persuade a Government to do the right and sensible thing instead of slavishly following the Minister in a course for which he is unable to give us one good or substantial reason. An industry, I repeat, is being destroyed, and the Minister and the Government apparently derive some satisfaction from that fact.

Have none of those who adhere to Liberal Party policy any heart or conscience? Have they no feelings for these people who have invested thousands of pounds of their own money—not subsidised by the State, or guaranteed by the Department of Industrial Development—to embark on a perfectly legitimate business, doing no harm to anyone and not likely to do so? Surely on broad principle, Liberal Party members, if they are sincere in their stated and written beliefs, would support the Opposition in this matter. But, as I said last night, there is no need for the Liberal Party to accept a single word said by any member on this side of the House. All its members would have to do would be to make their own inquiries.

It would appear that it serves no purpose to proceed further. I can only hope and trust that when a vote is taken on this matter there will be one or more members of the Liberal Party or the Country Party who will appreciate—as has the member for South Perth—that the Opposition is right in respect of this matter, if in respect of no other.

I feel sorry for the member for South Perth. He is trying to concoct some sort of reason or excuse as to why we should put the shadow over the industry and proclaim the death sentence at this stage. Possibly the only way the situation can be altered is by a change of Government—and then subject to the Legislative Council. The member for South Perth may be hoping that wiser counsel will prevail and that some time before the 30th June, 1966, this offending portion of the Bill will be repealed.

I am afraid that that is the only hope and prospects there are so far as these people and the industry are concerned; because if the Minister, after having all the facts and circumstances pointed out

to him, is not prepared to defer to the weight of argument at this stage, then surely when it is a matter of repealing some of his own legislation for which he fought for so many hours in this House it is unthinkable that he would be prepared then to take a step to reverse his current stubborn attitude.

So, finally, it depends on the honesty of one or more supporters of the Government. The only alternative to that is a change of Government after the next general election; otherwise this industry is damned and finished. This action having been taken on one occasion, who hereafter would be likely to invest money in another venture associated with the breeding of rabbits for commercial purposes?

No doubt members will have deduced that I am opposed to the third reading of this measure.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn) [5.38 p.m.]: Before the third reading of this Bill is passed I am going to protest once more against the attitude of the Government in connection with it. It still contains reference to vermin, and Alsatian dogs were discussed in the first stages; and after the Minister and members of the Government had heard the arguments which proved that the legislation, so far as dogs were concerned, was ill-timed, the Minister eventually intimated to the House that the Alsatian dog would not be banned under this measure. He went further and assured the House that the projected legislation repealing the Alsatian Dog Act would be withdrawn.

Why did the Minister do that? He did so because apparently it was proved to him that there was no need for the legislation concerning the Alsatian dog, which the Agriculture Protection Board had recommended to him should be banned. Now we are discussing this most objectionable and reprehensible provision concerning the breeding of rabbits for commercial purposes.

To my way of thinking there is something sinister and diabolical behind this projected legislation. If there is not, why is it that apart from the member for South Perth, who agrees with members of the Opposition, no member or supporter of the Government has been able to justify the inclusion of this provision in the Bill? The Minister remained in his seat hour after hour while we were discussing this matter, and he gave no valid reason as to why we should pass this legislation. All he was able to say was that representatives of two organisations—the Farmers' Union and the Pastoralists' Association—had recommended that this legislation be introduced.

Apart from that, he has been as silent as the tomb, despite the fact that he has been asked repeatedly to explain the reasons which prompted the representatives of the two organisations to make

the recommendation. Apparently they made the recommendation but advanced no reason for having done so; or, if they did, the Minister has not passed it on and apparently is not likely to.

The longer the debate continued, the more I was convinced that there is something further behind the legislation than has been explained by the Minister, backed by the congenial member for Stirling. All that has been said is that it is necessary to minimise or reduce the rabbit menace in Western Australia. It has been said there are two different types, one in the wild state and the other controlled. With regard to the rabbits in captivity, members know that because of the security devices surrounding the establishment there is no chance of those rabbits escaping and breeding with the wild rabbits.

I do not know whether or not the Minister for Industrial Development is about but I would have liked him to explain his attitude, as Minister for Industrial Development, in connection with this industry. It is one which is in its infancy, and we are entitled to receive some explanation from the Minister for Industrial Development.

When the present Opposition was the Government, I was, as Minister for Labour, deputed to introduce legislation with respect to monopolies and restrictive trade practices. We took that action for the express purpose of trying to protect the small struggling industrialist in Western Australia and to ensure that he would have the requisite guarantee of protection in order that he might carry on his industry, because we knew that certain big firms were able to place restrictions on raw materials and so forth—and probably the member for Bunbury will know something about this—with a view to either swallowing the small industry or squeezing the small man out altogether.

The industry under discussion at the moment is a small one and the one way by which it can be strangled is being adopted under this legislation. Why is this being done? The Minister for Industrial Development is charged with the responsibility of doing everything he possibly can to expand industry, on behalf of the people of Western Australia. That is his expressed purpose—one of his main functions as Minister for Industrial Development. It has not been demonstrated that this industry, although in its infancy, is in any way a menace to primary production in Western Australia. On the contrary it has been shown to have a great potential, although there are only a few engaged in it today.

It has been said that a lot of the waste products of primary industry is used by those who breed rabbits for commercial purposes. No doubt if the industry were given an opportunity to expand, more of these waste products could be utilised in

this way. Why is it not being given an opportunity to expand? Why will the death knell be sounded on the 30th June, 1966? The Minister for Industrial Development has been dumb on this subject.

I am satisfied that there is something—I cannot use the word “crook” because it would be unparliamentary—sinister and more deep-seated than the ill-founded statement already made by the Minister for Agriculture. Apparently the Minister for Industrial Development is not interested because big business is not behind the project at present.

MR. BRADY (Swan) [5.45 p.m.]: I spoke on this Bill last night and early this morning and I am going to take this opportunity of speaking again. I think the Opposition's attitude towards this matter is one of the finest contributions to democracy that this State has seen.

We have the House debating an industry which is in its embryo stage, and before it is properly developed we have a Liberal-Country Party Government which has decided to crucify it. It is being crucified for the sake of vested interests: it could be the fat lamb industry, or the mutton industry, or the beef industry; I do not know. But other industries will be in jeopardy if this type of legislation is allowed to go through. The members in this House interested in the poultry industry had better look to their laurels because they could be in jeopardy also. The crayfishing, too, could be affected; and so one could go on.

Last night I referred to the fact that unemployment has been rife in this State for a number of years. Here we have an industry which could create employment for hundreds of men and women, but for some reason or other the Government does not want to see this particular avenue of employment opened up. What is the explanation? It is not the argument which the Government used here, that one or two of the rabbits might get away and start to breed, because I think it has been proved beyond doubt during this debate that this type of rabbit does not cross-breed and it could not live out of the buildings where it is being bred at the moment. It has been inbred for so long under warm conditions that it could not survive for very long once it left the hutch.

So there seems to be some reason other than the allegation that these rabbits could be a menace to the various primary industries. That does not go down with me. I think the truth is that vested interests have decided this industry must go. I am not able to say which particular vested interest, but apparently the people who run this business are not affiliated with the Country Party or the Liberal Party or they would not be getting this treatment.

I feel proud to be able to stand up in this House and try to do something to help industry. I would have thought that the first person to help in a case like this

would be the Minister for Industrial Development. If people from England had wanted to start this industry the Government would have fallen over itself to provide land free of cost and help them with their financial arrangements and other activities through the various Government departments. But because local people have seen fit to get this industry under way it has been sniped at from the start. Not only has the immediate difficulty which is being faced by these people to be borne in mind; but also there is the fact that rabbits could be supplied to consumers cheaper than other meat. There are many people who cannot afford to buy meat at present-day prices and many housewives cannot afford to buy adequate meat on the wages being paid.

The world is hungry for meat. In New Guinea there are people who would walk over broken glass for miles to get a few pounds of rabbit meat, and people in America would buy it at the price at which local producers could offer it for sale. However, the Minister for Industrial Development is doing nothing about it. The State is going to face great difficulty with the entry of England into the European Common Market. Our primary producers will be scrambling in all directions to get new markets for their products and to engage in other forms of production; and this industry could be one of the main diversions.

A secondary industry could be built up, too. We know that overseas people are buying pelts and using them for the manufacture of women's clothing. They are being dyed in various hues and used extensively. In the last year or two over 10,000,000 pelts have been exported from Australia to the hat industry in England, and to Europe and America. Yet this Government is letting all that go overboard for the sake of somebody whose identity it is not prepared to disclose to this House. Nobody has approached me personally; this industry is not established in my electorate. But I am mindful that unemployment is worse in this State than it should be having regard for the industrial development, and primary and secondary industries that could be set up here.

What encouragement is there to the people coming from overseas when they read in the Press that this type of industry is being stymied? In every other home in the Old Country rabbits are being bred, and we know that in this State people have been breeding them for food supplies for many years. Last year, one or two people from my electorate asked me to see that their particular activity—breeding rabbits—was not abolished. It does not seem a right and proper thing to do without a proper inquiry.

I was pleased to know that some members of the Government had been out to see the rabbit-breeding farm at Beechboro for themselves. Those members would have seen that this industry has a great

potential. There is no smell arising from the hutch; there are no flies; and the industry is protected against other vermin, too. There is no semblance of justice if these people are to be thrown overboard. There are only two of these concerns of any commercial size. I understand one is at Beechboro and another is at Lesmurdie.

Mr. Toms: North Bayswater is the locality, not Beechboro.

Mr. BRADY: I stand corrected by the member for Bayswater. Last year a resident of my electorate told me he had been engaged by the Lesmurdie people to assist them in building up production. He had obtained a license from the Department of Agriculture to breed these particular rabbits. I think he was a returned serviceman, but I would not be too sure. In any case, he had a family to keep and he was looking to the future with considerable confidence.

I feel that the Government cannot justify its action in any way, and I want to join with the other members and protest loud and long against the action by the Government to squeeze out these people, who apparently have no political application and have no big financial interests to back them. They are being thrown overboard and nobody can justify this action by the Government. I hope that even at this late stage the Government might see its way clear to drop this Bill just as it is doing with the Alsation Dog Act Repeal Bill and forget this measure as many others have been forgotten, from time to time, after being introduced and found to be undesirable. I oppose the third reading.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) (5.54 p.m.): This is supposed to be a deliberative Assembly, and therefore, a place in which every proposition which is put forward has to be supported with justifiable arguments in its favour. Where there are justifiable arguments against the same proposition then it is the duty of some members to put forward those arguments. After the arguments for and against have been voiced it is supposed to be the duty—and I hope it is still the duty—of members to make their decision accordingly, and more especially on subjects which are not included in the political platforms of any of the parties concerned.

I have been waiting for the Minister concerned to supply the reasons which he has in his possession—if he has them—in support of the proposal which has been so strongly objected to by members on this side of the House who have already spoken. It is not sufficient for the Minister, or anyone else, to say this proposition has been requested by such and such an organisation. That is not a reason in support of the proposition; no reason at all. Any number of organisations could request a Government to do this or that or the other thing, but the fact of the request only

does not contain any argument for any such proposition. It does not supply any reason why a Government or Parliament should support it. Therefore there is, beyond any shadow of doubt, a strong responsibility upon the Minister to give us the reasons why this proposition should be supported; why it should be put into the law by Parliament; why it should be binding on the due date upon the people concerned.

I am most anxious to hear the reasons; and if they are good enough and strong enough and acceptable, then I would be favourable to considering them. But I am not going to vote for the proposition when the only argument put forward in its favour is that someone has requested it.

Mr. Wild: Does the Leader of the Opposition believe we should support something that has cost Australian farmers millions of pounds in attempting to eradicate it?

Mr. HAWKE: No; I do not. I think we should do everything to help them.

Mr. Wild: That is what we are doing.

Mr. HAWKE: No; it is not. That is not what you are doing at all. The proposition to which objection has been taken by members on this side of the House is a proposition which will serve notice—if this proposition becomes law—on those engaged in the safe breeding of particular types of rabbits or hares or animals for commercial purposes only. Therefore, it is not related in any shape or form to the suggestion made a moment ago by the Minister for Works; not related to that matter in any way whatsoever.

I thought the member for Balcatta made an extremely strong point when he said the Minister and his appropriate officers, instead of using up time and effort and money trying to serve the death notice on these people engaged in the safe breeding of rabbits for commercial purposes, would do much better using their time and effort and money in further stamping out the very menace to which the Minister for Works referred when he interjected.

Now I am not very often impressed by what the member for South Perth says. However, he, with some of his colleagues this morning went out and saw one of these breeding places; one of the places where rabbits are being bred for commercial purposes. The member for South Perth told us this afternoon there is no danger, no risk, and no menace whatever in the operations which are carried on in the establishment which he and the others saw with their own eyes.

If that be the situation—and all members who have inspected this establishment say the same thing—surely it is not only unnecessary but also extremely unjust for Parliament to serve a death sentence upon this industry. The honourable

member qualified what he had to say by claiming that if no danger, no menace, no threat, or no difficulty developed during the next three or four years Parliament could, between now and then, approve a Bill to repeal the offensive provision which is now in this measure.

Is that a fair proposition? The people concerned in operating these rabbit-breeding establishments have put their money into them; they have put their time and effort into them; and they have had to accumulate knowledge as to how best to operate their small industries. I ask members on the other side to put themselves in the position in which these people will find themselves if the provision objected to in this Bill becomes law. Would any member on the Government side, who was in the same position as these people, go ahead with any confidence? Would he go ahead with a feeling that he had a good future; that he had economic security? Would he try further to develop his industry and increase his production and create more wealth within the State?

Of course he would not! He would feel this was the beginning of the end. I am not sure whether the member for South Perth still operates an establishment out the Armadale road way where birds are bred and sold. I know he did at one time, so let us apply this situation to that sort of thing. Let us say Parliament approved a proposition in a Bill to serve notice upon the breeders of birds that on the 30th June, 1966, those establishments would have completely to close down.

In that situation would the member for South Perth, or anyone else similarly involved, feel confident about the future? Would they try further to develop their industry? Of course not! Some of them would try to dispose of their establishments at current valuation to someone who did not know about the fact that a death sentence had been pronounced. That is what some of them would do, but not all of them would do it. I do not think the member for South Perth would do it. I am sure he would warn anybody who approached him to buy his concern of what was in the wind.

I believe this proposition is most unnecessary, most unfair, most unjust, and cruel indeed in the effect it will have upon people engaged in this industry. If the Minister for Agriculture is in a position to advance reasons to show the commercial breeding of these rabbits under safe conditions, and their subsequent sale in the form of food to the people is dangerous, and he can do that, and does do it, then I am thoroughly prepared to have a new look at the situation and to make up my mind accordingly.

I am quite prepared to admit that any person not a member of this Chamber, who was looking down upon us from the gallery and listening to the arguments for

and against various propositions, and seeing the divisions which take place, would frequently gain the idea, and it would be well gained in most instances, that this was not a deliberative Chamber at all; that everything was signed, sealed, and delivered, in regard to measures coming here, before they arrived.

I can understand that being the rule of the road in regard to matters which develop from political platforms, and from election policy speeches, but I cannot for the life of me see why it should be the rule of the road in regard to propositions of the kind to which some members have objected during this debate. I think this is one of the instances where members of both sides of the House can take a reasonable view of both sides of the situation, can make a decision on the information and the facts put before us, and therefore we can, on this occasion, rise to reasonable heights in relation to being in fact as well as in name a deliberative Chamber, a body of men who have the capacity and the willingness fairly to deliberate upon arguments for and against, which have been put forward by those who have sponsored this proposition and, on the other hand, by those who are opposed to it.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [6.8 p.m.]: What I cannot understand from this debate, and from the action of the Minister in bringing forward the obnoxious clause in this Bill, is that he has applied it directly to only one being, namely, the rabbit. There are many obnoxious creatures around the metropolitan area to which the Minister might have given some thought and which could have been specified. For instance, the breeding of rabbits for commercial purposes—these animals have been called by so many different names during the debate that I find it difficult to know just how to refer to them—is almost on a parallel with the breeding of table pigeons, because pigeons bred for table purposes would most certainly cross with ordinary pigeons, and pigeons are vermin and a distinct menace in any city.

Even this Chamber was affected on one occasion. Because pigeons got into the roof the Chamber had to be deloused as lice were falling on to the *Votes and Proceedings*. That indicates that if any vermin were to be considered it should have been pigeons, and the breeding of pigeons for table purposes. There is no doubt that pigeons could be a danger to the health of the community, but the Minister has not given us any information which would indicate that rabbits which are bred for commercial purposes are detrimental to the health of the community.

I think these rabbits could be a great asset to the State. They are a means of providing soft white meat for invalids as

compared with the rather coarse meat of the bush rabbits. Therefore I believe there is sufficient justification for allowing some tolerance in the breeding of rabbits for food, and these breeding establishments should be permitted to continue to operate because they are a means of providing a certain type of invalid food.

It would have been far better if the Minister had amended the Act to allow the board to proclaim anything as vermin that it considered to be a menace instead of specifying one particular item. That is my main objection to the provision.

I think on this occasion it would be wrong for me to record a silent vote on the third reading after having heard the long debate which has taken place on this measure. Even at this late stage I ask the Minister to reconsider the clause in question and to have it removed from the Bill.

If just plain vermin are referred to, the board will be able to proclaim rabbits, cats, dogs, or anything else as vermin if it considers they are a menace. The departmental officers concerned can take the requisite action if they deem it necessary and desirable so to do. Surely that is the better way to do it rather than to prescribe one particular animal which, in this instance, is being used for commercial purposes. For the reasons I have given I oppose the third reading.

Question put.

Mr. Hawke: What a scandal!

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): The Noes have it.

Mr. Hawke: A Minister with no reply!

Division called for.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I gave my decision in favour of the Noes. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Beeloo will vote with the Ayes.

Mr. Hawke: I did not call "divide".

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): You did. I gave the call to the Noes; and you and the member for Beeloo called "Divide".

Mr. Hawke: I did?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Yes, you did.

Mr. Hawke: I did not.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): The member for Beeloo has indicated that he did, and I am almost certain the Leader of the Opposition did, too.

Mr. Hawke: I did not call "Divide".

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Very well. The member for Beeloo will have to vote with the Ayes.

Mr. Oldfield: Rabbits Jamieson!

Bells rung.

Remarks during Division

Mr. TONKIN: Mr. Speaker, I desire to know under what Standing Order the Speaker can direct the vote of any member who asks for a division.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I do not know which Standing Order it is, but the honourable member challenged my ruling and so, obviously, he must vote against it.

Mr. Graham: I do not think you can do it, Mr. Speaker.

Division Resumed

Division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—24

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Brand	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Cornell	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Craig	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Grayden	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Hart	Mr. Wild
Dr. Henn	Mr. Williams
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. O'Neill

(Teller)

Noes—21

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. W. Hegney
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Curran	Mr. Moir
Mr. Davies	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Evans	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Graham	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hall	Mr. Toms
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Heal	Mr. H. May
Mr. J. Hegney	

(Teller)

Ayes Pairs Noes

Mr. Burt	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Norton

Majority for—3.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

Sitting suspended from 6.18 to 7.30 p.m.

NATIONAL TRUST OF AUSTRALIA (W.A.) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 11th October on the following motion by Mr. Brand (Premier):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [7.30 p.m.]: As explained by the Premier when introducing this Bill, it seeks to establish, on a statutory basis, a national trust. The purposes for which it is proposed to establish the trust are set out mainly in the schedule attached to the Bill; and most, if not all, of the items in the schedule were read to us by the Premier when he explained the measure.

There are some provisions which appear to me to be very strange indeed. I will refer specifically to those matters later.

At the present time, as you would know, Mr. Speaker, there is in existence an association, the registered name of which is The National Trust of Australia (W.A.). This association has been incorporated under the appropriate law, the incorporation having taken place on the 11th September, 1959. The statutory authority to be set up is to be known as The National Trust of Australia (W.A.).

Initially this trust is to consist of those members who were members of the association immediately before this proposed law is to come into operation. Subsequently, those admitted to be members of the trust will be admitted under the rules of the trust as set down in accordance with this proposed new law. There is to be what the Bill describes as a governing council which will, of course, be the ruling authority in the main in relation to the activities of the statutory national trust.

It is proposed in the Bill that the first managing council, or the first council of the trust, is to consist of the persons who, immediately before the coming into operation of the Act, held office as members of the council of The National Trust of Australia (W.A.) which, as I mentioned, was incorporated under the relevant Act as an association on the 11th September, 1959.

The members of the first council are to hold office subject, of course, to the provisions of the proposed new law until the managing council is duly constituted in the manner set out in the proposed new law; or until the expiration of one year from the coming into operation of the new law, whichever day happens to be the earlier. The council to be set up subsequent to the first council is to consist of 16 councillors to be elected from the association to which I referred, plus nine other councillors who are to be appointed from nine separate organisations—and I will make more detailed reference to that a little later on.

However, I stress the point at this stage that of the total of 25 members to be appointed to the council after the first preliminary council, 16 are to be elected from amongst the members of the existing association, and one each from nine other authorities.

I think members will see immediately that the existing association is to be given amazing preferment first of all in relation to the initial council, and to the permanent council which will be set up afterwards. Of the 16 councillors to be elected from amongst the members of the existing association, or the existing National Trust of Australia (W.A.), as it is called, the president, two vice-presidents, the secretary, and the treasurer are to be chosen. I think it will be clear to members that not only is the existing association to be given the legal right to appoint 16 of the 25 members of the council, but

of the 16 to be appointed by the existing association, all of the main executive officers are to be chosen.

This seems to me to give the existing association amazing preference over and above all the other organisations which will be directly concerned, each one of which will, as I mentioned earlier, be given the right to nominate only one member to the council. I see no justification whatever for the great preference being shown to the members of the existing association; and I am quite at a loss to explain why one organisation of a number should be given all this majority representation on the council; and in addition from among the majority representation which it will be able to appoint, will come all of the main executive officers of the council.

One is inclined to wonder why any of the other organisations are being called in at all. Of the nine councillors—apart from the 16 to whom I have made reference—one is to be appointed on the nomination of the Premier; and presumably in a broad way is to represent the State—or maybe in a smaller way to represent the Government; another is to be appointed on the nomination of the University of Western Australia; a third is to be appointed on the nomination of The Western Australian Historical Society; another is to be appointed on the nomination of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects (Western Australian Chapter); the next is to be appointed on the nomination of The Royal Society of Western Australia; and yet another on the nomination of The Country Women's Association of Western Australia; the next will be appointed on the nomination of The Tree Society. A further member is to be appointed on the nomination of the bodies known as the Local Government Association of Western Australia and the Country Shire Councils' Association of W.A. Thus the local governing associations are to have only one person on the council between them. Finally, one is to be appointed on the nomination of The Western Australian Tourist Development Authority.

I would not claim to be very fully informed on the activities of all of the organisations involved. However, judging from what I have read of the activities of the association—or of The National Trust of Australia (W.A.)—as it is now called—and of The Western Australian Historical Society, I would think that the Historical Society has been far the more active of the two organisations, in regard to attempts to preserve within the State those buildings, and other things, which people in that type of organisation consider to be of great value, and worth perpetuating as memorials, either in honour of great citizens of the past, or as part of the development of the history of Western Australia as a

State within the Commonwealth of Australia; and, even prior to Federation, as a British colony.

Every citizen in the State is not keenly interested in the objectives which the proposed statutory trust will have to sponsor and achieve to the greatest possible extent. For instance, there might be a very old historical building somewhere—not occupied, not used and in some state of disrepair—and some people would see in that building only ruins, while other people would see in it a very important chapter of history in the development and progress of Western Australia.

As I have said, from what I have read of the activities of the association in past years as compared with what I have read of the Historical Society, I would say the Historical Society has been far more active in trying to achieve the objectives, or some of the objectives set down in the schedule of this Bill; and this, of course, leads me to inquire why the association should be given such remarkable preferential treatment; why the association should be given the legal right to elect 16 members to the governing council, including all of the main administrative officers, whereas the Historical Society is given only one representative—one representative against 16.

It might be the society has had a much better publicity officer than the association. It could be the work and endeavours of the society have been much more publicised than the work and the endeavours of the association, although it is not easy to try to find an explanation as to why that situation should have existed. I would think the association would have been as anxious to have its efforts and its achievements, if any, publicised to at least an extent similar to the publicity which has undoubtedly been used by the Historical Society.

The other organisations which are to be given the right to appoint nominees to the council are, of course, well known, but not as directly concerned by any means in promoting the essential purposes of the trust as the association and the society would be. Therefore it seems to me there should have been a much more even-handed treatment of the two main organisations in regard to the numbers which each organisation could nominate or elect to the governing council.

I would have thought, without having any of the knowledge necessary to make a final decision, that the Historical Society should be entitled to at least as many representatives on the governing council as the association. Had the society been given eight representatives on the council and the association eight representatives, I would have thought that would be a fair allocation of major representation for the two organisations which have a direct interest in this sort of work and which, through the years, have done some practical work in this field.

From what I have read I would think the Historical Society has been in existence much longer than the association. I have been given to understand the society has many more members than the association: it has done more work of a practical kind; and it has developed or obtained more funds from the public than the association has done. So I would ask members to give very serious consideration to what I have said along these lines.

It may be there is an explanation to justify the basis of representation set down in this Bill. If there is such an explanation and such a reason, I trust the Premier will not bury his head in the sand and refuse to tell us in the same unfortunate manner as the Minister for Agriculture did earlier today in connection with the Bill to amend the Vermin Act.

The other provisions in the Bill set down a number of procedures which it will be necessary for the trust and the governing council to follow. The funds of the trust may come from a number of sources. It is my guess most of the funds in the early stages will come from the Treasurer; but it is to be hoped the trust, when finally set up, not on the basis proposed in this Bill, but on some amended basis, will be able to appeal to the public in such a way as to obtain from those members of the public who are sympathetically inclined to this kind of work reasonable sums of money so that the State Treasury will not be too heavily burdened in providing the amount of money which this organisation will require from year to year.

I would think the present Treasurer has had sufficient experience by now in the Treasury to know it is quite easy to set up new organisations. In the initial stages the Treasurer receives all kinds of assurances to the effect that not much money will be required to launch these organisations and that when they are launched there will be such a response from supporting members of the public that no heavy burden is likely to be upon the Treasury for a number of years. However, practical experience often proves otherwise, because these organisations have a habit of growing; they have a habit of developing quite costly administration systems; and it is very difficult indeed for a Treasurer, once he becomes committed to supply funds to such an organisation, to refuse the requests which repeatedly come in.

That would apply more especially, I should think, to an organisation which is set up by Parliament on a statutory basis, because clothing an organisation with statutory powers—setting it up on a statutory basis and giving it an Act of Parliament of its own—implies the organisation has the approval of Parliament and there is at least an indirect indication there is a big financial responsibility upon the Government to ensure that the organisation not only operates, but operates without hindrance and without restriction.

The argument usually put up in that regard is that the organisation could do a great deal more if the Government would provide it with more funds; or, in reverse, that the organisation is not able to do anywhere near what it would be capable of doing because the Government is only making so many thousands of pounds available to it to help finance its operations. However, these considerations belong much more to the future than they do to a debate upon this measure at this stage.

My main concern is undoubtedly with the proposed composition of the trust. I cannot for the life of me understand why the association should be given such overwhelming representation—why it should be given monopoly control, as it were, of the chief administrative officers; and very convincing explanations will have to be put forward by the Premier if my support is to be obtained for the relevant portions of the Bill as they apply to that situation.

I think the two main organisations should have, as I said previously, equal or fairly equal representation, and that once all the members are nominated to the council—the whole 25 of them—those 25 members of the council should, in the normal democratic way, have an equal voice in selecting the president; the two vice presidents; the secretary; and the treasurer.

I think it is not only unfair and undemocratic, but also unwise to give one existing association a sort of pre-emptive right by law to pick all the main administrative officers in the proposed new statutory organisation. I am not able to see any justification whatever for that. Nor am I, as I said two or three times previously, able to see why the association should be given 16 members out of a total of 25 on the council, with the Historical Society being given only one out of 25. The proportion of 16 to 1 as between the two organisations is altogether out of balance in my understanding of the situation.

However, as I said earlier, I am not exceptionally well informed regarding the activities in the past of either the association or the society.

Therefore, I am very hopeful members on both sides of the House who are better informed will give other members the benefit of their knowledge, because it is necessary we should set up this proposed statutory organisation on the fairest, the best, and most workable basis possible so the representatives of all the organisations concerned will be able to work co-operatively together, instead of having, as we could have under this basis of representation, a feeling of envy, or jealousy, or ill-will, or something of the kind as between one group of representatives and another group.

I know it could be said the objectives for which the trust is being set up should be paramount all the time in the minds of the members of the trust, and that would wipe out any possibility of envy, or friction, or disunity. However, after all is said and done, the men and women who will be appointed to this trust will be human beings the same as we are in this Parliament, and they will be subject to the same feelings and to the same urges as we are here. The duties we have to perform and the objectives we all seek to achieve are tremendously more important than the purposes to which this trust will have to give attention and the duties which the members of the trust will have to carry out.

So it is essential, in my view, that the trust should be set up on the fairest, broadest, and most democratic basis possible, with representations being given to each organisation concerned according to its merits and especially according to its practical performance in the past.

MR. GUTHRIE (Subiaco) [8.2 p.m.] : In view of what the Leader of the Opposition has said—and I think he is entitled to the information for which he has asked—I would point out that I had something to do with the formation of this trust. I think, perhaps, I should tell the House of the beginnings of it. The Historical Society has existed for something like 38 years. I would not be sure about that, but it began some time back in the 1920's. It is quite true that the National Trust has existed only since 1959. But the Historical Society always had the objective of setting up a national trust. It realised that had to be some day.

A National Trust was set up in England in 1897 and the purpose for which the trust was set up in England, and has been set up in the other States of the Commonwealth, was to have a statutory body which would hold the title to the various properties which are to be retained for posterity; and they wished to have the legal power and authority to control those properties. The various bodies that are interested in this particular field will have their say in the management of it, and it is reasonable to say that a very large number of the private members of the National Trust are also members of the Historical Society.

It is a fact that at the present time a large number of the councillors of the National Trust are also members of the committee of management of the Historical Society; and the Historical Society played a very large part, as I will detail in a moment, in the formation of the trust.

Before the trust was formed, I had no connection with the Historical Society and no connection with its work. I was merely invited to take a part in the formation of the trust, purely because it was considered I could be of some assistance in

connection with the necessary legal work that was involved in the establishment of such a body; and I accepted the invitation on that basis. When that task was completed, and the trust was launched, I resigned from the council. I was acting in an honorary capacity; and that was the end of the undertaking I had given.

I had not taken any great interest, as others had done, in the work of the Historical Society and the preservation of these buildings. To keep the record straight, I think I should, perhaps tell the House about the beginnings of the National Trust. I am told that for a number of years the Historical Society had intended to do something about the formation of a national trust; and I have also been told that about January, 1958, a committee—who was on that committee I know not—was formed in this city with the object of doing something to form such a trust; but nothing came of its deliberations.

In consequence, in late March or early April in 1959 The Hon. Leslie Craig, who is well-known to members of this Parliament, was asked whether he would take the lead in endeavouring to get a national trust floated. He conferred with another former member of this Parliament—also well-known to members—in Sir Ross McDonald; and Sir Ross McDonald and The Hon. Leslie Craig convened a meeting which was held at 8 o'clock on the 10th April, 1959. Persons present at that meeting were: Mr. Craig himself; Sir Ross McDonald; Mr. Noel Goss, who was a visitor to this State and who was at that time the honorary secretary of the National Trust of Australia (Victoria); Miss Margaret Feilman, the town planner; Mr. Ian Medcalf; Mr. Vincent Serventy; Mr. F. A. Sharr, the State Librarian; Mr. A. C. Staples, who was at that time President of the Historical Society; and myself. There was an apology from the President of the Royal Institute of Architects and from the President of the Country Women's Association.

As a result of the discussions which took place that evening it was decided to form a committee to investigate the possibility of the formation of a trust; and that committee consisted of Miss Feilman, Mr. Medcalf, Mr. Sharr, Mr. Staples, Mr. Serventy, and myself. We held a number of meetings and we got together a number of people who were interested and who became members, with the result that on the 9th June, 1959, it was decided that a move should be made to incorporate the body; and on the 31st July, 1959, the necessary advertisement was inserted in the *The West Australian* for the incorporation of that body which, as the Bill before the House disclosed, was completed on the 11th September, 1959.

A public meeting was then held in the rooms of the Victoria League in Colin Street, West Perth, on the 28th September, 1959, at which, I think, there were 70 or

80 interested people present. It would be safe to say that nearly 50 per cent. of those people would have been members of the Historical Society. It was then resolved that the trust which had been incorporated should be given legal effect to. They then proceeded to elect their council, and Sir Ross McLarty was elected foundation president by the National Trust. I think I am correct in saying that Sir Ross McLarty was a member of the Historical Society for very many years.

Subsequently, the council which was elected that night elected Mr. Justice Jackson as the foundation chairman of the council, and Mr. Justice Jackson still holds that position. Sir Ross McLarty was compelled—I think last year—to stand down from the presidency, and I think I am correct in saying Mr. Ernest Lee Steere is the present president of the trust.

Following the election of a council at that meeting in September, 1959, the trust started to operate. It gathered together members who had paid their subscriptions, and it began to go about its business. At a meeting of the council held on the 10th February, 1960, Mr. Medcalf and I were asked to examine the various Statutes which were on the statute book, and which might be of some interest to the trust; and, at the same time, to consider the statutory provisions existing in other parts of the British Commonwealth.

We studied the legislation which has been in existence in the United Kingdom since 1907, the legislation which is in existence in South Australia, and the legislation which is in existence in New South Wales. We pointed out, as a matter of interest, that we felt, at that early stage of the trust's existence, it would be premature for the trust to approach the Government with the object of introducing legislation in the form of a Bill such as that which is at present before the House. But we did recommend to the council that an approach should be made to the Government in relation to some relief for the trust from liability for rates and taxes, stamp duty on transfer of properties, and for Federal and State probate duties. I would interpolate at this point that the Federal Parliament has already legislated to exempt the National Trust—or, rather, has legislated to allow the trust certain deductions under the Income Tax Act. That was done by specifically referring to the body by name, similar to all other trusts throughout Australia—similar National Trusts throughout Australia. There was no question that under the Federal Gift Duty Act there would be any liability for gift duty, because any gift to a non-profit-making corporate body is exempt from duty under that Act.

In any event—consequent upon the recommendations of Mr. Medcalf and myself—Sir Ross McLarty, as president of the council, and Mr. Medcalf and I were asked

to wait upon the Premier and to discuss with him informally the limited matters which we had recommended to the trust—namely, the exemption from liability for rates and taxes. The Premier indicated to us at that interview that he would consider favourably a proposal to introduce legislation along the lines of that in New South Wales and South Australia; and, in consequence, we reported back to the council. Owing to the various difficulties with regard to other business, this matter was not dealt with until the 22nd February, 1961, when the council of the National Trust asked Mr. Medcalf and me to give further consideration to the proposals which should be submitted regarding the suggested legislation.

Subsequently Mr. Medcalf intimated to me that he could not, owing to his other commitments, carry on with this work; and the council appointed Mr. I. T. Birt-whistle, who was then—and, I understand, still is—the president of the Historical Society, to prepare the necessary report. The report was accepted by the council; and I might add that the president of the Historical Society was in full accord with the proposals which were submitted to the Premier.

Subsequently, the Premier, in October last year, received a deputation and agreed to introduce legislation. I must confess that at that stage the annual general meeting came around and my own active connection with the council of the trust ended; and I am not fully acquainted with what transpired afterwards. But I would say, in fairness to the trust, that the recommendation in the report which we originally produced was to give a greater number of organisations representation than appears to be the case at present.

On the question of what appears to be the unbalance, I would emphasise that it is not actually the National Trust. The members of the council of the National Trust are, in the main—in fact, they very largely are—members of the Historical Society as well as being members of the National Trust. The conception as I saw it at the time I left the National Trust was that the Government should not be asked for any great amount of financial assistance at any time—the trust should be a body that should stand on its own feet.

The experience in England is that the properties taken over by the trust are, in fact, bequeathed to it, and it has the responsibility of managing them; and that has been the case to a limited extent in the Eastern States.

At the time I was on the council of the trust we had the proposal before us of taking over Strawberry Farm at Albany—Sir Richard Spencer's farm; the first in the State—so that it could be maintained in perpetuity; and that, I emphasise, is the purpose of the trust—to keep all these properties in perpetuity.

It is of some interest to see what the provisions are in the South Australian Act regarding this balance of the trust. That Act provides that the trust shall consist of a president and 24 members; and it is provided that the president and 12 members shall be elected by the members of the society. Then there are 12 nominated bodies, just as there are under the Western Australian constitution, who can nominate one member each; and I will read them to the House for the benefit of members. The bodies which, in South Australia, may nominate a member are—

The Council of the Royal Society of South Australia.

The Council of the Royal Geographical Society of Australasia (S.A. Branch) Inc.

The Council of the University of Adelaide.

The Committee of the Institute of Architects in South Australia.

The Committee of the Youth Hostels Association in South Australia.

The Committee of the Adelaide Bushwalkers.

The Committee of the Country Women's Association.

The Board of the South Australian Museum.

The Board of Governors of the National Gallery of South Australia.

The Trades and Labour Council in South Australia.

The Council of the Pioneers Association of South Australia.

The Council of the Royal Zoological Society.

I think the Pioneers Association of South Australia is equivalent to our Historical Society. Members will notice that in New South Wales there is a president and 24 members, and 13 out of the total—

Mr. J. Hegney: In South Australia.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, in South Australia. Thirteen out of the total are elected from the members of the council, and the remainder are nominated.

In New South Wales there is a total of 15 councillors who are elected annually by the members of the trust, and there are 10 councillors who are nominated; and it is provided that—

One shall be appointed by the Cumberland County Council.

One shall be appointed by the Fauna Protection Panel constituted under the Fauna Protection Act.

One shall be appointed by the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, New South Wales Chapter.

One shall be appointed jointly by the governing bodies of the Local Government Association of New South Wales and the Shires Association of New South Wales.

One shall be appointed by The Trustees of the Public Library of New South Wales, constituted under the Public Library Act, 1899.

One shall be appointed by the Trustees of the Australian Museum.

One shall be appointed by the University of Sydney.

One shall be appointed by the University of New South Wales.

One shall be appointed by the University of New England.

One shall be appointed by the Country Women's Association of New South Wales.

In addition there are two Government representatives, one representing the Director-General of Education, and one representing the Under-Secretary of the Department of Local Government, which gives two *ex officio* members of the council.

That is the situation in New South Wales and South Australia. It is not possible to read to the House the provisions of the English Act because it is a private Act of Parliament, and the English authorities do not include in the printed Statutes the private Acts of Parliament, only the public Acts. However, I have read the account which appears in *Halsbury's Laws of England* and, speaking from memory, I think that in England there is a council of 50 members, of whom 25 are appointed and 25 are elected.

I once again want to emphasise that it is hoped that the public will provide gifts, subscriptions, and what-have-you necessary to finance the scheme, and that there will be a minimum call on the Government; because all that is really being sought in this legislation are the necessary statutory powers to manage and control the historical buildings which will be handed over to the trust, we hope, over the years. These buildings will be maintained by the trust.

It is also recognised that such buildings can be revenue-producers in themselves, because people will pay money in order to visit or view most places of historical interest; and it is hoped that they will, themselves, at least be self-supporting. Whether that will be borne out, only time will tell, but it is necessary to make a start.

The National Trust in England, I understand, controls millions of pounds worth of property, to the extent now that it is getting choosy in what it will accept. Many of the old castles are controlled by the trust and are self-supporting financially.

I commend the Bill to the House, and I do suggest that there should be no fear that the Historical Society will not continue its functions; and its members will continue, I am sure, to be members of the National Trust. I have no doubt that with five or six committee members of the Historical Society being elected members, in addition to the nominated members, the National Trust will continue its work in harmony

with the society. It is only to be expected that it will, because the person interested in these matters, and sufficiently interested to join the Historical Society, is also likely to be the same person who is interested in paying a subscription to the National Trust; and I do feel that as time goes on the fears which the Leader of the Opposition has expressed will not eventuate.

I also point out that by incorporating this body as a statutory body under an Act of Parliament, and requiring it to submit its accounts to Parliament and have them audited by the Auditor-General, it will come under the constant review of Parliament so that if mistakes are made in the early days they can easily be corrected in the years to come.

It might be of some interest to know why the name the National Trust of Australia (W.A.) was chosen, and not the National Trust of Western Australia. The simple reason is that already the other States have adopted the practice of calling the trust the National Trust of Australia with the particular State in brackets; and it was felt that rather than break away from what had become the established practice in Australia, similar practice should be adopted here. Therefore, that name was accepted.

MR. ROWBERRY (Warren) [8.23 p.m.]: I would like to advance a few thoughts and sentiments on this Bill, which sets out to give statutory authority to the National Trust of Australia (W.A.); and I would like to advance the opinion that at first sight this Bill does not cause members to become air-borne or to work up any fanatical enthusiasm about it. I do think, however, that it is an important measure in the history of Western Australia, and I would go further and commend the Government for bringing it before the House. In the surge of present-day progress and the great leap forward industrially which we have been promised—I do not say that in any sarcastic way—it is necessary to see that we preserve our ancient landmarks.

Mr. Oldfield: Some people would have us keep the barracks—

Mr. ROWBERRY: I will deal with that. It may be said: In England ruins, wrecks, castles, and such-like do not engender any enthusiasm in the ordinary person in the street. Why worry about the past? It is the future we are concerned with.

I point out that countries and civilisations which have not concerned themselves with the past have not lasted very long in the scheme of things; and it is necessary, I think, to take such action as we may think wise to preserve such buildings and institutions and to do such things as the Bill envisages in order to preserve our ancient buildings and national beauties for the future.

The Bill mentions that in Scotland the National Trust was formed in 1950. But long before then the people in the Old Country had a proper appreciation of the value of historical buildings, otherwise those buildings would have become ruins and would have been heard of no more.

Fortunately, however, we have in the community certain people who are just as interested in beauty as they are in utility, and they consider money should be spent in beautification as it is just as necessary to provide beautiful things as it is to preserve things of purely utilitarian value.

I have in mind a vision of Princes Street, Edinburgh, where probably millions of pounds have been spent for no other purpose than to create beauty in the eye of the beholder.

Mr. Bickerton: Where is Edinburgh?

Mr. ROWBERRY: I am talking about the capital of Scotland. Just to polish up the history and geography of some members, Scotland is a small country situated to the north of England, and it primarily dominated England, and subsequently it has been making an effort to dominate the whole world. Excuse me for going off at a tangent Mr. Speaker—

Mr. W. Hegney: Tell them about Killiecrankie.

Mr. ROWBERRY: —but I was talking about the beautiful vision of a street in Edinburgh with Scott's monument on the one hand, and on the other, the great crag of the Castle Rock on which the castle is superimposed. This does not only give inspiration and delight to people in the Old Country, but it creates a memory which never fades from the inhabitants of that country no matter to what part of the world they emigrate. Because of that tradition and history, I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

I know that the measure has for its aims and objects the restoration and preservation of historical buildings and those of outstanding architectural merit. I do not think those aims and objects go far enough. According to some of our architects we have no buildings at all that have great architectural merit in the City of Perth. I think we should add to those aims and objects buildings of great historical merit; and, where possible, they should be kept open for regular inspection by the public. The trust should also safeguard the beauty and interest of the countryside and coastline, in the form of beaches, stands of timber, national parks, aboriginal relics, and places of importance such as the breeding grounds of native birds, animals, and plants.

This third one, I think, is the most important of all; namely, to stimulate and encourage public interest in places and things of national or local importance by reason of educational, historical, architectural, traditional, artistic, or other special

interest. I think there is great need for a movement that will stimulate interest in these things among the people. At present I have in mind a controversy that is likely to arise. My thoughts have been drawn to it by a remark made by the Premier when he introduced this Bill. He said—

With the rapidly-changing skyline of our city and the need to provide modern highways, many of our historic landmarks could be in danger of disappearing.

A few days ago some of us were privileged to attend a lecture given by a certain gentleman at the other end of the building, during which we were shown pictures of the barracks. It was pointed out to us that the barracks were likely to be swept away in the implementation of the Stephenson Plan to provide access to the north of the city from the Narrows Bridge by the construction of a switch road.

I think it would be a tragedy if a building of the historic semblance of the gateway to the barracks alone were swept away merely to provide the route for a road. The question arises: Is it necessary to build the road along that particular route? Is it necessary to destroy buildings to make way for a road? If it is, what is gained by destroying beauty for the sake of utility?

Mr. Brand: I think it is better to destroy buildings to make the sort of road we want these days in order to provide the greatest margin of safety.

Mr. ROWBERRY: The type of road we want these days is a matter for conjecture, and a question of opinion. I think that great consideration should be given to the problem before we destroy any building of historic or architectural value merely to make way for a road. After all is said and done, it is possible to build the road underneath St. George's Terrace or other roads already in existence by means of an underpass. This evening on television, we saw such a bypass that had been constructed in London. I am not saying that the State of Western Australia has the same amount of money to spend on a bypass for a road as the authorities in the City of London. At the risk of punning, I think every avenue should be explored before we take action to destroy our historic buildings.

I now come to the composition of the proposed national trust. Being just a layman, I cannot understand it. I will read it for the information of members so that they may pass judgment. It is as follows:—

The trust will be managed by a council consisting of 25 members, of whom 16 will be elected by the members of the trust (and these 16 will include a president, two vice-presidents, a secretary, and a treasurer)—

Up to that stage I have no quarrel with the composition of the trust whatsoever because I should imagine that its members,

being individuals who have shown great interest in the history of the State and historical places and things, would be those who would be most suitable for appointment to this trust and to form judgments in a council of this nature. The proposal for the composition of the trust continues—
—and nine will be nominated by the following:—

- (i) The Premier of Western Australia;
- (ii) The University of Western Australia;
- (iii) The Historical Society of Western Australia

and so on. Then there is this reference—

Provision will be made for a chairman and deputy chairman to be appointed by the Council from their elected members.

What puzzles me is that initially "a president" is mentioned, and not "the president". That means any person will be elected from the members of the trust. Then, in the Bill, there is a provision which states—

At the first duly convened meeting of the Council held after the annual general meeting of The Trust the councillors shall, in accordance with the rules, elect from among the elected councillors a Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Council.

What does that mean? Probably when the Premier replies to the debate he will clarify those words which appear in the Bill. It seems to me that first of all a president and a vice-president are elected and then a chairman and a deputy-chairman are elected and I should imagine that the duties of these officers would be synonymous.

I notice that in the list of organisations which will be required to nominate the persons to be elected to the council is the Royal Institute of Architects (W.A. Chapter). I consider it is high time that this institute made a study of building trends and created a building image suitable for the Western Australian climate. It would appear to me—and this is merely my humble opinion—that our architects are becoming plagiarists or copyists. They are copying styles and trends from other countries which do not fulfil the requirements of buildings in Western Australia.

In some instances our architects design buildings which are entirely unsuitable for our climate and our way of life. They should do some research and look back into the records that were left by our pioneers on building designs and trends when the buildings that were erected were eminently suitable for our climate; and, what is more, they had great beauty. In many instances we have architects who are adopting the styles and building ornaments of other countries which, in my opinion, are atrocities. If they are supposed to

represent beauty, there is no beauty in my eye. I can cite a typical instance to members.

A week or so ago we had the pleasure of paying a visit to the Games Village where we found modern houses which had been designed and erected to meet the requirements of the people of Western Australia after the games are concluded.

Mr. Davies: They will become works of art.

Mr. ROWBERRY: Those houses were built to the designs submitted by members of the Royal Institute of Architects (W.A. Chapter) and, to my mind, they represent a waste of money. For one thing, as a medium for building, brick is very unsatisfactory for the construction of houses in this State. Brick takes longer to heat than other building media; but, at the same time, takes much longer to cool down. Thus, any building constructed of brick can, during the summertime, become very uncomfortable.

Another feature of these houses is the open fireplace. The fireplace is situated in a room part of which is at right angles to the fireplace. An open fireplace heats a room by radiation and it will be impossible for the people who are sitting around the corner from the fireplace to gain any heat from the fire. Yet these houses have been designed by skilled architects.

Another point of criticism is that, in my opinion, too many bricks were used in the construction of these houses. In one house the fireplace was built about 15 inches above the floor level. If present-day architects took the trouble to study the design of houses built in the old days they would discover that open fireplaces were constructed on the floor level, the principle being that the air circulated along the floor. Heat causes the air in the room to circulate, and an open fireplace creates greater circulation of cold air along the floor than an ordinary fireplace.

If the Royal Institute of Architects is to have a representative elected to this trust it will have the opportunity, I hope, of studying the designs of ancient buildings, and in the future may be able to create an image of building construction for contractors to follow in years to come. The word "image" is apparently common usage today. It is said that we create an image of youth, an image of efficiency, and the Minister for Industrial Development is often found referring to the creation of images. He has created the image of the great leap forward.

Mr. Court: You want to be careful, or they will create an image of you.

Mr. Hawke: "Lurch" is the word.

Mr. ROWBERRY: Our architects should devote their time to studying local conditions, some form, some trend, or some image which would be suitable to the people of this State for the building of

houses at the lowest cost, and not follow the designs which they have in the houses erected at the Games Village. These houses, which have walls of glass from top to bottom, require outside walls of brick to ensure privacy. This has created unnecessary cost.

I notice that this trust will be financed, in the main, by money which will be obtained from the public. I imagine that this is something which will commend itself to the public. I congratulate the Government for bringing this measure forward. It is a step in the right direction, especially at this time when we have reached that point in history when the State is over 100 years old, and it is high time we did something to preserve our ancient and historic landmarks.

Speaking of centenaries, I had the privilege of attending the other evening, on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, a dinner held to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Perth Building Society of Western Australia. It was of interest to me to notice on the invitation card that in brackets after the name of the society the word "permanent" was printed. I wonder how long is "permanent." I wonder if the word "permanent" was inserted after its name 100 years ago as an act of faith. I wonder why the trust had so much faith in itself as to insert the word "permanent" on the card.

This Bill has the objective of creating some permanency in regard to historical buildings, architectural and traditional interests, and places of natural beauty within the State. That objective has my commendation. During the evening I referred to, the people in attendance were shown a very interesting document—the first deed or agreement made between the society and the person who first built a house in Western Australia. It was built in Murray Street near where Boans Ltd. stands.

I have been referring to building trends, and it is interesting to point out that this very site would not be passed by the health authorities in these days as a suitable one for building or subdivision. Boans Ltd. is built on a swamp, and nowadays permission cannot be obtained for subdivision of land unless the water table is at least three feet below the surface. As this land is on a swamp the water table is not sufficiently low to enable satisfactory sanitary facilities to be constructed.

Some might claim that there is nothing in the Bill to excite the imagination of the people, but in my opinion it is vitally necessary to have legislation such as this.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [8.48 p.m.]: By the conferring on the national trust of the powers proposed in the Bill I fear it will run headlong into conflict with the authority set up under the Metropolitan Region

Town Planning Scheme. If the Government does not want that to happen it should reconsider the constitution of the trust and include a representative of the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Authority on it. From the instances quoted relating to the preservation of historical buildings—I have in mind the controversy on the retention of the old barracks—the authority set up under the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme will seek to develop the new, while the national trust will seek to retain the old. Very often the retention of the old becomes more expensive than the development of the new.

It was suggested by the member for Warren that it was not only the intention of the national trust or the Historical Society to retain the archway of the old barracks, but also to rebuild the building almost entirely and turn it into a type of museum. On a rough estimate the cost is £70,000. If such a huge expenditure is involved some other Government projects will have to suffer as a consequence. It is only right to put these matters in their true perspective, and we should not create trusts and organisations which entail the expenditure of large sums of public money. Already there are many organisations doing that very thing, and if the Government desires to add to the list I can name a few.

These organisations, such as the Historical Society, very often become "hysterical" societies over minor matters. We have seen that brought into action in this House over the years, and we notice how they prevailed on members of Parliament to take a particular line of action. In many instances the attitude of these organisations was not very realistic; but because of their persistence and their pressure they often achieved what they wanted. If the Government continues to take this line it will have to find other avenues of taxation to finance the proposals put forward by these organisations.

Even though a few methods have been enumerated by the Government to finance the operation of the national trust, in the long run the main party to foot the bill will be the Government itself, because the trust is to be set up as a semi-governmental body. As such it will expect funds to be channelled through the Government purse.

The member for Subiaco read out the list of the various bodies in the Eastern States which had representation on the National Trust. The trust proposed in the Bill is to be constituted under the same pattern; but whether or not that is desirable, I cannot say. He said the Historical Society in this State was formed in the 1920's; whereas the National Trust of Australia (W.A.) was formed as recently as 1959. Probably the latter has received the blessing of other societies in

this State, but as yet it has not become a secure body which knows exactly where it is going. To pass legislation to back up this trust is to put the cart before the horse.

An important aspect to be considered is the relative value to the community of societies like the National Trust. Many of the historical, educational, and traditional places and things are to come under the jurisdiction of the National Trust; but what one person might consider to be beautiful another might not. This contrast of opinion was illustrated in the recent controversy over the houses in the Games Village. The question revolves around the saying that beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

Once a proposition has been adopted by the National Trust there will be much lobbying among its members to press forward with it, and the Government will be subjected to a great deal of pressure to provide the necessary finance. If the Premier considers this sort of caper to be desirable he will be placing a great load on his shoulders. If he thinks the State can carry it that is all very well; but it is an aspect of Government with which I do not agree. I would not agree to any Government being subjected to increasing pressure from societies which have complete legislative coverage.

The Bill contains a number of features which are interesting, particularly the one relating to the composition of the council of the National Trust. The greatest representation on any similar trust in the Eastern States is 14, but in the Bill it is proposed to appoint 16 councillors.

Mr. Guthrie: There are 15 councillors in the National Trust in South Australia.

Mr. JAMIESON: Among those to be appointed is the nominee of the Premier and Treasurer of the State. Although in the past the Premier and the Treasurer have been the same person, it is possible for each portfolio to be held by a different person. In that case there would be two nominees on the trust—one representing the Premier and another representing the Treasurer.

There is also to be a nominee of the University of Western Australia, and this representation is commendable and desirable. Such a nominee would be able to supply all academic information required, because he would have more ready access to it than other people in the community.

Reference has been made to the representation of the Historical Society on the National Trust, and the possibility of that society having more than one nominee. In my view it should have two or three representatives, with a view to reducing the representation of the other bodies.

It is proposed that the Country Women's Association be represented, but I would point out there are other similar worthy

associations in this State which do as much good work; I refer in particular to the Women's Service Guild. As 50 per cent. of the activities of the National Trust will be confined to the metropolitan area, the Women's Service Guild should have representation in preference to the Country Women's Association. I see very little difference between representation by the Country Women's Association and representation by, say, the Salvation Army Home League. They are both important bodies and both function throughout the State. There is no reason to give preference to one of them.

On the National Trust of South Australia there is a representative of the Trades and Labour Council, but I do not see any proposal in the Bill before us to include a nominee of the Trades and Labour Council in Western Australia. It would be most desirable to have representation from such a body as it would help to bring about a balance in the council of the National Trust.

Another body which should be given greater representation on the trust is the Local Government Association, because it could be involved in some expenditure through the activities of the trust. It is proposed that one nominee of the Local Government Association be appointed to the council, but that is not sufficient. This body looks after the interests of the rate-payers; and even on the authority established under the Metropolitan Region and Town Planning Scheme it has greater representation than it has under the Bill before us. In fact, it has nearly all the say in that authority. I contend it should have a greater say in the deliberations of the council of the National Trust.

The Tourist Development Authority should also have a bigger representation on the council. After all, this authority would know far better than anyone else what would be attractive to tourists. We must remember that the trust will not only be handling historical documents and buildings but will be dealing with many other things as well. But the Tourist Development Authority has only one representative. As I have said, this authority would know best what it would be appropriate to keep or otherwise from a tourist point of view. After all is said and done, it would be no use modernising a home but retaining the old bathroom. It is just no good retaining something for the mere sake of retaining it. It must have real value.

Therefore the Government should give much more thought to the composition of this council before proceeding any further with the Bill. It is badly drafted because the trust should not have a far bigger representation than any other body. As it is to be constituted under the Bill, far too much public finance could be spent in the wrong directions.

There are many other things which I do not like about the Bill. For instance a councillor may be removed for misconduct. What is misconduct? Could a councillor be removed because he complains or objects to the way a meeting is being run? If he is to be removed because of gross misconduct, this should be stated. Anything could be considered as misconduct. If these people are to be appointed to this council they should only be removed if guilty of gross misconduct—not just misconduct. If a councillor merely chops down a tree on one of the sites that the people control, or something like that, he should not be removed. Such action should be taken only if he does something that has a very detrimental effect upon the council itself.

One of the problems associated with progress is that many folk do not like to see old things disappear. That causes most of the agitation in the community. The way to overcome that problem is to adopt the example set by Canberra. In the War Memorial Museum over there the historic scenes of the Dardanelles and Gallipoli have been maintained in all their glory by models effectively displayed in cabinets. The idea of retaining buildings and other things for posterity is so that those in future years might see what they were like. These things are not retained for their usefulness but because it is desired that people in future might not merely be told about buildings and things but be shown models of them that they can see with their own eyes.

If life-like models were made of people and buildings and anything historical which it was desired to preserve for posterity, it would prove a far less costly venture than the actual retention of those things which can be retained. I do not mean that everything should be preserved in this way, but only those things it is impossible or undesirable to retain in their natural form.

Mr. Bickerton: I think we could hand over 90 per cent. of our books in the library to the National Trust.

Mr. JAMIESON: I think we could possibly do that, too, or send them to the enlightened African nations, because they are of very little use to us. Be that as it may, we have to face things as they come along.

However, I would suggest to the Premier that he is certainly going to have his hands full of trouble if he is not careful and does not watch where these people are going to lead him. They will lead him along a path paved with pound notes of more than single denomination. He will find his Treasury funds depleted unnecessarily in a cause which, although in the eyes of some beholders it might be important, in the relative scheme of things is not really important at all and should take a lesser position in the development of this State.

I believe that some buildings and objects should be retained. I do not believe that the face of the earth should be bulldozed willy-nilly into another shape. That would be just as absurd as it would be to retain many of the projects that such a national trust would foist upon the Government in this State.

I think I have clearly indicated to the House my opinion on this Bill. For what it is worth I intend to support the legislation at this stage, but I believe that before the legislation is passed and becomes binding on the people of this State there are many amendments that should be made to the composition of the Council and to the authority it will be given.

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [9.7 p.m.]: I, of course, support the Bill; but there are one or two undesirable features to which I would like to draw attention. The member for Subiaco made the statement that it is unlikely this trust will require Parliament to appropriate any substantial funds for it. However, I cannot help but feel that unless the trust is given fairly substantial funds it will not serve any useful purpose.

At the moment it would appear that this organisation will usurp the functions of existing organisations. As is well known, there is already in Western Australia the W.A. Historical Society which has been in operation since the 1920's. We also have the State Gardens Board, which goes out of its way to acquire land for public use. We have the Tourist Development Authority, and we have the various local authorities which at present take over any buildings or places of historical importance. For instance, any buildings which people want to preserve are taken over.

So we already have a set-up in Western Australia under various organisations which virtually already does everything which this trust will do. Some of these organisations—like the Historical Society—have been in existence for a long time; whereas the trust was only formed in 1959. Unless substantial funds are made available to this trust, it will virtually go into hibernation.

The second point to which I would like to draw attention is that the National Trust will not place the emphasis on the historical aspect of places and buildings and in respect of collating information of a historical nature: the trust will be more along the lines of the English National Trust. That trust was originally established to principally safeguard rights-of-way. Now, of course, it does take into consideration the historical aspect and goes much further by acquiring land for public buildings and other public purposes.

In Western Australia our trust is very similar. The emphasis is not on the historical aspect; whereas the Historical Society, which has been in existence since

the 1920's, is an organisation which has devoted itself exclusively to things, places, buildings and events of historical importance. It has performed its task extremely satisfactorily. It has, for instance, been responsible for the preservation of the Old Mill at South Perth, and the Round House at Fremantle, just to mention two. It has been responsible for the preservation of many buildings of historical interest throughout Western Australia. Therefore, when the Premier replies to the debate I would like him to define the role the Historical Society will play in the future as compared with the role of the trust.

Some time ago the Premier wrote to the Historical Society informing it that although it was the Government's intention to introduce legislation resulting in the formation of the trust, the Historical Society still had a function to perform in Western Australia. However, it would seem to me from conversation with many members of the Historical Society that they are rather at a loss to know what the function of the society will be. They feel that its function is being usurped by this organisation. Therefore, as I have said, in view of the letter written by the Premier to the society, it would be of great assistance if he would in his reply define to a greater extent the role of the Historical Society and that of the trust.

On that particular point I would mention that Mr. Justice Jackson has also written to the Historical Society stating that he feels it still has a role to perform in Western Australia. As I have said, it is important to the members of the society that they should know the role which the society is to play in Western Australia in the future.

I agree with many of the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition in respect of the composition of the council of this trust. It is very strange indeed that we should be setting up a trust the council of which is to comprise 16 councillors nominated by the National Trust and only nine others nominated by other extremely responsible organisations and people listed in the Bill.

This trust is an organisation which, as I have mentioned, only came into being in 1959. Who will be the members of the trust to be formed under the Bill? This is important, because they will be the people in whom we will vest our buildings of historical importance and that kind of thing. Anyone could become a member of the National Trust a couple of years ago when it was formed. One only had to pay £10 10s. to become a life member.

Mr. Guthrie: That is not right.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The member for Subiaco says that that is not correct, and it may not be. He would probably know. However, I was speaking to a Mr. Sewell

from South Perth, who is a most prominent member of the Historical Society and a foundation member of the National Trust. He stated that he only went along and paid £10 10s. to become a life member.

Mr. Guthrie: The amount of £10 10s. was the first year's subscription as a foundation member.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The member for Subiaco knows the position in that respect. However, Mr. Sewell states that he became a member by paying a fee. Anyone, in other words, could become a member by paying the prescribed fee. Those people get together at annual meetings—and, of course, only a proportion of the members attend annual meetings—and there they would elect their 16 members of the council. Those 16 members, of course, would outweigh the combined vote of the appointees from the other responsible organisations listed in the Bill.

We see that one person is to be appointed by the Premier, one by the University of Western Australia, one only from the Western Australian Historical Society, one from the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, one from the Royal Society of Western Australia, one from the Country Women's Association of Western Australia, one from the Tree Society, one from the Local Government Association of Western Australia and the Country Shire Councils' Association of Western Australia, and one from the Western Australian Tourist Development Authority.

Only nine members are to be appointed by those very responsible organisations, and they have to go along to meetings of the council and be outvoted, on anything that is brought forward, by the 16 members nominated by the National Trust. What is the National Trust?

Mr. Hawke: What is it? That's what I want to know.

Mr. GRAYDEN: A group of people who got together and usurped the existing functions of the Historical Society. That is the position. There are some very responsible people on the National Trust, and I do not want to reflect on them. Many of them have had a lifetime of public service to Western Australia; but the point is those people are not in the majority.

As I have said, anybody can become a member of the National Trust and, in those circumstances, it is unthinkable that the trust should be able to elect 16 councillors while the other important organisations I have mentioned can nominate only nine. I hope the Premier will give serious consideration to accepting an amendment reducing the number of members appointed by the National Trust to nine. That would not be a very big concession, but it would make the position

more equitable. The National Trust could elect nine and the other organisations could elect one each, making a total of 18.

If that were done at least the other organisations mentioned in the Bill would have the same voting power and be on the same basis as the appointees from the National Trust, and I believe that is the least we can do. Paragraph (a) of sub-clause (1) of clause 10 should be amended so that there will be only nine councillors elected by the trust instead of the 16 mentioned in the Bill. Then I think the latter portion of that clause which reads—

and those sixteen elected councillors shall include the President, two Vice-Presidents, the Secretary and the Treasurer of The Trust . . .

should be deleted.

Mr. W. Hegney: Is your amendment on the notice paper yet?

Mr. GRAYDEN: It is not, but I hope the Premier will give consideration to such an amendment because I think it is extremely desirable. We should limit the members of the National Trust on the council to nine, and put them on the same basis as the other nine appointees from those important organisations which are listed.

Mr. Oldfield: I will have an even two bob you don't move an amendment.

Mr. GRAYDEN: These buildings and other places of historical importance which are to be vested in the trust do not belong to any individual or any organisation in Western Australia. They belong to the people of Western Australia as a whole, and to posterity; and this Parliament should not lightly vest objects of that kind in an organisation such as the National Trust. I think it would be much wiser to vest these objects in an organisation the council of which comprised nine members of the National Trust with nine members representing these other important organisations. Then let the council as a whole elect its president, two vice-presidents, secretary, and treasurer. I think that is the least that should be done.

Finally I would like to say that in England one of the objects of the National Trust is to acquire land which can serve the people in the future. It may possibly be set aside for amusement purposes, or it may be an old farm which is preserved so that people can see farm life without having to travel great distances. I suggest that one of the things our National Trust, when it is established, could well do would be to take over that strip of the South Perth foreshore starting from the Narrows Bridge.

Mr. Brand: Don't forget that warning you gave in regard to finance.

Mr. GRAYDEN: That is the sort of thing the National Trust in England does, and I suggest our National Trust when it

is established could take over that strip of land and preserve it as open space or parkland for use by the people of Western Australia, and for posterity. If it does that it will have justified its existence.

Mr. Rowberry: In your opinion.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I hope that the National Trust, of its own volition, will give consideration to the taking over of that strip of land; and if it does not do so of its own volition I hope the South Perth City Council will put that suggestion to it; because that is the sort of thing which is being done in England at present. There is no land like that available in any city in the world, because it is undeveloped, close to the centre of the city, and would be of tremendous value as parkland. I was going to say that it would probably cost a large sum of money, but upon reflection I do not think that is necessarily so.

Mr. Oldfield: Is this good mosquito-breeding country?

Mr. Guthrie: Good rabbit-breeding country.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I think the local authority would gladly hand it over to the National Trust if it would take over the responsibility of developing the land as a park.

Mr. W. Hegney: Is that the land which was to be taken over by Key West?

Mr. GRAYDEN: This is some of the land which was set aside for Key West; but, as everybody knows, that project has fallen through and the South Perth City Council is looking around for other people who will develop that part of the foreshore. Its development is beyond the capacity of the South Perth City Council at present, and I am quite sure that if the council knew the National Trust would take it over and develop it as a park, as has been done by the National Trust in England, the council would hand it over on those terms.

In conclusion I ask the Premier once again to give serious consideration to accepting an amendment along the lines I have suggested, because I think it would be a distinct improvement to the legislation.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn) [9.24 p.m.]: I desire briefly to make a few remarks on the Bill, but in doing so I shall not discuss the proposed constitution of the trust because previous speakers have dealt with it. I understood from the answer to the interjection I made to the member for South Perth, that he will put an amendment on the notice paper in accordance with his suggestions in connection with the personnel of the trust. I am inclined to think that the number of 25 members for the trust is a little too large.

but I am not adamant on the point. However, I do suggest that there is room for some alterations to be made to the organisations which may be represented on the trust.

Under the Bill the Country Women's Association will have one representative, while all the local authorities throughout the State will be entitled to only one representative. The older settled places like the Vasse district, Augusta, Geraldton, Albany, York, and so on, would be more interested in the preservation of historical buildings than would, say, new districts like Nollamara or Dianella. Therefore I would suggest that if this Bill is to be proceeded with more consideration should be given to increasing the representation of the local authorities.

There are a number of other organisations which could be represented, and one could go on for quite a while detailing them. In my mind they would all have some justification for having a representative on the trust; but, as I said before, it could become well and truly overloaded.

As there is a provision in the Bill which says that the funds of the trust shall comprise all moneys received by the trust out of money appropriated by Parliament for the purposes of this Act, I believe that if and when this body is established and given statutory authority one of its first activities will be to pass a resolution authorising the trust to approach the Government for a grant. As year follows year the pressure will be on the Government, irrespective of its political colour, to increase the amount of the grant.

The trust may have justification for asking the Government to increase progressively the sums of money which should be made available to it; but I think before long the Premier would find strong representations would be made for the Government to give the trust a grant probably more than sufficient for its needs. Although I do not expect the Premier to be able to answer this question, even approximately, I would like to know if he can give me an idea of how much per annum will be allocated by the Treasury to the trust.

Some few years ago certain bodies known as the Museum, the State Library Board, and the Art Gallery comprised one authority which was established under an Act passed in about the year 1900. Then, following representations by trustees of the Museum, the Library, and the Art Gallery Board, the Government divorced the control of the Library from the Museum and the Art Gallery, and later the Museum and Art Gallery were segregated and now we have three authorities.

As regards the State Library Board I would like to say that its administration is most efficient. During the last six or

seven years the board, in conjunction with the local authorities, has done a wonderful job. It has been able to establish libraries in key centres throughout the State, including York, Moora, Geraldton, Narrogin, and a number of other places.

One of the objects of this National Trust is to establish and maintain a library or libraries, both reference and circulating. Having regard to the activities and ramifications of the State Library Board, I think every member will agree that this would be a duplication. The Premier or the member for Subiaco may say, "It is not proposed to establish libraries." But if it is not proposed to establish libraries, why include that provision in the objects? Why copy holus bolus from an Act in existence in some other State or some other country the objects of a certain body, without having regard for local circumstances?

There is one other point. Some few years ago the Government gave the Library Board a grant of about £100,000. I happened to be the Minister administering the Act at the time and I think the grant went up to £115,000. I have had a look at the Estimates for the current year and I see it is proposed to grant the Library Board £180,000 for its activities. The amount to be allocated to the Museum is £55,000, and £35,000 is to be given to the Art Gallery. So that makes £270,000 for these three bodies.

I might be entirely wrong in my interpretation of the provisions of the Bill, but I can see that the National Trust must necessarily cut across some of the activities of these other bodies. So there will undoubtedly be duplication. I suggest it would be advisable, if the National Trust is to be set up, that these bodies should be represented directly on the trust, in order to prevent overlapping and duplication. Otherwise the trust might quite unconsciously do things which would run counter to the interests of the other bodies already set up.

I see that £1,600 has been allocated to the National Theatre; and £5,000 has been provided for the Elizabethan Theatre Trust. It is incumbent on the Treasurer to hand out these grants yearly. If he failed to include the requisite amounts in the Estimates presented to Parliament the bodies concerned would have no hesitation in approaching him, and the Government, to ensure that they were not left out in the cold.

It is not very often that the member for South Perth and I agree; but I think he is on the right track when he makes reference to the proposed constitution of the trust. The Premier and the member for Subiaco may say it is not proposed to

enlarge the trust to that extent, but one of its objects is set out quite clearly in the schedule. It is as follows:—

To employ and remunerate a director or directors of studies, teachers, lecturers, tutors, research workers and students, secretaries, and other employees and persons as may be necessary for the purposes of carrying out and giving effect to the objects and purposes of The Trust.

The Premier is entitled to be informed—if he has not already been informed—by those sponsoring the Bill, of the extent to which the people mentioned will be employed. Is it proposed to employ one director, one secretary, and one teacher; or is it proposed subsequently to employ a fairly substantial staff?

If it is proposed to employ a substantial staff, then I have no doubt the Government of the day will be asked to substantially increase any grant that it might propose to make to the trust. So I hope the Premier will obtain this information, if he is not in a position to give it at the moment, in order that we may have an idea of the extent of the proposed activities of the trust. If it is possible to obtain the approximate amount which will be required each year, that information would also be of great benefit.

I notice that in the list of grants made by the Premier's Department the W.A. Historical Society received only a nominal £50. That may suffice for its present activities; but if consideration is given to direct representation of the trustees of the Museum, the Art Gallery, and the Library Board, it will save duplication, and will help liaison between such bodies as the gardens board, the tourist authority, and other organisations which may be represented on this trust. I support the second reading of the Bill, but I think there is room for substantial amendment of its provisions.

MR. HALL (Albany) [9.36 p.m.]: I would like to say a few words on this measure. I think it is a commendable attempt to bring things into line in order to obtain greater value in regard to our historical buildings and other features. It will line up machinery of an antique nature, and also enable research to be undertaken into our archives.

Like the member for South Perth, however, I am a bit dubious about the number of people on the controlling body. I think this provision has been inserted to keep the measure in line with the Statutes obtaining in other States. I would like to refer to the National Trust of Australia (New South Wales) Act, section 9 of which reads as follows:—

The Council, other than the first Council, shall be constituted in accordance with this section and shall consist of not more than 27 councillors.

When we compare the size of the two States I cannot see why we should appoint 25 councillors for this State. Subsections (3) and (4) of section 9 of the New South Wales Act read—

(3) Fifteen councillors (in this Act referred to as the elected councillors) shall be elected annually, in accordance with the rules, from amongst the members of the National Trust.

(4) Ten councillors (in this Act referred to as the appointed councillors) shall be appointed to the Council, where the time for such appointment is prescribed by the by-laws . . .

The Bill before us runs pretty well in line with the provisions of the New South Wales Act. To continue to quote from that Act—

(a) one shall be appointed by the Cumberland County Council;

(b) one shall be appointed by the Fauna Protection Panel constituted under the Fauna Protection Act, 1948;

(c) one shall be appointed by The Royal Australian Institute of Architects, New South Wales Chapter;

(d) one shall be appointed jointly by the governing bodies of the Local Government Association of New South Wales and the Shires Association of New South Wales;

Those provisions run fairly parallel to the provisions contained in the measure before us. One can commend the member for South Perth for trying to reduce the number of councillors to be appointed, with a view to bringing the measure into accord with the size of our State, and the subsequent expenditure involved.

When this National Trust is formed it will serve many purposes. One of its duties will be research into historical documents at present in our archives. I understand that secret documents belonging to the Commonwealth are handed over to the State for safekeeping, because of their historical value. We must give serious thought to the composition of the board, so that we may have full confidence in any disclosures and political research it may make. For instance, research might possibly be done into the late Ben Chifley, and other notable figures, in order that their history might be displayed. In such cases, however, I dare say the relatives of the person concerned will be consulted before any such information is made public. So the trust will have an exacting job. I would now like to pay some tribute to the historical attractions of Albany.

Mr. Oldfield: Is it old enough to have a history?

Mr. HALL: I think it is one of the oldest areas in the State. It might have been a city if Lord Forrest had not let the grass

grow so long. The old gaol dates back to 1875. There is also a farm to which the member for Subiaco made reference. Apart from this there is the fort, to which my predecessor made reference on several occasions. Point King lighthouse is also of some historical importance. It dates back many years. There are many other items of interest, and research will probably reveal that there are courthouses which have been built by convicts and which also have a place in history. Albany and Busselton are perhaps the two most historical towns in Western Australia. They should accordingly have some representation on the council it is proposed to appoint. They would certainly have more historical value to present than other areas, and they would prove a great tourist attraction.

The Government will not be able to carry its activities very far if it does not provide funds for the purpose, because undoubtedly certain equipment will be required. For instance, provision will have to be made for such things as an ancient sewing machine which is perhaps 200 years old. This will have to be placed so that it will catch the eye of the tourist during the tourist season in Albany. I cannot see why this body should not move into a field, which is now being exploited in England, where afternoon teas are being served in various historical buildings.

Mr. Rowberry: Are there any castles in Albany?

Mr. HALL: Not that I know of. I would now like to make some reference to paragraph (h) of the schedule. Is the Premier going to carry out the provisions set out in the measure? Is this going to be put into practice? The provision to which I refer reads as follows:—

the preservation or protection of, or prevention of damage to, animals, birds, fish or other fauna whatsoever, trees and plants of any kind whatsoever in or on any of those lands.

Would that provide full protection to the domestic rabbit? It will certainly need to be looked at in the Committee stage. We might even be able to enter into a discussion on the rabbit question.

I commend the Bill. I think it is an attempt to bring things into line. As the member for Warren has said, we should be able to go around these historical buildings, instead of going through them. Many tourists have visited towns like Albany, and through the medium of the local Press they have been able to express their feelings on what they have seen. We should preserve the old as we hope to build the new.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [9.45 p.m.]: I desire to say a few words in connection with this measure. I think it must be generally conceded that its objective is a most laudable one and therefore the Bill is highly

desirable. But I regret very much the importance of the Historical Society has been somewhat overlooked in the framing of the measure and it has not been given the recognition which I feel is due to it for what it has done for so many years in the direction proposed by the Bill.

I find myself in agreement with those who have suggested that the representation of the association could with advantage be reduced and stronger representation given to the Historical Society. I hope the Government will see whether it can do that; and if it is done I will not have much objection to the Bill. I am very familiar with the work of the Historical Society, having had representations made to me by it over the years. I have been impressed by the great sincerity of purpose of its representatives when they came forward with any proposals; and they have achieved a great deal. There is no doubt that if it were not for the activities of the Historical Society the structure known as the Old Mill would not be in existence today.

It was solely due to the efforts of that society in the initial stages that an attempt was made to find some way of preserving that structure, with most satisfactory results. So it seems to me that an organisation which has worked so well and so sincerely and has achieved worth-while results is entitled to more than is being given to it by this Bill. I therefore hope the Government will have second thoughts about this and be prepared to accept some amendments to its proposals. However, I give my general support to the Bill in the hope that a satisfactory measure will be the outcome.

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [9.48 p.m.]: I wish to give my support to the Bill. I agree with those speakers who say that the association appears to have a monopoly as against the Western Australian Historical Society which has done so much good work in Western Australia over the years. There are nine councillors to be appointed by the trust. We find that the Western Australian Historical Society has only one representative; and other bodies which I believe are deserving of much greater representation are the Local Government Association and the Country Shire Councils Association of Western Australia.

Mr. Hawke: They have only one between them.

Mr. BICKERTON: Yes; and I believe that this national trust will have a great deal of work to do in country areas and no greater assistance could be given to it than by the local governing bodies. Organisations are listed which I feel could possibly be done without. The Country Women's Association has a representative. I realise this is a very worth-while organisation; but so are many other women's

organisations which exist throughout the State; and I doubt whether one organisation should be singled out. I believe individual organisations should have been omitted and that representation given to one of the bodies I have mentioned.

One representative is to be appointed by the Premier and Treasurer of the State—I do not know whether that is to be one representative or two—and one is to be a representative nominated by the Western Australian Tourist Development Authority. I feel the Premier's representative could quite easily be a member of the Tourist Development Authority; and if that were so, there would be an extra one which could go to the Western Australian Historical Society.

Looking through the other appointments I find there is to be one nominee of the University of Western Australia and one from the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. Again, these two seem to go together. I think one person could represent the Institute of Architects and also the University of Western Australia. I feel sure it would not be difficult to find one individual who could represent both of those bodies. Then we could finish up with two representatives of the Historical Society and at least two representatives of local government and the Country Shire Councils Association. Indeed, if we were to go so far as to take away the Country Women's Association's representative we could have three representatives from the local governing bodies.

I feel that would be more in keeping with the area of the State that is controlled by these bodies. The shires in my area do a lot on the tourist development side, as well as endeavour to keep in order many of the old historical buildings which exist. They work in conjunction with the trust down here and are doing a lot of good work in that regard. In Roebourne the local shire is doing much to maintain old buildings for historical purposes; and the same thing is being done at places like Cossack. At Port Hedland a subcommittee of the shire council has recently been set up to look after old places and develop tourist attractions; and I feel that local government should have at least three representatives on the trust. That would be my way of getting around it without increasing the number of councillors to be appointed.

If another representative were required I am of the opinion that there is little reason for the Royal Society of Western Australia to be represented. I think we would probably find that many of the people who are members of the Western Australian Historical Society—and probably of the trust—would also be members of the Royal Society of Western Australia; and there again is a means of obtaining another nominee who could represent

local government. There could at least be three representatives on the local government side; and I consider that to be most desirable.

That is all I wish to say in this respect, except that I suppose the people on the trust would have a better idea than I of what buildings are worth maintaining and what should not be maintained. The member for Beeloo mentioned that they go about this in a really sensible way rather than in a hysterical one. We have had lots of examples of people judging the worth of a building purely and simply on its architecture and age, irrespective of how much it may be holding up development. I cannot side with my colleague the member for Warren in regard to the barracks. I feel that development and progress in this case is much more important than retention of the building where it is.

If a model could be placed in a building like the Museum, then I would be all for it; but I do not think it is necessary for the old barracks to stand in their present form where they are, as it is to the detriment of the development of the Stephenson Plan. I suppose beauty lies in the eye of the beholder. The architecture does not appeal to me personally. I think the move to leave the archway may have some merit provided it is dismantled and re-erected somewhere else—perhaps at the entrance to King's Park.

Mr. Hawke: Hands off the park!

Mr. BICKERTON: By that means we could retain it.

Mr. Brand: Have you looked at the arch?

Mr. BICKERTON: I am not particularly keen on the arch.

Mr. Brand: Neither am I.

Mr. BICKERTON: I do not think that building should remain in its present position. It occurs to me that people wish to preserve old things, and I wonder whether it might not have been a good idea if someone had had sufficient foresight to dismantle the barracks 50 years ago. Then we would have heard no more about it. However, once a building is 70 or 100 years old everyone wants to preserve it.

Mr. Hawke: You might be like that yourself some day.

Mr. BICKERTON: I suggest to the Premier that if he does not soon get rid of the Treasury buildings he will have another problem on his hands.

Mr. Brand: That will not worry me in the least.

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [9.51 p.m.]: I can express thanks to the House for its support of the Bill, but it

was not altogether an enthusiastic support because of the many conditions which members have applied to their continuing support.

I think the member for Subiaco outlined the history of this particular measure and clearly indicated to the House that the Government in introducing the Bill was doing only what was suggested by a group of people who had taken a keen interest in having a national trust established and officially authorised by Statute, recognised by the Government itself and by this Parliament.

We had hoped to follow the lead of the Commonwealth, New South Wales, South Australia, and other States in setting up a national trust in order to achieve the objectives, some of which in a general way are set out in the Bill.

Mr. Hawke: There would be no objection to the setting up of a trust.

Mr. BRAND: I am going on to say that the legislation which we see before us is patterned on the Bills which have been introduced in other States; and it was recognised that there would be some argument as to whether the Country Women's Association should have a representative, or whether it should be the Women's Service Guild, or some other organisation. I have never known a piece of legislation setting up a board which was constituted by representation of various people to go through this House without numerous alternative suggestions being offered, either for political or for genuine reasons.

Therefore, it is accepted that some of the points made by members tonight regarding the representation—particularly of the nine appointed members—to be represented on the trust itself—might well receive further consideration. I would like to say I queried the reason for the appointment of a representative of the Country Women's Association as against any other organisation and was told that the Country Women's Association had taken a very live interest in these matters from the inception of that organisation. This was apparent to those who were organising the attempt to get this Bill before the House; and they made representations to the Government that the C.W.A. had taken a great interest and therefore that body was put forward as a women's organisation to have a representative on the trust.

I gather from what has been said here tonight that there are some differences of opinion between the National Trust and the Historical Society. It would appear to me there has been some communication or some lobbying. I want to say I knew nothing of this except that the Bill has been delayed on the notice paper as a result of a request from Mr. Justice Jackson, the president of the trust, who said

that discussions were taking place between the Historical Society and the trust in regard to some points of difference; and he reported to me the other day that these had been resolved. That was my reason for bringing up the Bill.

I do not propose to have a long discussion in the House regarding the differences of the members of the trust and of the Historical Society. The objective of the Government in bringing this piece of legislation before the House was to establish a national trust with the objectives which have been outlined, in order that early in our history we may be able to preserve the worth-while things of traditional and historical significance. But until such time as the members of the trust and the Historical Society settle their differences and we are able to come here with the full backing of all sections of the community in this matter, it would seem that the Bill should be set aside.

Mr. Hawke: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRAND: The Leader of the Opposition has made the point that there is a larger or an inequitable number of National Trust members as against Historical Society members.

Mr. Hawke: Sixteen to one!

Mr. BRAND: But I was under the impression that the group of people known as the National Trust—which was established, I think, in 1959—was in part, if not in large part, made up of members of the Historical Society; and that those two organisations had the same objectives and were right behind this move. But if there is going to be a parochial war behind the scenes as to who should be the main people to be represented on this body, then this Chamber is not the place to thrash it out, because we could not then reach any satisfactory decision on the matter.

It would seem to me that although the Government had intended to pass this piece of legislation through the House, we should not proceed any further with the Bill until such time as these problems have been resolved. It could be that there is something in the argument of the Leader of the Opposition that there should be a more balanced representation.

Mr. Hawke: I think there should be.

Mr. BRAND: I know nothing of the problems, except as reported to me by the president of the trust. I was advised, as members will see from the notice paper, that certain amendments to the schedule would be all that was necessary to resolve those differences. But if they are more deep-seated than that and there is some real argument going on behind the scenes, then the very principle and the very idea behind the establishment of a trust will not really work.

With regard to finance, I would simply say that so far as the inclusion of the particular clause dealing with the appropriation of money for the trust is concerned, it was recognised that from the beginning the trust would have to have some financial assistance, be it small or large. Presumably—as in the case of the Tourist Development Authority, and other trusts—the Treasury would have the final say as to the amount of money to be allocated each year.

The Leader of the Opposition, who is an ex-Treasurer of this State, pointed out that there could be increasing pressure year by year to preserve a certain building or to do certain work; but, on the other hand, if we are not prepared to give some financial backing to such a trust we cannot hope that it will get anywhere. Moneys appropriated in the first instance might help the trust to build up an income; and ultimately—as I understand is the case in other countries—such a trust or an organisation could become independent.

There is no point in proceeding to deal with all the matters raised by members, because they have more or less touched on the same problems. With regard to the representation on the council, the member for Warren raised a query concerning the president and the chairman. The president is, of course, the president of the trust; and the chairman referred to in the Bill is the chairman of the council itself, which is elected and set up by the appointed members.

I think a point has justifiably been made that the provision regarding the representative appointed by the Premier and Treasurer of this State is ambiguous. As far as I understand this matter, the representative was to be a member of the Premier's Department. However, that point could be easily clarified. The Premier could no doubt appoint a Treasury officer who might be more useful in watching the financial problems of the council.

Surely the architects have a place in the scheme of things; because they are the people who would advise the trust on whether buildings were of value and worth preserving for the future. I think it is important that the Tourist Development Authority should be represented. However, I do not agree with the member for Beeloo who said that the Metropolitan Region Authority should have representation, because if it is to be represented then practically every road board within the built-up regions might claim representation. As members have pointed out, this Bill proposes a council of 25 members, which, in itself, is rather unwieldy. The local authority could well be represented by someone appointed from the Shire Councils Association and by the metropolitan local government authorities.

The barracks at the head of St. George's Terrace has been mentioned. I have no doubt that a fight will be put up by those supporters of the "Save the Barracks" campaign to preserve the building. However, I agree with the member for Pilbara, who pointed out that from the time the original plan was conceived by the architects for a State Parliament House to be erected on this site, and for the Terrace to lead up to the front of the State Parliament House, some 60 years have gone by. The barracks have now become historically important because of their age. Professor Stephenson, when reporting on this building, said it had very little architectural value. He pointed out that in the interests of progress and the development of a modern western switch highway—which we must have at this end of the city and at this particular stage, and built in relation to the Narrows Bridge—we must concede that the barracks should go.

However, as a result of representations made to me by a deputation, the planners are examining the possibility of saving the arch. If members take the trouble to look at the arch they will see that it is not a substantial part of the building. If it is left in that particular spot it can only spoil the original conception of the architects, and I think it would stand out like the proverbial house in the desert—all on its own—and would not be an attraction on that particular site. Therefore, although the planners are still giving consideration to ways and means of saving the arch, it would appear to me that in the long run the general community will stand by the original conception of a completed State Parliament House on one of the best sites in Australia for a State Parliament House, with the wide street, St. George's Terrace, leading up to it. I think that will complete the very fine conception and plan of the architects in 1900.

I thank members for their support of the Bill. They have expressed their opinions and have stated that this Bill has a worthy objective, but the machinery portions of the measure do not appear to meet with the approval of members. Therefore, I think it would be a waste of time arguing about all the various points which could be raised, and, in the long run, we would not achieve a great deal. It is up to the people backing this legislation to resolve their differences and, after they have read the speeches which have been made on the Bill, and have discussed the points which have been raised, to come forward with an amended piece of legislation which will meet the wishes of all concerned.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. I. W. Manning) in the Chair; Mr. Brand (Premier) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short Title and Citation—*Progress*

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr. Guthrie.

MOTOR VEHICLE (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE SURCHARGE) BILL.*Second Reading*

Debate resumed, from the 25th October, on the following motion by Mr. Brand (Treasurer):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [10.14 p.m.]: This Bill can, with every justification, be described as a straight-out taxing measure. Any person reading the title of the Bill could easily be misled as to its real purpose, because the title is associated with the motor vehicle third party insurance legislation already on the statute book. The Bill with which we are now dealing in no way amends the provisions of the existing motor vehicle third party insurance law. All this Bill proposes to do, and all it will do if it is approved by both Houses of Parliament, will be to impose upon every owner of a registered motor vehicle an additional tax of £1 per annum.

It is true the Bill does exempt from the proposed taxation impost a small number of special vehicles. However, I should say probably 98 or 99 per cent. of all motor vehicles registered will have to stand this additional taxation. I think most members would agree the amount of taxation imposed on the ownership of motor vehicles, and especially on the use of them, is very great indeed. There is the licensing fee or tax; there is the driver's licence fee or tax; there is the motor vehicle third party insurance tax; there is the very heavy tax upon petrol; there is the sales tax upon tyres, batteries, and so on; and now this latest straightout tax of £1 on every motor vehicle coming under the provisions of the motor vehicle third party insurance law.

During the last few days members have been very generous to the Government, and especially to the Treasurer. Already this week we have approved of two Bills—two straightout taxing measures—which will impose upon sections of people in the State an increased taxation burden of over £400,000 per annum. The Bill now before us proposes to impose another increased taxation burden of nearly £250,000 per annum. Indeed, I should think in the next financial year the amount which will be collected under this additional tax will exceed £250,000 because of the increased number of motor vehicles which will be on the road as compared with the total number which were on the road during the last financial year.

In justification of this proposed new tax the Treasurer told us the now familiar story about the Grants Commission, and what views the members of the commission hold, and which they have expressed, regarding taxation imposts of a similar character to this one being imposed in at least the State of Victoria.

I think members of this House should not willy-nilly agree to be dragged along the road of heavily increased taxation by this sort of submission from the Treasurer. I am convinced in my own mind members have already this session given approval to a sufficient amount of additional taxation to be gathered from the people of Western Australia. Agreement to this proposed new and additional tax—the one proposed in the Bill now before us—would, I think, be imposing too great a total burden in this field of increased taxation during one Parliamentary session. Therefore, I propose to vote against the second reading of the Bill and I hope a sufficient number of the members of the House will do likewise to bring about its defeat.

MR. HEAL (Perth) [10.21 p.m.]: I desire briefly to support the remarks that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition. As he has pointed out, this House has already approved of two other taxing measures this session. The Treasurer has stated that if the State Treasury is to finance the needs of the State this proposed levy of £1 per annum on every third party insurance policy issued is necessary. I would not mind so much if motorists were to benefit from the imposition of this £1 levy, but the Treasurer has said that the money will be paid into Consolidated Revenue. He said that the State Treasury would receive well over £230,000 from this source, but, in my opinion, it will receive well over £250,000 from this extra charge on motor vehicle licenses which will be spent in whatever manner the Treasurer so desires.

The Treasurer also pointed out that unless this extra taxation were imposed on the motorists of the State the Grants Commission would penalise us in other directions. I asked the Treasurer if, within his memory, the Grants Commission had ever penalised Western Australia when it had not complied with the suggestions it had put forward for increasing the revenue of this State, and I do not think he said that the commission had ever penalised us.

The Treasurer also advanced the argument that although the New South Wales Government had increased driver's license fees from £1 to £2, it was considered that this was not the fairest means of obtaining extra revenue and it was decided to make the £1 levy on every motor vehicle license issued. If the Treasurer is to follow that line of action, why does he not follow the policy of the Premier of South Australia who has brought down legislation to

fix prices on goods and other commodities? However, I know the Premier of this State is a firm believer in free enterprise and will have nothing to do with fixed prices. So I think the excuse he has given for the imposition of this tax is very feeble.

I would like the Premier to cite an instance of when the Grants Commission has penalised this State because he has not agreed to do what the Grants Commission has suggested in regard to taking steps for the collection of more revenue. I also reiterate that the imposition of this £1 levy would not be so hard to take if the money to be received from it were to be spent for the benefit of the motorists of Western Australia and not paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. On behalf of my electors I protest against this taxing measure.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [10.26 p.m.]: I, too, oppose this measure for the reasons advanced by my colleague and also for other reasons. It seems to me to be a roundabout way to raise Government finance, when a surcharge of £1 is to be imposed on every third party insurance policy issued, because nothing is redeemed under third party insurance. The only redeeming amount the trust will get is the commission for handling the money that will be paid to the Treasury by the imposition of this surcharge, which again seems to be a stupid way to raise Government finance because of the unnecessary expense involved in the payment of the commission to the trust.

If one can tell me that is sanity in basic finance, I am not here, and I am certainly speaking here at the present moment. If it is so vital for a Government to raise additional finance particularly because of the criticism levelled by the Grants Commission against the State for not raising its taxes to a level commensurate with those in the Eastern States, surely the Government has to have enough courage and be honest enough to say to the people of the State that because of the increased motor vehicle registrations more traffic police and other facilities are required to reduce motor accidents and promote safety. Everyone would then have to contribute towards the additional expenditure accordingly. At the moment, however, the full load is borne by the motorist.

The only reason for increasing the premium on third party insurance should be for the provision of additional coverage. It should certainly not be increased as a taxing measure. When a tax is imposed by this means the cost of this Parliament is increased because instead of merely amending the Act relating to third party insurance, we find the Premier has to bring down two separate Bills: one to authorise the imposition of this surcharge and another to amend the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act to give the trust the right to do certain things and act as agent

for the Government. Again I ask: Is that a sane and reasonable arrangement to raise Government finance? To my mind it is not.

In this world and in these days it is wise to adopt straightforward methods. Why is it necessary to go a roundabout way to raise Government finance when it can be raised in a direct manner? The direct way is not only the best way but the honest and fairest way. The Government by endeavouring to impose a surcharge on every third party insurance policy issued for motor vehicles is only hoodwinking the public because the motorists are not going to get the full advantage of the commission the Government will be paying to the trust.

It is no use the Government trying to tell me that we have to slavishly follow the policy adopted by Governments in the Eastern States to raise finance. In the words of the member for Mt. Marshall, if the Premier of Victoria or New South Wales has a cold, surely there is no need for our Premier to cough. As long as we can prove to the Grants Commission that we are honestly endeavouring to raise the necessary finance for the administration of the State in our own way, surely that is good enough and will prevent the Grants Commission from penalising the State. If we seek to raise the necessary finance, not by imposing this levy on third party insurance premiums but by some other method, surely that is our business, because I consider that we should find this money by some direct means instead of by this method. If the finance is so necessary I favour the direct way.

We should tell the people we are imposing this tax because we consider they should pay it and not that Parliament considers it should be collected by means of imposing a levy on the premium of each policy issued under the third party insurance legislation. If one were desirous of buying a certain article one would not do it by indirect means, but would go direct to the shop and buy what was required. It would only be from necessity that one would ask someone else to make the purchase—and as a matter of convenience.

If that is done, then, of course, one is obliged to the person handling one's affairs. In the circumstances the Government should be prepared to handle its own affairs, and to raise and collect its own taxes. It should not put in some body or organisation as a dupe to raise those taxes for it. In those circumstances I oppose the provisions of the Bill.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [10.31 p.m.]: I am strongly opposed to this imposition. I do not think there is the slightest justification for it. This Government has been profligate in the way it has thrown money around in certain directions, regardless of

the effect generally, relying on its majority to come back here and extract more money from the people.

Mr. Brand: You did that.

Mr. TONKIN: Oh no we did not! We did not sell the State Building Supplies at a loss of £1,676,143. If the Treasurer will look at the Auditor-General's report he will find that the probable cost to the State directly attributable to the disposal of State Building Supplies has been assessed at £1,676,143, to which must be added the obligation to meet debt charges on loss of capital, having regard for the fact that Hawker Siddeley will pay some interest on money outstanding; and, therefore, making allowance for that fact we can say that the additional annual impost on the Budget is at least £45,000 a year.

So we have the direct loss of £1,676,000 which never should have been sustained at all; and on top of that we have the annual recurring loss, as an impost on the Budget, of at least £45,000; and that will go on until the end of the century. Apart from that, the Minister for Industrial Development made a good fellow of himself and gave £3,711 to Air Beef at the expense of the State. Firstly, it was done at the expense mostly of the growers. Then I suppose the Country Party representatives put on a show about that, so an adjustment was made, and now it is wholly at the expense of the State; because this money was taken into profit and loss account in the first instance, and profit distributed, because it was believed that this charge which was properly an impost would have been paid.

But because of the action of the Minister for Industrial Development in directing that this should be written down—this amount of £3,000 odd—the State suffers a loss, and the Auditor-General draws attention to that fact. The Government cannot go on throwing State money away and then bring in fresh taxation upon the people to make up for it.

Mr. May: The cow must run dry some time.

Mr. Court: That Air Beef money was in dispute when you were in the Government.

Mr. TONKIN: No it was not. It was taken into profit and loss account as being profit properly earned.

Mr. Court: It was still in dispute.

Mr. TONKIN: No; the company would not pay it. There was no dispute so far as the meatworks were concerned. The charges were levied in accordance with the agreement and in the proper way, and it was money properly due to the meatworks; and on the basis of its being properly due to the meatworks a distribution of profits was made to the growers in accordance with the contracts signed. But the Minister for Industrial Development, a friend of Air Beef, directs the management to write the amount off.

Mr. Court: Because it was a fair and equitable thing to do.

Mr. TONKIN: It was not; and it is done now at the expense of the State; at the expense of the taxpayer, who is called upon to make up the deficiency. In 1959 when the Government was imposing additional taxation on motorists in connection with motor vehicle licenses, registrations, and transfers, in order to qualify for matching money from the Commonwealth, I pointed out it was not necessary to impose as big a burden as it was intended to impose, because the State would take from the motorist more money than was actually necessary to enable it to qualify for the maximum of matching money which the Commonwealth would make available.

When I used that argument the Minister of the day said that was not the position at all; that we would be able to use all the matching money we could get in order to qualify for matching money from the Commonwealth. History has proved my forecast to be right. There is now to the credit of the Central Road Trust Fund a sum of £2,112,158. That was the credit at the 30th June, after the maximum distribution allowed by Commonwealth law was made to local authorities outside the metropolitan area; to local authorities within the Commonwealth area, and to the King's Park Board.

No more money could be obtained under the Act. The absolute maximum payment was made, and when it was made there was left in the fund £2,112,158. This fund is building up at the rate of £700,000 a year. The State will never be able to spend it, because there is a restriction under the Commonwealth law which provides that the distribution from this fund shall be limited to twice the amount of the Commonwealth contribution. So it does not matter how much money is in the fund, or how much local authorities want to get their hands on it, because legally the Government cannot pay it.

Let us see how this fund is built up. In the first year it obtained a credit of £703,000—that was in the year 1959-60. For the year 1960-61 the credit in the fund, after all maximum disbursements had been made was £1,412,000. For the present year the credit is £2,112,000. It is just too silly—having placed this impost on the motorist for motor vehicle licenses, registration fees and transfer fees—to take money which the Government cannot use.

On the pretext of getting matching money from the Commonwealth we were able to do this, but we have taken from the people hundreds of thousands of pounds more than was necessary, and we just cannot get any advantage from it. It stays in this fund, and it will continue to build up till at the end of five years there will probably be in this fund £4,000,000

which has been extracted from the motorist unnecessarily, without any corresponding advantage to anybody. Despite the fact that the fund is building up in that way the Government comes along with this proposition to take another £240,000 from the motorist, by way of straight-out taxation on the motorist, to help Consolidated Revenue. If the Government had a proper investigation made of the main roads position it would realise that an alteration of this Act would permit it to obtain at least £700,000 per annum from this source.

Is the poor motorist being singled out for this taxation because that is the easiest way to raise the money? That is the only explanation I can find for what the Government proposes to do. I suggest before the Treasurer goes any further with this proposition he should cause an examination to be made of the position of the Central Road Trust Fund, to find out how the fund is building up and why no corresponding advantage can be obtained from the Commonwealth.

If the Government had heeded the Opposition at the time it would have relieved the motorist of a good deal of this imposition, but I was not supposed to know what I was talking about when I said this fund would continue to build up, year after year. Absolutely no notice was taken of what I said. Now we have the figures before us showing there was £700,000 in credit in the first year, £1,400,000 in credit in the second year, and at the present time £2,100,000 in credit. What is the sense or justification for this? I contend there is absolutely none. Whilst that situation remains the Government will get no vote of mine to raise additional taxes from the motorist, as it seeks to do in the Bill before us.

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [10.42 p.m.]: The speeches made by members of the Opposition are those one expects to hear in argument against the imposition of taxes. To the member for Beeloo I would point out that I made the position clear on every occasion I spoke on the matter—and nothing I said was misleading—and intimated that this was a straight-out tax of £1 on every third party insurance policy.

I have informed the House that this tax has nothing to do with any motor vehicle third party premium increase, or with any benefits to be derived from such increase. I intimated that the line which had been adopted by Victoria was being followed. The suggestion made by one or two members in this House of an alternative method of raising the money has been given consideration; that is, the suggestion to increase the driver's license fee. In New South Wales that fee has been increased by 100 per cent., and it now stands at £2.

Mr. Davies: Three or four years ago you increased the driver's license fee in this State.

Mr. BRAND: So did New South Wales. I understand that an increase of 15s. in driver's license fees would have to be imposed in order to derive the same benefit as is to be derived from the imposition of this third party insurance surcharge. The fact that there can be a number of drivers in a family has been taken into account. It was considered that the impact of an increase in driver's license fees will be greater on families as a whole than a straight-out surcharge on third party insurance.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition raised the point in respect to the Central Road Trust Fund which was established to attract the maximum matching grant of the Commonwealth Government. I do not propose to dispute the figures which he, no doubt, has taken from the report of the Auditor-General. Until such time as the information is available as to why there has been such a build-up in that fund, it will be unwise for me to give any explanation at this stage.

There has been an agreement in existence, covering a period of five years, under which the States are to be granted a sum of £30,000,000 by the Commonwealth on the basis of the States finding £2 for every £1 contributed by the Commonwealth. Those who are in control of that fund have taken into account the need at the end of five years to produce a very substantial amount of money in order to attract the maximum which has been offered by the Commonwealth. Although I have no definite information I am sure that is the reason for the building up of the fund.

Mr. Hawke: That is not so.

Mr. BRAND: It must be so.

Mr. Tonkin: Why must it be so?

Mr. BRAND: So that in the final year a very substantial sum of money can be produced. When the late Mr. Perkins introduced that legislation in this House it was pointed out that the Government did not anticipate raising all the money during the final year of the five-year period.

Mr. Tonkin: The Commonwealth has agreed to pay the lesser of the two amounts.

Mr. BRAND: Of course it has; but we want to attract the maximum.

Mr. Tonkin: I know. What you are doing up to date is attracting the maximum.

Mr. BRAND: We cannot attract the maximum in any one year or during the last year, because the amount is considerable.

Mr. Tonkin: You will continue to build up at the rate of £700,000 a year.

Mr. BRAND: We will look into that and find out the reason from the experts. In Western Australia we have been very reasonable in imposing charges in respect of motor vehicles, particularly third party

insurance charges. Some time this week the Minister for Local Government, who is in charge of third party motor vehicle trust matters will introduce a measure to amend the relevant Act, and it is proposed to increase the limits which are allowed for compensation benefits. The Bill envisages an increase in third party premiums.

As the Leader of the Opposition well knows, the Bill before us is a straight-out £1 tax by the Treasury, and it has no relationship to third party insurance at all. If the limits of third party compensation payments are to be increased, obviously there will have to be an increase in third party insurance premiums.

I want to read out the information I have in regard to third party premiums payable in the other States. It is as follows:—

Class 1, Private		Metropolitan		Country
		Area		
		£ s. d.	£ s. d.	
Western Australia	4 6 0	4 6 0	
Victoria	9 2 0	4 7 6	
New South Wales	13 8 0	9 0 0	
Queensland	9 0 0	9 0 0	
Tasmania	4 18 0	4 18 0	

Those figures will indicate the higher charges which are imposed in the other States. Therefore it can be seen there is a substantial difference between the charges imposed in the major States and those imposed in Western Australia.

Mr. Hawke: The Bill before us does not deal with that matter.

Mr. BRAND: I know; but I am pointing out that even with this £1 surcharge in third party insurance premiums, the charges in Western Australia will not be as high as those of the major States.

Mr. Davies: How long will this surcharge remain?

Mr. BRAND: It is intended to be a permanent tax.

Mr. Hawke: Another lurch forward!

Mr. BRAND: Although the Government is not earmarking this surcharge of £1 for any special fund it must be pointed out that the impact of motoring on the Treasury is very substantial in these days. There is a demand for better conditions from the motorists who are already on the road; and this will grow as the number of motorcars increases and we get more complicated road features, when there will have to be more and more control.

It was said in this House not so very long ago that the answer to the traffic problem was to increase the police traffic supervision on the roads. I think we have been able to increase the number by 25, which is comparatively few, having regard for the increasing demand for greater supervision. It has been said by members of the Opposition that they have agreed to two measures—one in regard to stamp

duty and the other in regard to liquor license fees—which will bring in something like £350,000 or £400,000. However, I would point out that it is my intention to introduce legislation regarding superannuation which will involve the Treasury in a full year in a sum of £100,000. I only mention that because in this session we are going to increase superannuation and pensions and we must find the money from somewhere.

I believe the £1 surcharge under this measure is a reasonable contribution to the problem which faces the State in the ever-increasing demand for services and the impact that the number of motorcars on the roads these days is making.

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

Ayes—22

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Brand	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Cornell	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Craig	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Crommellin	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Wild
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Williams
Dr. Henn	Mr. O'Neill

(Teller)

Noes—21

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Curran	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. Heal	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. H. May
Mr. W. Hegney	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Burt	Mr. Kelly
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. Norton
Mr. Hart	Mr. Brady

Majority for—1.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Treasurer) [10.58. p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

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

Ayes—22

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Brand	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Cornell	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Craig	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Crommellin	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Wild
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Williams
Dr. Henn	Mr. O'Neill

(Teller)

Noes—21

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Curran	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Molr
Mr. Evans	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. Heal	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. H. May
Mr. W. Hegney	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes

Noes

Mr. Burt	Mr. Kelly
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. Norton
Mr. Hart	Mr. Brady

Majority for—1.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILLS (3): RETURNED

1. Health Act Amendment Bill (No. 3).
Bill returned from the Council without amendment.
2. Electoral Act Amendment Bill.
Bill returned from the Council with an amendment.
3. Supply Bill (No. 2), £22,000,000.
Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Council's Amendment

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. I. W. Manning) in the Chair; Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment made by the Council is as follows:—

Clause 10, page 10, line 10—Delete the word "meat" and substitute the word "food".

Mr. COURT: This amendment is not a momentous one.

Mr. W. Hegney: It is something we can get our teeth into.

Mr. COURT: When the Bill was being dealt with in this House previously, attention was drawn to this word, and I promised to have it examined by the Crown Law Department, and if necessary attended to in another place. It was considered necessary to make the alteration, and I therefore move—

That the amendment made by the Council be agreed to.

Mr. JAMIESON: While not altogether disagreeing with this amendment, it seems strange to me that it has been found necessary to alter the word "meat" to "food" because in many of our Acts food

is referred to as meat. I do not know whether it is the intention of Parliament to amend the various Acts in which this word appears. However, it does seem strange that at this late stage it should be considered necessary to make the alteration.

Mr. COURT: For the sake of the record, might I explain the reason for the amendment? After the matter was brought to the attention of members by the member for Balcatta, the matter was studied. It was found that previous reference made in the Act was to the word "food" and therefore it was considered necessary to alter the word "meat" in this clause.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Report

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Council; and, on motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Chief Secretary), read a first time.

MOTOR VEHICLE (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed, from the 25th October, on the following motion by Mr. Brand (Treasurer):—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [11.10 p.m.]: This Bill is complementary to the one we were discussing some little time ago.

Mr. Graham: There is no need to be complimentary to the Government!

Mr. HAWKE: The provisions in this Bill lay down an easy system of collecting the tax of £1 on each motor vehicle (third party insurance) premium. Some of the provisions in the Bill are necessary because of the system of licensing of motor vehicles which operates in Western Australia. As, I think, all members know, the Police Department is the registration authority in the metropolitan area and the local authorities are the licensing agents or authorities outside of the metropolitan area. Therefore, there has to be provision to enable the tax of £1 on each motor vehicle to be transferred from the country local authorities to the Treasurer so that the money might find its way into the Treasury and be available for general governmental purposes.

The provision is that country local authorities will transmit the money to the trust associated with third party insurance on motor vehicles. The other provision lays it down that the Commissioner of Police in regard to the metropolitan area shall pay the £1 tax which he receives with every registration or with every premium payment to the Treasury.

The proposed system of channelling this taxation to the Treasury appears to be efficient and satisfactory. All I am sorry about is that the members of the Opposition did not succeed in defeating the previous Bill—the taxation Bill. Had we done so, the Bill now before us would have been unnecessary. In the circumstances, there appears to be no reasonable alternative but for the Bill now before us to be supported.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Nalder (Minister for Agriculture), and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 11.16 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 1st November, 1962

CONTENTS

	Page
ASSENT TO BILLS	2243
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Housing in Medina and Calista Districts—	
Number for Sale and Deposit Required	2244
Number Planned	2244
Pensioner Units	2244
Kwinana Industrial Area: Provision of	
Technical Education	2244
Naturalisation Ceremonies: Distribution of	
Legislative Council Enrolment Cards	2244
Railway Freight: Coolgardie to Esperance—	
Present and Estimated Weekly Tonnage	2244
COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL—	
Ministerial Statement	2245
LEAVE OF ABSENCE	2245
BILLS—	
Administration Act Amendment Bill: Returned	2278
Bush Fires Act Amendment Bill: Assembly's Request for Conference	2278
Charitable Trusts Bill: Returned	2278

CONTENTS—continued

	Page
BILLS—continued	
Child Welfare Act Amendment Bill (No. 2): Assent	2243
Electoral Act Amendment Bill: Assembly's Message	2250
Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act (Revival and Continuance) Bill—	
2r.	2279
Com.; Report; 3r.	2279
Housing Loan Guarantee Act Amendment Bill: Returned	2251
Licensing Act Amendment Bill (No. 3)—	
2r.	2253
Com.	2259
Licensing (Rottneest Island) Bill—	
Receipt; 1r.	2234
Married Women's Property Act Amendment Bill: Returned	2278
Mental Health Bill: Assent	2243
Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill: Assent	2243
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill—	
Receipt; 1r.	2250
2r.	2256
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance Surcharge) Bill—	
Receipt; 1r.	2250
2r.	2234
Mount Goldsworthy-Ord River-Depuech Island Railway Bill: Returned	2251
Native Flora Protection Act Amendment Bill: 2r.	2279
Painters' Registration Act Amendment Bill: Assent	2243
Plant Diseases Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	2251
Com.	2253
Report; 3r.	2253
Reserves Bill—	
2r.	2236
Com.; Report; 3r.	2236
Road Closure Bill—	
2r.	2236
Com.; Report; 3r.	2236
Stamp Act Amendment Bill (No. 2): 2r.	2245
Testator's Family Maintenance Act Amendment Bill: Returned	2278
Town Planning and Development Act Amendment Bill: Assent	2243
Trustees Bill: Returned	2278

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

BILLS (5): ASSENT

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1. Mental Health Bill.
2. Town Planning and Development Act Amendment Bill.
3. Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill.
4. Painters' Registration Act Amendment Bill.
5. Child Welfare Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).