

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 10th September, 1957.

CONTENTS.

Questions :	Page
Busselton hospital, proposed additions, commencement, and estimated cost	1356
Weighbridge, registration at Bunbury	1356
Housing, parking facilities, Wandana Flats	1356
Education, (a) South Bunbury school, overcrowding	1357
(b) South Bunbury school, old pavilion	1357
(c) Boyup Brook junior high school, accommodation for married teachers	1357
(d) Oslo lunches, cost, constituents, etc.	1357
Cannington fire station, manning with permanent staff	1357
Road transport, (a) interstate hauliers, taxing legislation	1357
(b) Bridgetown and Boyup Brook to Tone River, fuel cartage	1358
S.p. betting, turnover, Kalgoorlie and Boulder shops	1358
Rice, assistance and yield, Liveringa project	1358
Electricity supplies, provision at Serpentine and Jarrahdale	1358
Health, tuberculosis control	1358
Railways, (a) effect of restriction of Bunbury service	1358
(b) Bunbury goods shed extension	1359
Pensioners, automatic adjustment of rates	1359
Drainage, (a) Thornlie estate, Kenwick	1359
(b) responsibility for expenditure of Commonwealth-State finance	1359
Fremantle railway bridge, reports on siting of new structure	1359
Goldmining, aluminium therapy	1360
Agent General, appointment of Minister for Lands	1360
Traffic, Goldfields taxi rates	1360
General Revenue Estimates, date of introduction	1360
Timber transport, prevention of accidents	1360
Bills : Health Act Amendment, Council's amendments	1361
Trustees Act Amendment, returned	1361
Audit Act Amendment, returned	1361
State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment (No. 2), Com., report	1361
Fremantle Harbour Trust Act Amendment, 2r.	1376
King's Park Aquatic Centre, 2r.	1384

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

QUESTIONS.

BUSSELTON HOSPITAL.

Proposed Additions, Commencement and Estimated Cost.

Mr. **BOVELL** asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Will he give details of the proposed additions to the Busselton hospital?

(2) What is the estimated amount to be expended?

(3) When will the additions be commenced?

The **MINISTER** replied:

(1) New laundry.

Additions to kitchen.

Children's bathroom and food preparation room.

Additional male lavatory.

New sterilising room to operating theatre.

Combined single room and iron-lung room.

New boiler house.

Improvements to casualty treatment room.

(2) It is not policy to publish estimates in respect of work for which tenders are to be called.

(3) It is hoped to start this financial year.

WEIGHBRIDGE.

Registration at Bunbury.

Mr. **ROBERTS** asked the Minister for Police:

(1) In view of the reply received to my question on the 29th August, 1957, was not the weighbridge adjacent to the W.A.G.R. goods shed, Bunbury, when in use, available to the public?

(2) Why, therefore, was there no record at the Police Department of any registration of same by the W.A.G.R.?

The **MINISTER** replied:

In accordance with the decision laid down by the then Premier in January, 1930, and carried out by successive Governments, railway weighbridges have been the sole responsibility of the Railway Department and do not come under police jurisdiction.

HOUSING.

Parking Facilities, Wandana Flats.

Mr. **ROBERTS** asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Are parking facilities provided at Wandana Flats for the tenants of such flats and clients of Wandana restaurant?

(2) If so, what number of parking spaces are available to—

(a) the tenants;

(b) the clients?

(3) What are the fees charged for this facility and who gets the revenue from such charges?

The **MINISTER** replied:

(1) Parking facilities are provided for tenants of flats only.

(2) (a) 44.

(b) Nil.

(3) 5s. per week per space. State Housing Commission.

EDUCATION.

(a) *South Bunbury School, Overcrowding.*

Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Education:

In view of the apparent overcrowding at the South Bunbury school, what are the future plans for alleviating the position at an early date?

The MINISTER replied:

It is proposed to erect two classrooms at Carey Park school, thus relieving the South Bunbury school.

(b) *South Bunbury School, Old Pavilion.*

Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Is it a fact that renovations and alterations are contemplated with respect to the old pavilion building within the grounds of the South Bunbury school?

(2) If so—

(a) what is the total expenditure contemplated;

(b) what are the details of such renovations and alterations;

(c) will additional classroom space result?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) (a) £420.

(b) General repairs to the building, complete internal and external painting, renewal of one window, supply and spread 10 cubic yards of gravel to grounds adjacent, replace existing giant stove with a wonderheat convection heater, and replace two old basins with two new flat back basins.

(c) No.

(c) *Boyup Brook Junior High School, Accommodation for Married Teachers.*

Mr. HEARMAN asked the Minister for Education:

(1) How many married teachers are on the staff of the junior high school at Boyup Brook?

(2) What departmental accommodation is available for married teachers at Boyup Brook?

(3) What other accommodation is at present in use at Boyup Brook by married teachers?

(4) Does the department regard the situation regarding accommodation for married teachers at Boyup Brook as satisfactory?

(5) Has the department any plans for improving this situation at Boyup Brook?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Two married men.

(2) Headmaster's quarters consisting of three rooms and kitchen.

(3) Married staff members occupy privately-owned houses.

(4) Yes.

(5) No.

(d) *Oslo Lunches, Cost, Constituents, etc.*

Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Education:

(1) How many schools in Western Australia are serviced with Oslo lunches?

(2) What are the main constituents of an Oslo lunch?

(3) What is the average cost in the metropolitan area of such a lunch served to a child?

(4) Have any statistics been recorded which suggest that children, who have been regularly served with Oslo lunches, enjoy better health (as indicated by the school attendance roll) than other children?

The MINISTER replied:

The information is not available, as the provision of Oslo lunches is a voluntary effort on the part of parents' associations and other committees, and there are no departmental statistics regarding effectiveness.

CANNINGTON FIRE STATION.

Manning with Permanent Staff.

Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

(1) Has the Fire Brigades Board given any recent consideration to manning the Cannington fire station with permanent officers and men?

(2) If so, when is it anticipated that the permanent manning of this station will commence?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Early in the Fire Brigades Board's next financial year, which commences on the 1st October, 1957.

ROAD TRANSPORT.

(a) *Interstate Hauliers, Taxing Legislation.*

Mr. EVANS asked the Treasurer:

Will the Government give consideration to enacting legislation, similar to that recently passed in Victoria, and approved by the High Court of Australia, for the purpose of taxing interstate road hauliers?

The TREASURER replied:

This matter will be investigated after an examination of the Victorian legislation and the High Court ruling.

(b) Bridgetown and Boyup Brook to Tone River, Fuel Cartage.

Mr. HEARMAN asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) What are the present arrangements for the cartage of fuel by road from Bridgetown to Tone River?

(2) How much of this cartage is done by the subsidised road haulier from Boyup Brook to Tone River?

(3) How could the tonnage of goods hauled by the subsidised road haulier from Boyup Brook to Tone River be effected by allowing farmers to cart fuel from Cranbrook to Tone River?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Oil company's delivery vehicle.

(2) The subsidised road haulier does not operate from Bridgetown but conveys drum fuel from Boyup Brook to Tone River farms. It is thought that deliveries from Boyup Brook would represent approximately 70 per cent. of the Tone River consumption.

(3) If part of the district requirements were obtained through Cranbrook, there would be a corresponding reduction in supplies from other sources, principally Boyup Brook.

S.P. BETTING.

Turnover, Kalgoorlie and Boulder Shops.

Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Police:

(1) What was the average weekly turnover during the years—

(a) August, 1955, to August, 1956;

(b) August, 1956, to August, 1957; of starting-price bookmakers in Kalgoorlie?

(2) How does the turnover of starting-price bookmakers in Kalgoorlie and Boulder for the week (three feature racing days) during the Goldfields racing round, 1956, compare with that of the same period for the racing round this year?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) (a) £21,942.

(b) £22,427.

(2) 1956—£45,295.

1957—£48,205.

RICE.

Assistance and Yield, Liveringa Project.

Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has finality been reached with regard to assistance to be given to the Liveringa rice project?

(2) What approximate yield is anticipated progressively over the next 10 years, and what markets will be used to dispose of the crops?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Negotiations between Northern Developments Pty. Ltd. and the State are still in progress.

(2) The estimated yield is two tons of paddy rice per acre. During the first five years the estimated annual planting is 1,000 acres, to be increased after the fifth year to 2,000 acres per annum up to the end of the tenth year, with an objective of 4,000 to 5,000 acres in 20 years. The company expects to supply the local market but when production reaches a figure in excess of the local demand, the surplus will be exported, to near Asian countries where it is considered a market is assured.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.

Provision at Serpentine and Jarrahdale.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY asked the Minister for Works:

When is it expected that the towns of Serpentine and Jarrahdale will be supplied with electricity?

The MINISTER replied:

The commission expects to supply Jarrahdale before the end of this financial year and Serpentine before the end of 1958.

HEALTH.

Tuberculosis Control.

Mr. GRAYDEN asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Is it a fact that the Tuberculosis Control Branch has started a second compulsory x-ray survey?

(2) What was the total amount spent on the first compulsory chest x-ray survey?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) It is not practicable to separate the cost of the compulsory x-ray survey from other similar and overlapping functions of the Tuberculosis Control Branch.

RAILWAYS.

(a) Effect of Restriction of Bunbury Service.

Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

Prior to the 22nd July, 1957, public transport between Pinjarra and Bunbury catered for the people in the intervening areas to do their shopping and business transactions in the last-mentioned town, but now, in view of the cut in both rail and bus services, the public cannot travel to and from Bunbury in the one day and have sufficient time in Bunbury to transact their business. In view of the Government's policy on decentralisation, will consideration be given to arranging a schedule so that this much-wanted service is re-instated, even if only on a Friday?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT replied:

The patronage accorded the service from intervening stations could not justify its continuance, particularly in face of demands for economies and charges of railway inefficiency.

(b) *Bunbury Goods Shed Extension.*

Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

Have funds been set aside to permit of the enlargement of the goods shed in Bunbury during this financial year?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT replied:

Yes.

PENSIONS.

Automatic Adjustment of Rates.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY asked the Premier:

(1) Does he still hold the same opinion as he expressed when speaking on the Acts Amendment (Superannuation and Pensions) Bill, on the 13th November, 1951, as reported at page 613 of Hansard, No. 1, 1951, as follows:—

It would be much more satisfactory to the pensioners concerned, at least in a time of rising prices, if provision were made for automatic adjustment of pension rates, scientifically based on alterations in the cost of living?

(2) If so, has the Government given any consideration to the views expressed by the Premier?

(3) If the answer is "Yes," what decision was arrived at?

(4) If consideration has not been given, will he have a decision made in this regard, and advise the House of the decision arrived at during this session?

The PREMIER replied:

A Bill to amend this Act will be introduced in the near future.

DRAINAGE.

(a) *Thornlie Estate, Kenwick.*

Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Is he aware that parts of Thornlie estate, in Spring Road, Kenwick, are under water?

(2) Is he aware that a high-water table is in existence on parts of the land on which houses are erected?

(3) Did the Town Planning Board agree to the land being subdivided for a housing project?

(4) In view of certain moneys being provided under the Commonwealth-State housing agreement, will he investigate these complaints and the complaints in regard to a high-water table?

(5) Will he undertake to have the land drained, which is now suffering from flooding and on which houses have already been erected?

The MINISTER replied:

As the Thornlie estate is a private building project, it does not come within my jurisdiction, and the responsibility of the State Housing Commission ceases with allocation of loan moneys under the provisions of the Commonwealth-State housing agreement, 1956.

(b) *Responsibility for Expenditure of Commonwealth-State Finance.*

Mr. WILD (without notice) asked the Minister for Housing:

Further to my question this afternoon in connection with the Thornlie estate and the use of Commonwealth-State finance, I take it the State is responsible to the Commonwealth Government for the use of that money—am I correct in assuming from his answer that he or the Government accepts no responsibility whatever for the way in which the money is being spent?

The MINISTER replied:

I would assume that if the State Housing Commission had evidence of the public moneys, which have been passed to the building societies and made available to individual applicants, being spent in such a manner as to in any way jeopardise the security, it would immediately take the matter up with the building society concerned, but such matters as rising water levels in the metropolitan area and elsewhere, unfortunately, are not isolated. In many cases there are temporary difficulties, but, with better local drainage, the tillage of the soil and some application by the occupants of homes, the position is eased. It is true that the Housing Commission, and indeed I as Minister, have some, shall I say, unofficial knowledge of certain difficulties that are confronting the people in the settlement at Thornlie, but officially, for the reasons given earlier, I have no knowledge of the situation and neither do I think it is necessary for the Housing Commission to intervene in any way.

FREMANTLE RAILWAY BRIDGE.

Reports on Siting of New Structure.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is he aware that in Messrs. Dumas and Brisbane's report (on page 11) regarding a new railway bridge at Fremantle, they said:

The siting of the railway bridge just below the Highway bridge would not interfere with the business centre, and would necessitate the resumption of only a few residences?

(2) Is he aware that, on page 28 of Colonel Tydeman's report on the railway bridge alongside the traffic bridge, Colonel Tydeman said:

The scheme is feasible purely from the engineering side but not from the operating angle. The disturbance of the north side of the river would be considerable and almost as much as the Point Brown scheme?

(3) Is he also aware that a conference held in July, 1952, had this to say:

If the bridge were removed up to the traffic bridge, North Fremantle would be cut up to such an extent that land development of the whole area would be stultified?

(4) Is he also aware that Colonel Tydeman, in a report to his Minister on the 18th December, 1952, said:

Owing to the silting of berths in the harbour the trust experienced difficulties in the berthing of ships of a certain draft, and if they decided on the half-baked scheme of moving the railway bridge up to the traffic bridge for six berths in addition to the one which has now commenced, within a few years the railway bridge would have to be re-sited again?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) (2) and (3) Yes.

(4) No. But I am aware that Mr. Tydeman as a signatory to the report issued on the 16th July, 1954, by the inter-departmental committee appointed by Cabinet to consider the question of the extension of the Fremantle harbour said:

We are agreed that the additional wharfage accommodation can be most quickly, safely and economically provided by extending the existing harbour facilities upstream as far as the road bridge by constructing five new berths. The addition of these berths to the existing ones should be the limit of the extension of the harbour upstream.

GOLDMINING.

Aluminium Therapy.

Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Has any recent investigation been carried out to further ascertain the effect of aluminium therapy treatment on gold-miners in this State?

(2) If not, did the last findings indicate that the treatment would be satisfactory?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) An analysis of the results of medical examinations is made each year and the report for 1956-57 is now in preparation.

(2) Only minor changes in the rate of advance of silicosis have been noted and these are not regarded as conclusive evidence.

AGENT GENERAL.

Appointment of Minister for Lands.

Hon. D. BRAND (without notice) asked the Premier:

Assuming that the Press report is correct that the Minister for Lands has been appointed Agent General for this State, can he indicate when the appointment will be taken up in London?

The PREMIER replied:

I would say it is not correct for any newspaper to report that the Minister for Lands has been appointed as Agent General, nor would it be correct for any person to say that. The Government has asked the Minister for Lands whether he would be prepared to accept appointment and he has indicated that he would be prepared to do so. In those circumstances, the Government will follow the normal and proper course and make a recommendation to the Governor-in-Executive Council that the Minister for Lands be appointed to the position.

TRAFFIC.

Goldfields Taxi Rates.

Mr. EVANS (without notice) asked the Minister for Transport:

Will he please state when the recently approved taxi rates for the Goldfields will apply?

The MINISTER replied:

It is anticipated that the amendments to the traffic regulations, which cover the permissible charges outside the metropolitan area, will be approved by Executive Council next week and I am hopeful that they will be gazetted on Friday of next week.

GENERAL REVENUE ESTIMATES.

Date of Introduction.

Hon. D. BRAND (without notice) asked the Treasurer:

Has he now any more definite idea of when he will introduce his General Revenue Estimates?

The TREASURER replied:

Yes, I hope to introduce them on Thursday of this week.

TIMBER TRANSPORT.

Prevention of Accidents.

Mr. NALDER (without notice) asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is it his intention to take action with regard to the accident which occurred on Saturday night?

(2) In view of the fact that a number of accidents have occurred involving timber transport, does he intend to take any action in an endeavour to reduce the number of such accidents that are occurring?

The MINISTER replied:

Action is being taken constantly in an endeavour to minimise, or entirely prevent, accidents which occur, very often with fatal results. The traffic regulations are sufficiently comprehensive to enable enforcement, or action to be taken, against people who offend. I must confess that I have not the details of the accident that the member for Katanning has in mind; for instance, as to whether the vehicle was properly illuminated and other such considerations. But I have no doubt that the police traffic authorities will thoroughly investigate the matter and take proper action.

BILLS (3)—RETURNED.

1. Health Act Amendment.
With amendments.
2. Trustees Act Amendment.
3. Audit Act Amendment.
Without amendment.

BILL—STATE TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

In Committee.

Resumed from the 5th September. Mr. Moir in the Chair; the Minister for Transport in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported after Clause 5 had been agreed to.

Clause 6—First Schedule amended:

Hon. A. F. WATTS: This is the major clause of the Bill and one which proposes to effect the greatest alterations to the existing position under the Act of 1933. I oppose the whole clause.

Hon. D. Brand: Hear, hear!

Hon. A. F. WATTS: It would not be any use my moving an amendment that would suit the idea I have in mind. In fact, in some of the paragraphs of the Bill, I cannot imagine any amendment that would be satisfactory to move at all. The whole business has been fully discussed on the second reading but this is the time and place for us to make our final protest about the passage of this clause. I oppose the clause and I hope the Committee will reject it.

Mr. BOVELL: I join with the Leader of the Country Party in opposing this clause in its entirety. It is a dragnet clause which will virtually prevent the primary producer particularly from having any discretion in carrying his own goods. Carriage of livestock is of great importance to primary producers. The member for Harvey has said that if people from the

Augusta-Margaret River area wished to catch the stock market at Midland Junction, they would have to load their stock on trucks as far as Busselton on Friday morning, which would mean they would be on the way for the whole of Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

This clause also deals with the carriage of timber and honey. The Minister for Agriculture asked how the beekeepers would be penalised. If he consults the official statement by the beekeepers section in the "Farmers' Weekly" of the 22nd August, he will see how this will handicap the beekeepers. The whole clause should be opposed, but I will be prepared to support suitable amendments. I have no doubt the member for Blackwood will outline the reasons for the amendments he has on the notice paper.

Mr. HEARMAN: I, too, feel that this clause embodies the main substance of the Bill. Because our attitude to the measure has been one of opposition, it follows therefore that we wish to oppose this clause. The Minister would be well advised to have a look at its provisions before proceeding further with the clause because it seems to me from the wording that a situation would be created which the Minister does not intend.

For instance, if a farmer has a subsidised road haulier operating outside his property, he cannot cart anything on his vehicle outside his own property, that is, if I read paragraph (b) of the proposed new Clause 1 correctly. I would like to hear the Minister on this point. Further, the provision concerning timber could cause considerable trouble and possibly unemployment. Members should oppose this clause.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: Needless to say I anticipated opposition to the proposals contained in this clause. If members consider the problem seriously instead of trying to magnify it beyond all reasonable proportions for the purpose of making a point, then we might get somewhere. I daresay we are all guilty of adopting that attitude at times. If the member for Blackwood would have some regard to the Act, he would see that among other things Section 34 says that no licence shall be necessary in respect of any goods vehicle which operates within a radius of 20 miles from the place of business of the owner. He will see immediately that the objection he has raised is by no means valid.

I read the statement issued by the Beekeepers' Association and I want to state definitely that I am not impressed by it. For the life of me, I can see no great inconvenience or hardship to the beekeepers if they are required to send what I may term the finished product by rail instead of transporting it 50, 100 or 200 miles in their own vehicles. They

will still be free to move around the timbered country with their beehives and other equipment and to carry any of these appliances from place to place. The only restriction will be in connection with tins or drums of honey and tins or drums of beeswax. Even there, it is well known that the Transport Board issues very many licences every day of the week, having regard to the type of commodity or goods people seek to transport—also having regard to the locality and nature of the district to which, or from which, they desire to haul goods.

Hon. D. Brand: In view of the fact that it only means £10,000 if all this went on the railways, is it not a wrong approach if the industry considers it a hardship and inconvenience?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: If we approach the matter in that way, in order to be logical and consistent, we must give way, as legislators, so far as the products from any other section of the community are concerned. For instance, a person in any type of business in the metropolitan area could establish, in certain respects, that it suited his convenience to transport from here to another centre by road instead of by rail.

Hon. D. Brand: The beekeepers already enjoy that exemption.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: That is so, but I think that interjection overlooks entirely the dire stress of the Railway Department, its finances and their impact upon the finance and economy of the State. I immediately concede that perhaps no one of the reforms set out in this legislation will, of itself, do a great deal in the direction of assisting the finances of the Railway Department, but all of them together, in addition to other steps which are being taken, can have some sort of corrective effect upon the existing situation. Surely nobody is going to argue regarding the necessity of that!

Mr. Nalder: What is the position of the beekeeper so far as empty containers are concerned?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: In what way?

Mr. Nalder: Is he to pick them up at the rail point nearest to where he is operating?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: It would be easier and more convenient for him to deliver full tins and pick up empty tins from the rail centre, a comparatively few miles away, rather than to come to Perth—say, 200 miles away—in order to do that same thing. His depot for loading and unloading full and empty drums will be nearer to his scene of operations. His hardships will be no different from those suffered by other sections of the community at the present time. What astounds me to a very great extent is that

the very people who are protesting about the desire of the Government, in the interests of the railways, to compel these people to make greater use of the system, are the same folk who were complaining bitterly a few months ago about any proposal advanced for a cessation of railway operations.

Mr. Bovell: Our opposition is to monopolies in this regard.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: If we use a catchcry in respect of various propositions, that does not answer the question of whether the primary producers want the railways or not. They apparently want to use them in respect of certain selected commodities, which are carried at in the vicinity of half-price. I have already said that if Parliament agrees to these proposals, the primary producers will still be the favoured section of the community. They will be permitted to carry livestock, poultry, fruit, vegetables and other perishable farm produce, including dairy produce, by road if they so desire.

Mr. Bovell: Only if they have their own vehicles, and small people cannot afford them.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: That provision is in the Act at the present time.

Mr. Bovell: But the Minister has already admitted it was never policed. He said that at the second reading stage.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I said nothing of the sort. I said exemptions have been granted by the Transport Board, but these are concessions in excess of what is laid down in the Act itself and could be withdrawn tomorrow, without reference to Parliament. I say to members of the Opposition—not by threat, as it has not been considered by the Government at this stage—that if Parliament adopts an irresponsible attitude in connection with this Bill, the Government will perhaps be forced to use the only means at its disposal for the purpose of providing more revenue for the railways.

Mr. Bovell: That is a threat.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: No, it is not a threat. The Government has not even considered the matter; neither have I made any submission to Cabinet in connection with it. The purpose is to submit a piece of legislation in order to see what is the will of Parliament in connection with it. If Parliament rejects the legislation, the Government will be compelled to look at every means by which it can, to a greater or lesser degree, achieve the same objective. I ask all members to give some consideration to that aspect.

So far as the transport of livestock is concerned, I want to state clearly and definitely that I am at a loss to understand the point of view expressed by those

one would be pardoned for believing are speaking on behalf of primary producers. The story, as we have heard it in this Chamber, is that it is unsatisfactory to haul livestock by rail on account of the time factor and, because of that, the loss of condition or bloom, in respect of the stock when marketed. The point is overlooked that probably all livestock sold in the metropolitan area are transported by road over short distances, but for the longer hauls, railway haulage is used. Therefore, if there is anything in regard to the time factor, surely it would be of greater importance for stock that came from 150 or 200 miles from the market!

Mr. I. W. Manning: When I tried to tell you that, you reckoned I was in a kindergarten class.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: The member for Harvey would well be advised to remain silent in this matter.

Hon. A. F. Watts: That is what you told him.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I am aware of what I told him, and in respect of what. Therefore, if the farmers choose the railways as against road haulage for longer distances, it surely demonstrates that the time factor is not the prime consideration. We know perfectly well—and I am certain members of the Opposition will admit it, if not in this Chamber—that rail transport is used for long haulages because of the cheap freight as compared with the cost of road transport, notwithstanding that the comparison sounds favourable, so far as the railways are concerned for shorter distances, because of the lesser freight payable, but farmers still choose to use road vehicles for the short runs.

Therefore, if we are honest in the matter, it is not the time that the animals will be spending in rail trucks or any other type of vehicle between the farm and market that matters; it is the question of cost. Farmers choose to use the railways when they get freights at bargain prices. When will the back of the workers of East Perth be broken? Somebody is carrying the difference between the true cost of the haulage, and the haulage over the long distances, which is done at less than cost.

Mr. Nalder: It would be someone who is taking the advantage of it.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: Advantage of what?

Mr. Nalder: You just mentioned the backs of the people of East Perth.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: Someone is bearing the difference.

Mr. Nalder: Who is?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: The general community, of which the workers of East Perth are not an inconspicuous part.

The Premier: You will get on!

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I think, for the time being, that touches on the principal points raised. In respect of the question of the haulage of livestock, I made certain inquiries of the Railway Department and I was informed that a special train could be assembled within two hours of its being ordered. Stock loaded at my old home town, Narrogin, could, for instance, be at the Midland markets within 11 hours. In other words, if loaded at 7.30 p.m., one day it could, before 6.30 the next morning, be in the Midland markets.

I have a report from the Railways Commission in which it is pointed out that many of the new-type wagons introduced are unsurpassed in Australia, and livestock firms have expressed their satisfaction with these new vehicles. The introduction of diesel locomotives has permitted great improvements in transit times and many timetables for livestock movement have been remodelled. It is reliably estimated that from December to August, approximately 50 per cent. of the livestock wagons remain idle. These wagons represent a large amount of capital and it is essential from the economic aspect that an improvement in the position be effected.

If I remember aright, these vehicles were, in the main, ordered by the McCarty-Watts Government. The contracts were then let, but naturally it took some while before all the vehicles were ready for use.

Hon. D. Brand: Have any more been ordered since?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I am unable to answer that. But the fact is that the Government, or Governments, have provided, at tremendous cost, efficient vehicles for the haulage of livestock. There are tens or hundreds of thousands of pounds worth of livestock vehicles lying unused. As the Commissioner of Railways points out, for the greater part of the year, only 50 per cent. are used and these were built for the haulage of farmers' livestock.

But, I repeat, if we agree to the provisions of the Bill, the farmers will still be permitted to haul their livestock by road, but there would be some restriction on what they will be able to take with them on the return journey.

Hon. D. Brand: A prohibition, I think.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: Not a prohibition or anything like it.

Hon. D. Brand: What will they be able to take back?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: All their groceries, wearing apparel and appliances that are used domestically in the home.

Hon. A. F. Watts: That is not in the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: No, but it is in the Act which is the main thing.

Hon. A. F. Watts: It was in the schedule, but you have taken it out.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: It has been taken out because it is redundant. The exemptions to which I have made reference apply today as they have applied since the Act first became law, with respect to every section of the community.

Hon. A. F. Watts: Will you give us the section in the Act which governs that?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: Yes, I will even do that. The Act provides that, subject to the exceptions stated, a commercial goods vehicle shall not operate on any road unless such vehicle is licensed. What does "operate" mean? As applied to vehicles, it means—

to carry or offer to carry passengers or goods for hire or for any consideration, or in the course of or in connection with any trade or business whatever.

Hon. A. F. Watts: Is not farming a business?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: Yes, it is, and a farmer who sought on the return journey to take back with him plant, machinery or building materials for his sheds, etc., would be regarded as indulging in the haulage of goods for his business. But, to my knowledge, no one has been apprehended, whether he be a city or a country dweller, for taking a stock of groceries home for himself, or blankets, clothing or other requirements for his home. Neither have people been apprehended for hauling, as we know they do round holiday time, such things as tents, dingies, fishing boats, etc. They are not required for a business or in association with a business.

These things have been going on for the last 24 years and they will continue to go on, because they will not be interfered with in any way whatsoever. In other words, the farmer will, if this measure becomes law, enjoy by Act of Parliament, the same privileges as every other section of the community in respect of his domestic requirements, but so far as his business requirements are concerned, there will be certain limitations, but limitations that do not compare with those imposed on every other section of the community.

Mr. Hearman: What is the position of the chap who takes a few spare parts back in his car?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I think that is a question of sweet reasonableness.

Mr. Hearman: Maybe, but we would like to know where we stand. What is the position if a man takes some ploughshares back?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I would say that the carting of a few odd bolts and nuts would not be regarded as an infringement of the Act any more than, at the present moment, there is a restriction, shall I say, on any business people in the city of Perth. I suppose if someone took a few bits and pieces in his car to a country centre, even if he were apprehended by a Transport Board inspector, nothing would happen. What is sought are the flagrant breaches, particularly where large tonnages are involved. The whole spirit of the Act has been one, surely, of endeavouring to make our transport system work as smoothly as possible, with a modicum of commonsense applied.

We could all, I suppose, point to isolated cases, of traffic inspectors having gone to excesses, and I suppose we could point to policemen having done the wrong thing from time to time. But one swallow does not make a summer, and neither does a bit of over-zealousness on the part of one officer necessarily make any statute or proposal faulty.

Finally, I ask members to give serious consideration to this. I am certain that, as I resume my seat, members will have a totally different impression of what the restrictions will be and what the possibilities are as against the far-fetched ideas which they gave vent to as recently as last week.

Mr. BOVELL: In one breath the Minister says the Bill is necessary to improve the finances in the railways, and in the next he says it will not make one iota of difference to the farmers of the State.

The Minister for Transport: I did not say that.

Mr. BOVELL: Yes, the Minister did. He finished on that note.

The Minister for Transport: No.

Mr. BOVELL: The Minister said that the conditions had been existing for the last 24 years and the fact was that the primary producers would be able to carry exactly what they are carrying now.

The Minister for Transport: I did not say that.

Mr. BOVELL: The Minister gave that impression.

The Minister for Transport: For his domestic use, yes; for his business, no.

Hon. D. Brand: You said we had made a song and dance about nothing, last week.

Mr. BOVELL: That is so. The Minister has created the impression that this does not affect the primary producer one iota and that everything will be all right. Well, it will not be all right so far as the primary producer is concerned.

The Minister for Transport: Explain how that is.

Mr. BOVELL: The producers are quite willing to use the railways, and they want to use them, but they believe service must be given. The Government has curtailed 842 miles of line—or will have curtailed nearly that length when the Elleker line is closed.

Hon. D. Brand: Is it going to be closed?

The Minister for Transport: There are three weeks to go.

Mr. BOVELL: However, 842 miles of line have been virtually closed, but no economies in the railway system are evident. I do not believe what the Minister is apparently trying to say. In my opinion, the real purpose of the Bill, and this clause in particular, is to make the farmer pay for the railways so that the status quo can be maintained without any reorganisation. There should, in a service which has lost a quarter of its activities, be certain economies and restrictions effected, but the Government has not shown in one instance that economies have been effected.

The Minister for Transport: The member for Bunbury does not seem to like certain economies being provided for on the Perth-Bunbury line.

Mr. BOVELL: None of us do, and I believe there is no necessity to make economies if efficiency is the keynote of organisation, and true competition between rail and road transport is allowed to proceed. That is the secret of our transport success.

The Minister for Transport: You mean 6d. per ton mile for wheat and fertiliser by rail the same as by road.

Mr. BOVELL: I do not mean anything of the sort; I mean true competition without creating a monopoly, which is what the Bill will do. Not only will this measure safeguard the service that is operating now, but the same—if not more—staff and overhead costs apply today as when the railway system was 25 per cent. greater than it is today. So the Minister should admit that this clause will have a far-reaching effect on the economy of the primary producers. If he were honest with the Committee, he would withdraw the Bill.

The Minister for Transport: I think you ought to withdraw that statement. You said "honest with the Committee". I hope I am that, even if we have a difference of opinion.

Mr. BOVELL: I do not mean to reflect on the Minister's personal integrity.

The Minister for Transport: Thank you!

Mr. BOVELL: I mean that if the Government sets its mind to creating transport systems which would be competitive, so that there would not be a monopoly, the State would be better served.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I was interested in the Minister's remarks about the use of the word "operate" and the requirements of Section 33 in regard to commercial goods vehicles. If he is going to base the right of farmers—I use them as an example, because the schedule we are amending deals more particularly with them—to carry things for domestic use on the return journey, on the connotation of the word "operate" in this legislation, he will get matters very involved indeed. I say that because during the greater part of the 24 years to which he has referred, nobody has ever thought that he had the right which the Minister alleges he now has, to carry such domestic requirements without interference from the Transport Board.

Nor did the Minister's remarks last Thursday contribute to that idea because he certainly gave the Committee to understand that this legislation, if passed, would greatly contribute to the salvation of a certain country storekeeper to whom he referred who was troubled, according to the Minister, because groceries and suchlike for domestic use, were being carried by road whereas he was compelled to carry them by rail. He gave us distinctly to understand that the provisions of this Bill would, at least to a considerable extent, remedy that potion. Now he proceeds to tell us that in view of the definition of the word "operate" in the parent Act, and the provisions of section 33, that would not be the case.

Those two parts of the Act were in it when the First Schedule was approved by the legislature, and if what the Minister says is correct, why was it necessary to have those words in the schedule? It says—

and on the return journey the carriage of requisites for the domestic use of such producer.

Why was it necessary to have those words in the First Schedule?

The Minister for Transport: Because it went a little further than that. You read the next few words.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: All right. It says—
or for use by him in the production of the commodities herein named.

We are not worried about that. We are asking about groceries and clothing.

The Minister for Transport: As a lawyer, you will know that where things are stated specifically, those which are not stated are thereby excluded.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I believe it will put people in the position of having to argue technicalities to get out of something which the law already enables them to do and which this new paragraph in the Bill could have enabled them to do with the addition of four or five words. I would like to quote to the Minister some words which he used in support of a proposal to close the railways. Those words did not give me—and I am sure they gave no other member in this Chamber—any impression that we were going to have a Bill of this nature this session. By the use of such persuasive argument, the Minister induced members here and in another place to agree to that rail closure motion.

On the 30th November last year, at page 2818 of Hansard, the Minister said—

There are numerous advantages pertaining to road transport that appeal to the public. It may be all right for us to theorise or say that our railways are consuming local fuel whereas road transport requires imported fuel, but the point is that the public are desirous of using road transport—

and here I come to the point in which I am particularly interested because the Minister went on to say—

and I very much doubt whether members of Parliament can forever and a day adopt the role of King Canute in an endeavour to hold back the waves of progress.

I suggest it is the very opposite of what he is doing today. On the one hand, he induces the Legislature to agree to the closing of 800 miles of railway line, by using that argument, and some nine months afterwards he comes here and says, "We will cut out road transport." Nine months ago, that very thing was holding back the waves of progress. I hope the Minister will not leave this business on the basis of technicality, because if he does, I think some steps should be taken to make the position clear in the schedule.

Hon. D. BRAND: The point was made during the second reading that if the Minister were to police this Act as effectively as he evidently desired, he would require a much greater force of inspectors than he has at present. He assured us that not one extra man would be employed. In my opinion, unless he employs a few more, he will have as much chance of success as King Canute had with his venture, because he will have no hope of policing the Act. The Minister read from a file in which the commissioner said that the railways could prepare a livestock train within two hours. Prior to that the Minister stated that the farmer was taking advantage in the long haul of stock by using the train, but that he wanted to use road transport for the shorter hauls.

As I have travelled around the State, I have found stock being brought from Carnamah, 191 miles away, and Coorow, 170 miles away. The people in the Great Southern have made repeated applications to the Transport Board for licences to bring stock to market, but the point has not yet been conceded. However, stock has come by road from Mt. Barker and from the eastern wheat belt, distances of 100 miles or more. That disproves the Minister's claim that the farmer uses road transport only for the short hauls. The reason why he uses road transport is because he finds it is a convenient way of transporting his stock. He is able to load the stock in the paddock on his farm and take it direct to the abattoir or saleyards.

As regards the undertaking of the Railways Commission that a train could be prepared for the carriage of livestock in two hours, I would like to ask why the commission has not been busy and provided the trains in competition with road transport, particularly if the freight is so cheap, compared with road transport, and the time required so short? I am sure the farmer would be only too pleased to use it if that were the case.

The Minister for Transport: What induces him to bring it by road is that he can take back a commodity like fuel, with high freight rates, virtually without any freight costs at all.

Hon. D. BRAND: That is not always the case.

The Minister for Transport: Not always.

Hon. D. BRAND: The farmer does it because, in the first place, he finds it more convenient and he can cart his stock by road more efficiently. With other members, I attended a protest meeting at Kojonup and there the whole emphasis was on their being allowed to cart stock by road to Perth. No mention was made of back-loading.

The Railways Commission has said that it can provide a train at short notice. When we were the Government we were concerned that so much wheat and super was being carted by road and we asked the commission why it could not cart these goods. We were told that the railways did not have sufficient motive power. We provided motive power of one kind or another, and we then asked why wheat was still going by road. We were told that the railways did not have sufficient rollingstock. We provided extra rollingstock and then the excuse was "Not enough experienced men to drive the trains and to act as firemen." A special bureau was set up and men were trained. At about the time there was a change of Government, we asked "What now?" and the commission said, "The track is no good."

Mr. Rodoreda: You can't win!

Hon. D. BRAND: No. That is a true story, and I remember it well.

Mr. Bovell: If you asked them now, they would say the Government is no good.

Hon. D. BRAND: Some of them would. Nevertheless, they are the hard, cold facts, and I view with some reservation the claim by the Railways Commission, especially at this stage, that it can do anything in particular. As the member for Vasse pointed out, the Minister said that we were making a great song and dance and using our imagination regarding the penalties that would be imposed on country people. He indicated that they were negligible and that the Government was making only minor amendments. If they are only minor amendments, why disturb the equilibrium of these people? Why impose further restrictions upon them, because it is difficult in any case to get enough people to live in the country and to be content to stay there?

In introducing this legislation the Minister is, to say the least, discouraging country settlement and residents remaining in country districts. The emphasis in legislation of this nature should be laid on the avoidance of restrictions and on discouraging people from coming to settle in the metropolitan area. I oppose this clause, which is really the focal point of the whole legislation.

Mr. HEARMAN: The Minister has stated that the workers of East Perth were carrying the farmers on their backs. In that event, they could be carrying other sections of the community on their backs, because the country railway services are not the only ones operating at a loss. If the Minister were to be correct, he would say that the taxpayers throughout Australia were footing the railway deficits.

The Premier: The loan funds are carrying a great deal of the burden.

Mr. HEARMAN: To suggest that the city dweller is subsidising the farmer in respect of rail transport is to misrepresent the position completely, and I cannot accept that as the need for introducing this Bill. The Minister said that the farmer only used the railways for long haulages of stock, and not for short journeys. I am not disputing that fact. I would point out that in the transport of stock, the question of mileage is not as important as the time factor. If 50 miles have to be covered and it takes the railway service two days to do so, that is of no use to the farmer who wants to send stock to Midland Junction.

I have been told by farmers in the Dinninup area that when they load stock on Monday for the Midland Junction sales, it does not arrive there until Wednesday. Here again it is not a question of distance but the time involved. I understand that

improvements have been made in the service. In the lower South-West there is no prospect of getting stock into the Monday sale at Midland Junction by rail transport because that service does not fit in with all sale days. If farmers were to take advantage of a particular sale, they would have to transport their stock by road.

The whole question of stock transport is bound up with back-loading. If the railways cannot give a satisfactory service economically, I cannot see the objection to the farmer being permitted to handle the transport in the best way he can, that is, to send his stock to reach Midland by Monday and to back-load. The farmers cannot be blamed if they avail themselves of this form of transport. They should not be criticised and disparaged for doing that. It is the sensible thing. I do not see the need for putting farmers to additional expense in the transport of stock, as will be brought about by this Bill.

Last week I asked questions, the answers to which, showed that for one particular area the cartage of fuel by rail cost 132s. a ton, whereas by other means of transport it could be carted for 69s. a ton. We should remember that the farmers of this State must compete with the farmers overseas. They should be able to cut their costs as much as possible if they are not to be placed at a disadvantage. I can assure the Minister that the electors of East Perth will be affected if the farmers are so placed at a disadvantage.

The suggestion that the Railway Department is able to assemble a stock train in two hours does not impress me, because, with few exceptions farmers do not want special trains. The average farmer sends forward only a couple of trucks on a regular scheduled service. The rapid transport of stock on the railways should be examined further. I am not satisfied from inquiries in my electorate that the best use is made of the existing railway facilities. With the track rehabilitation carried out in the South-West, train No. 56 could pull out at midnight instead of 10 p.m.; this would mean two more hours of loading time. The Government should give attention to that sort of thing and should endeavour to provide a service which is to the advantage of the farmer.

If the Minister were to study the position he would find that, in regard to perishables being transported, the farmers in the South-West have supported the railways since the inauguration of a good service. Since the improvement of the service for the transport of fruit, no request has been made to the Transport Board for cartage by road, except in cases where growers have been charged £50 for taking a truck on to the Fremantle wharf during the week-end. When such charges are made, road transport becomes a more attractive proposition.

The Minister for Agriculture: There is a good railway service for fruit freight in the South-West.

Mr. HEARMAN: I am aware of that. It proves the point that if the railways provide a good service, restrictions will not be necessary. The exemption to cart perishables will not affect the fruit growers.

The Minister for Transport: Then move to delete it from the clause.

Mr. HEARMAN: I do not intend to, otherwise the department would be able to charge the growers £50 for a truckload to the wharf on Sundays. In many cases, the services to the metropolitan area have been improved, and since then there has been no complaint nor has there been as much pressure for road transport permits. This problem is not bound up with the loyalty of farmers. They are affected by the economics of the situation. If they cannot get the service they require from the railways, then they should be entitled to use other forms of transport. They should be permitted to take advantage of as economical a form of transport as possible, that is, to cart by road and to back-load.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I am concerned at the lack of appreciation by the Minister as to the road transport of stock. Stock is, in the main, taken to Midland Junction by two forms of transport—in the farmer's own vehicle, or by engaging a carrier to cart the stock. The farmer who back-loads invariably takes the stock to Midland Junction in his own vehicle. The commercial carrier who carts the stock to Midland is not permitted to back-load. The Bill is not concerned with back-loading by carriers, but the Minister is.

For my part, I am disappointed that he did not make some comment on the specific cases reported to him about farmers from Augusta, Margaret River and Nannup carting their own stock to Midland, or engaging a carrier to do so. It is the intention of the Minister to force farmers in those areas to transport their stock by loading them at the nearest railhead. In this case, it is Busselton. To expect farmers to load cattle for the Monday's sale on the previous Friday at Busselton is beyond all reason. I would ask the Minister to make some comment on this aspect.

If this restriction applies to farmers in the areas I mentioned, it must also apply to farmers similarly placed in other parts of the State. The Minister has challenged us to give specific instances where people would be disadvantaged, and I have referred to a very obvious case.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I might mention for the edification of the member for Harvey and others that in the

past 12 months, apart from annual exemptions and licences, special licences have been granted for something in excess of 5,000,000 ton miles by the Transport Board.

Mr. Hearman: That is, 5,000,000 pennies which the Government has saved on train operations.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: That freight has been lost to the railways. That exemption was granted by the Transport Board in the exercise of its discretion after certain factors had been taken into account.

Mr. Hearman: If the railways had hauled that freight, the deficit would have been greater.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: That is not so.

Mr. Hearman: That is according to the answers you have given.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: Not even that.

Mr. Hearman: According to your answers, you said that the department lost one penny for every ton mile of railway operation.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: Somehow it does not occur to the member for Blackwood that there are certain overhead charges which go on even if no trains were running. He is confusing himself with working expenses as against the total expenditure of the railway system. It would be possible to lose on the earnings as against the working expenses. It might also be possible to make a profit under those circumstances, but when the administration charges, interest and depreciation are taken into account, then there might be a loss. Those factors affect to a large extent the loss, whether there be frequent or infrequent services operating. In many cases that makes a difference.

With regard to the transport of livestock, I shall read a portion of a report made to me only a few weeks ago by the chairman of the Transport Board based on statistics in great detail which had been taken out in connection with livestock arriving at the Midland Junction sales. It refers to the livestock exemption introduced in 1948, and is as follows:—

Since the livestock exemption was introduced several years ago a check has been made each year on the numbers coming into the metropolitan area by road and rail. After the exemption was gazetted it was found that the bulk of stock originating within a radius of 100 miles was transported by road. But beyond that area the numbers were in favour of rail transport.

Apparently the time factor does not matter when there is a terrific amount of time.

During the next year or so, it was found that road transport had extended to places up to 120 miles radius, but since that date there has been no material alteration in the area from which stock is hauled by rail and road respectively.

There is a short report based on tables which can be seen and which deals with every little railway siding in Western Australia. It shows that for the long distances where the time factor would be not less than twice what it would be by road haulage, the farmers prefer to rail. So in those cases the time factor is of less consequence because of the attractiveness of the cheap freight based on the telescopic system employed by the Railway Department.

Mr. Owen: There is still a lot of stock from those distances.

THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: That is so. It is not true to say that all the stock within 100 miles or 80 miles or 50 miles of the metropolitan area comes by road, because some is transported by rail. But overall, in the great majority of cases, within a radius of 100 to 120 miles of the markets, it comes by road, and beyond that distance the great percentage comes by rail; and it should be plain why that is so.

I did not frame the original statute, but I have discussed this question of the domestic requirements of farmers with the Transport Board. As a matter of fact, when the first bells were ringing at 4.25 p.m. today, I was concluding a 20-minute telephone conversation with the chairman of the board in respect of that very matter. He assured me that that had been the position all the way through. It has been examined and is covered by the statute. If we remove this automatic permission to the primary producer to load goods on the return journey for the purposes of his business, there is no requirement to state specifically that he can take them for his domestic use.

As I interjected previously, if for a certain section there is a specific or additional concession, and it is merely stated in that form, it can be interpreted as being the only concession applicable to that section. I hazard the guess that when the statute was drawn up over 20 years ago, that was laid down so that there would not be confusion; that the farmer would be permitted to transport his goods for domestic use, the same as every other section of the community, but, in addition, should be permitted to transport goods by road for the purpose of his business.

The effect of these words now becoming redundant is that he may continue, in common with everybody else, to transport goods by road without let or hindrance for his domestic requirements; but for the

purpose of his business, other than those specifically stated in the clause we are considering, he shall be subject to the same limitations as every other section of the community. Also, at all times there will be available to him this matter of a special licence granted to him by the board after taking into account all the considerations, in the same way as the board has been issuing licences every year, and has done so ever since it came into being.

So if we take one by one the objections that have been raised and analyse them, it will be found that there is not this great detriment to the farming community that was made out. It will be inconvenient to the primary producer to some extent. He will have to meet additional costs; there is no disputing that. Fuel is one of the higher-priced commodities. I cannot say off-hand what it is per ton mile; but let us say it is 8d. Naturally, as he is returning with an empty vehicle, he could transport that fuel for nothing or next to nothing; and he prefers to do that.

But anybody in business in a country centre who comes to town cannot stock his vehicle with fuel for business purposes. Only the farmer can do that; and as the railways are being retained basically because of the tonnages for the primary producer, surely he has some obligation to those railways, not merely to use them for the lower-freight goods, which are being carted at less than cost, and please himself in connection with the higher-freight goods! Surely he has an obligation to give the railways an opportunity to have a balanced programme of carting goods in both directions, both low-freight and high-freight! As every other section of the community is compelled to do that, I cannot see why farmers should not also be compelled to do so from the point of view of the extremity in which the Railway Department's finances find themselves at present.

Mr. BOVELL: I move—

That progress be reported.

The Minister for Works: What for?

Mr. BOVELL: Because the Minister wants time to have a look at this matter.

The Minister for Transport: I think the Minister has got you flabbergasted.

Motion put and a division called for.

Remarks During Division.

The Minister for Works: You will have your little fun!

Mr. Bovell: By jove, you are a reformed character!

The Minister for Works: There is more joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth!

Division Resumed.

Division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	18
Noes	24

Majority against 6

Ayes.

Mr. Ackland	Mr. W. Manning
Mr. Bovell	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Court	Mr. Owen
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. I. Manning

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Gaffy	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Graham	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. Hall	Mr. Potter
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Heal	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Toms
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Kelly	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Pairs.

<i>Ayes.</i>	<i>Noes.</i>
Mr. Perkins	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Oldfield	Mr. Sewell

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. BOVELL: I moved that motion because I was not satisfied that enough members on the Government side were taking sufficient interest in this debate. For some time in the last hour during the discussion of this measure—which is most important to the country—the Government benches have been almost empty except for one or two in the front.

Mr. Lawrence: Rubbish!

Hon. D. Brand: It is not rubbish.

Mr. BOVELL: There has been less than a quorum on the Government side. I know what would have been the position in this Committee, if we had been discussing legislation affecting industrial workers.

The Premier: You would have been in the dining-room having a cup of tea.

Mr. BOVELL: I might remind the Premier that I do not have tea between meals.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must discuss the clause.

Mr. BOVELL: I feel that the clause is so important that there should be a full attendance of members.

Mr. NALDER: I thought that the Minister would accept the proposal by the member for Vasse that progress be reported, because I feel he is getting further into the mire than ever, and especially after having listened to his speech on Thursday and compared it with what

he has said today. I think he should give more consideration to this measure before it goes any further.

On Thursday he was very perturbed about the position of country storekeepers and read a letter from one of them. He pointed out that this grocer was concerned about the fact that farmers were coming to Perth and carting back their domestic requirements, thus putting men out of business in the country; and because the farmer had an advantage enjoyed by no other section, it was time some action was taken.

Today the Minister has gone to some pains to tell us that even as late as when the first bells were ringing today, he had been discussing with the chairman of the Transport Board what the farmer could still cart from the city and what he could not cart. The Minister can correct me if I am wrong, but I understood him to state that the farmer will still be allowed to cart back to his property goods for his domestic requirements. Is that correct?

The Minister for Transport: Yes.

Mr. NALDER: I am very pleased that the Minister has said that. If he is not careful, he will get himself into a bigger tangle than ever.

The Minister for Transport: The Minister will look after himself.

Mr. NALDER: I am pleased to hear that.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. NALDER: Before tea we were discussing the privileged section in the community to which the Minister referred and his statement that the people of East Perth were helping to carry that section on their backs. I would like the Minister to bring down legislation affecting city people in regard to transport. What do city business people contribute to the maintenance of the railways in this State? I would like the Minister to answer that.

The Minister for Works: They pay their share of the deficit.

Mr. NALDER: I am glad to hear that suggestion. We have heard so much of the farmers, the privileged section of the people; wanting the railways to be kept running and also wanting an open go as regards road transport. Before tea the Minister for Transport assured me that farmers bringing stock to Midland Junction would be allowed, if the Bill becomes law, to carry back to their farms any commodity to be used entirely for domestic purposes. He said he had that statement from the chairman of the Transport Board—that no farmer carting goods in those circumstances would be stopped by a transport inspector.

Does the Minister know that many farmers have amenities equal to those of city people—such as electric lighting

plants and stoves that burn coke? He might be in trouble here because there is some restriction on the carting of coke and many farmers have to obtain that fuel from the metropolitan area. Their lighting plants also require fuel—

Mr. Hearman: They also use it for their refrigerators.

Mr. NALDER: Yes. Last week a farmer rang me and said he wanted to take a load of coke back to his farm, having brought down some turkeys on his truck and I told him I thought he could do so. He said to me, "I would like you to mention the figure that I was charged last year when I got coke up by rail. I bought four tons of coke which cost me about £22 and it cost me £20 to have it railed up." The freight cost him almost as much as the price of the coke, and so I think the farming community will be pleased to hear from the Minister that they can cart back to the farm any commodity intended for domestic use. In view of the Minister's statement, I hope the farmers will have some freedom in this regard if the Bill becomes law. We think the restriction is unnecessary and will not help expand production. For that reason, I strongly oppose the clause.

Mr. I. W. MANNING: I was interested to hear the Minister say patronage of the railways had increased beyond a radius of 100 miles from the metropolitan area. He should have raised that point when the railways motion was being debated. I attempted to make the same point by interjection the other evening, and the Minister made some quip about "kindergarten stuff." I still say the railways are most valuable pulling heavy loads over long hauls and the statement of the chairman of the Transport Board, quoted by the Minister, justifies that view because, as the Minister said, use of the railways increased at the points furthest from the metropolitan area.

Therefore, I think I was right in saying that the Government has closed lines that the people wanted to use and is now trying to force people nearer the metropolitan area to use the railways although they find motor transport more convenient. Is the Minister more concerned about the back-loading which he believes farmers are doing, having brought stock to market, or the conveyance of stock to market by carriers? In many South-West country towns there are carriers who carry stock only, and motor transport is the main mode of stock transport today from the farm to the metropolitan market. Is the Minister trying to take that type of traffic off the roads or to prevent the back-loading by farmers?

Mr. ACKLAND: The most amazing feature of the Bill is the number of times the Minister has contradicted himself. When introducing the measure, he expressed concern for country storekeepers

and said that with farmers buying stores at chain shops in the city to take back to the country, country storekeepers would be forced out of business. Tonight the Minister says the Bill will not interfere with anyone living in the country who wants to take back with him his domestic requirements, and he mentioned groceries and drapery. Throughout the rail closure debate and this one, he has maintained the same attitude.

When an argument suits him he uses it, but when it does not suit him he completely turns face, as he has on this occasion. The inconvenience and annoyance caused to people in country areas is exemplified in a letter in "The West Australian" of the 7th September, under the heading, "A Farmer Attacks Transport Board." It, states—

R. York, Wongan Hills: I write to show where the taxpayer's hard-earned money is going.

On 3rd September, I rose at 4 a.m. and took my truck to Perth with a load of oats. Then I went to North Fremantle to pick up a load of fuel to be used in producing more primary products on our farm.

I had no sooner left the depot when I was stopped by a Transport Board officer and all particulars of my loads in and out were taken.

I then travelled to Perth and as I drove past the Metropolitan Markets in Wellington-st. I was again stopped and questioned. I did not feel too pleased but said nothing about it.

On my way home I was again stopped between Mundaring and Sawyers Valley. By this time I was annoyed and said so.

Three times stopped and questioned in one day when minding my own business and conforming to the Transport Act is too much.

Hon. D. Brand: No wonder they say they have not enough inspectors.

Mr. ACKLAND: The Minister said there were only two extra inspectors and yet people who are constantly carting on the roads tell me there is a host of them and they see new faces nearly every time they take a load out of the city.

The Minister for Transport: When they see your face, they tell you anything.

Mr. ACKLAND: Does the Minister think an inspector is doing a job if he sits for hours beside the road under a shady tree reading a novel and waiting to pounce on some individual who is earning his living, in order to annoy and confuse him when he is not breaking the law? The letter continues—

It appears to me that the Transport Board is trying to relieve the unemployment position by putting on more

inspectors at the taxpayers' expense. Each one of these men was new to me. One of them told me that all the inspectors who were on the road are now in the head office.

It is high time that private enterprise got a fair deal, and all forms of transport restriction were lifted. Then men like these could do some useful, constructive work for the community.

That is from a man who takes little interest in public matters and whom I have never heard speak at a meeting at that centre. Is it any wonder that members on this side of the Chamber oppose the measure or that we are confused when the Minister says one thing on one occasion and the opposite on the next occasion, as he has done in the instance I have quoted?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: All members representing country constituencies must oppose this clause because it will inflict increased costs on the farming community. Like the member for Moore, I am somewhat perplexed after hearing the statement made by the Minister the other night when he talked about farmers being able to take groceries home. He went on to say that was not the way to bring about decentralisation. I sympathise with him there because if country towns are to prosper, people must do their business in those towns and not in the metropolitan area. Tonight the Minister has turned a somersault. He tells us that farmers can cart groceries, etc. I would also like some clarification about the carting of livestock, because this matter is causing concern not only in my district but in others as well.

The other night the Minister gave figures showing the number of stock that came to the Midland Junction abattoir by road and by rail. The figures were for the period from January to June of this year and they show that 240,000 sheep came by rail and 423,000 by road. For the same period 4,600 cattle came by rail and 9,200 by road. That would indicate that road transport is the more favoured for the carrying of livestock. Occasionally farmers pay more to get their stock to market by road than by rail and for a very good reason, because they get them to market in a much shorter period. That makes a considerable difference to them because their stock arrive in better order and they get better prices for them.

I would like the Minister to answer the following question: Will the carrier still be able to continue if this legislation is passed? The Minister said that the carrier has been operating for some time past because of a suspension of regulations which enabled him to operate. If this Bill is passed, does the Government intend to wipe the stock carrier off the road? I have reason to believe that is so. If that should happen, a large number of small farmers will suffer great inconvenience

and loss because while the large farmer has his own truck fitted out to carry stock, together with the other appliances on the farm which enable him to use road transport, the small farmer cannot afford to pay £2,000 or £3,000, or more, for a truck. He must employ a carrier.

The Minister says the farmer can carry some groceries. I do not know whether that will do him much good, and I am not concerned about it. But he will be prevented from back-loading with essential requirements for his farm; requirements without which he cannot carry on. This clause will mean his costs will be added to. I would rather have one of the Premier's many taxes than agree to this measure which, in fact, is another tax. We had a comparison some time ago and I think the member for Victoria Park was sorry he asked the question.

Mr. Andrew: We know how hypocritical you are!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Minister talked about King Canute not being able to repel the ocean waves. Our transport system has been the result of progress—progress that means a great deal to the farming community. It is the exportable primary industries that are so important in the economy of this State. They are already facing increased costs from which they do not seem to be able to get away. The more we penalise primary industry, the greater the chance of bringing about unemployment, and retarding not only primary industry but secondary industry as well. The clause is a harsh one; it is not in the interests of the farming community and I trust members will oppose it.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: If restrictive legislation were the basis for prosperity, then we in Western Australia would be in for some great days, particularly if we continue along the lines contained in the Bill. The first provision deals with the carriage of goods to the nearest town, which means that farm produce must be taken to the nearest point where it can be loaded. For instance, if a man had a farm between Narrogin and Highbury which is a distance of nine miles, and if he lived five miles from Narrogin and four miles from Highbury, and had wheat to send to the flour mill, he must take his wheat the four miles to Highbury, put it on a train, and bring it back nine miles to Narrogin, instead of being able to take it the five miles to Narrogin direct.

It is absolutely stupid. The Minister told us what could be done by the railways in relation to the transport of stock; how they could prepare a stock train within two hours and how the stock could be delivered fresh at Midland. No doubt it could be done. But if it can be done, why has it not been done? That is the question. I feel the railways can compete with road transport but that does not mean we must restrict or prohibit road transport in order to give the railways a monopoly.

The railways have many advantages. For instance, in regard to the transport of sheep a double-decker truck might be sent up with sheep, but it is not possible for it to take back other articles that may be required, firstly, because of the regulations, and secondly, because it is not possible to load them on the truck where the sheep have been. So it has to make a double journey at great loss. Despite that, it is able to compete with the railways and this is because the latter will not cater for the transport offering.

If the railways were out to do the job they should be doing, they would ascertain the requirements of their clients. But this has not been done. If they found out the needs for certain stock trains and prepared a schedule to suit the needs of their clients, the railways would be supported. The Minister said a train would be made up if it is required, but we cannot expect farmers to go around a district inquiring who wants a train on certain days.

The Minister for Works: Why did you oppose the closure of certain railway lines?

Mr. Andrew: They are always inconsistent.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: There is no reason why the railways should not compete fairly with road transport but they should not be given a monopoly; that will not help the position.

Mr. Ackland: You will only increase inefficiency.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: With all other forms of transport suppressed, the railways would have no inducement to secure traffic. Even when there is a certain amount of competition, no attempt has been made to secure the traffic offering. Many farmers prefer to send their stock by train, providing it runs at the right time, and is fast enough for the business available. On the other hand, because of their geographical situation it is impracticable for some farmers to use the trains. A general rule cannot be applied. The clause we are discussing seeks to prevent everybody else from transporting goods and we should oppose it in its entirety, because it is a ticket for the railways to continue operating inefficiently; and efficiency is the first thing we require in our railway system today.

Mr. ACKLAND: The Premier said that the people of Western Australia were carrying the country people on their backs, and the Minister for Transport said tonight that the people of East Perth were doing likewise. On the 6th November, 1956, the member for Mt. Marshall asked some questions which I think are pertinent to this clause. They dealt with the earnings of the railways and he said the total earnings of the railways

amounted to £13,274,166. In answer to a question with reference to suburban coaching he told members that £372,421 was the amount suburban traffic found towards the cost, which means that they are responsible for well over £1,000,000 of the deficit on the line. I notice that the working expenses of suburban coaching traffic were £1,468,995. That leaves more than twice the amount of loss than was incurred on the 842 miles of railway closed by this Government because those lines were too costly to run.

I want the Committee to realise that in passing this extra impost on to the country people by bringing in this amendment to the State Transport Co-ordination Act, they are inflicting a second impost on the people of rural districts. The Government has shown no sign whatever of having done anything to reduce the cost of the suburban traffic. When we add the loss on the trams and the buses, we find the figure is nearly three times as much as the loss which was incurred on the railways that have been closed.

This clause is the crux of the whole amendment to the Act. If there is any justice, the Committee will throw it out and have nothing to do with it. This is supposed to be a country where all people are treated on a fair and equitable basis. There is a loss of nearly £1,500,000 on services within the metropolitan area, and yet 842 miles of country railways are closed because they lost £500,000, and the Government tries to inflict this impost on top of that!

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

Ayes	24
Noes	18
Majority for		6

Ayes.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Gaffy	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Graham	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. Hall	Mr. Potter
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Heal	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Toms
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Kelly	Mr. May

Noes.

Mr. Ackland	Mr. W. Manning
Mr. Bovell	Mr. Ross McLarty
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Court	Mr. Owen
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hearnman	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. I. Manning

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Perkins	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Oldfield	Mr. Sewell

Clause thus passed.

(Teller.)

(Teller.)

Clause 7—Second Schedule amended:

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I propose to offer opposition to this clause. This is one which substitutes the R.A.C. formula in respect of licences for public vehicles for the Dendy-Marshall formula, which has been in operation for so many years. It is true that under the Traffic Act, an alteration was made during last session in respect of vehicles licensed under the Traffic Act and the result, as will be the result in this case, was very substantial increases in the licence fees being paid for vehicles. There was at the time no substantial objection to the alteration to the Traffic Act, because it was realised that considerations applied to the matter in regard to the provision of funds for road maintenance and improvement and warranted an increase of this nature.

However, I think there is a very different view to be taken in respect of licence fees under this Act for the reason that the vehicles for which these licences will have to be paid have already been licensed under the Traffic Act. In fact, it appears at the moment that the position of some of these vehicles is to be extremely bad from the point of view of cost of licensing, because not only did the Traffic Act of last year insert the R.A.C. formula in place of the Dendy Marshall formula, but it also provided that because diesel-propelled vehicles paid no petrol tax to the Commonwealth Government and made no contribution to the Federal Aid Road Fund, they should pay twice the amount of the tax on a petrol-driven vehicle.

At the moment we are advised that the Federal Government proposes to impose a tax of 1s. per gallon on diesel fuel and as soon as that tax is imposed, unless an alteration is made to the Traffic Act to cope with the position, these vehicles are going to pay, in addition to the double tax, also 1s. per gallon on the fuel they use. That may be, for the moment, taken to be beside the point. The point I want to impress on the Committee is that the vehicles this schedule of licence fees is going to apply to, have already been licensed under the Traffic Act and, as a consequence, this licence under the State Transport Co-ordination Act is only one which gives them leave, if the Transport Board so decides, to operate as a public vehicle.

I have already expressed my opinion in regard to the definition of "public vehicle" which reads, "any vehicle which must be licensed under this Act." Taken in conjunction with the other provisions of the measure now before us, it can readily lead to a position where vehicles that at the present time are not considered liable for a licence under the State Transport Co-ordination Act, could have the necessity for a licence applied to them if they are found to be carrying goods that are not exempted under this Act, because every

vehicle that carries goods not exempted becomes a public vehicle and then becomes liable to a licence fee.

It seems to me that there is no necessity whatever to alter the formula in this legislation relating to any increase in the fees. I should say that a fee of £28 10s. would become about £40 and the same would apply in proportion for the others. I consider that the licence fees are sufficiently high already, if they have to be paid by persons, as they have, who have already paid a licence fee for the right to use the road. I do not propose to support the clause and ask the Committee to reject it.

Mr. HEARMAN: Last year, during the debate on the amendment to the Traffic Act it was said that the R.A.C. formula should be substituted for the Dendy-Marshall formula because it brought us into line with the other States and it was desirable to have uniformity so that comparisons could be made between licences here and in the other States. That argument has been adduced by the Minister. The Committee should be aware of what it is doing in changing this formula, and two points should be borne in mind.

One is: Which formula arrives at the highest horsepower, and the other is: Which is the fairest to use? The Dendy-Marshall formula does produce a lower figure than the R.A.C. Under the Dendy-Marshall formula, the average for a Ford V8 is shown at 25 horsepower. Under the R.A.C. formula it is 30 horsepower, an increase of approximately one-fifth, which is a substantial increase in horsepower that is being introduced by the change of the formula. I think there is no objection to the R.A.C. formula and it may be widely used for normal vehicle licensing.

If the Minister studies the schedule at present in the Bill, he will notice that the Dendy-Marshall formula takes some account of the length of stroke of the motor and if he looks at the R.A.C. formula, he will find it takes no account of that whatsoever. With the present trend in design of motor engines there is a tendency to reduce the length of the stroke and increase diameter, so the difference between the results achieved under the two formulae with present designs is even more marked. When there are over-square engines the bore is bigger than the stroke, and the R.A.C. formula tends to increase the horsepower rather more than one which takes into account the fact that the stroke has been shortened.

It is fair enough to expect the Minister to tell us why it is desirable to have uniformity in this matter and why the Government has decided to put on this additional impost. We have been told by the Minister that the initial thinking behind the legislation is for it to do something towards curbing railway deficits; to put more goods on to the railways. The

alteration of the formula will make no difference to the amount of goods carted by the railways, but it will put an additional fee on the road transport operators. I want to know why the Government has altered the formula which will bring in additional revenue but will not achieve increased tonnage for the railways.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: The revenue received from the fees payable on commercial vehicles does not find its way into the Government coffers. Therefore to the Treasurer or the Government, it does not matter whether the fee is £50 or 2s. But it will have an effect upon the local authorities.

Mr. Ackland: Have they approached you for an increase in the licence fees?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: No. But if the hon. member knows anything about transport and traffic matters, he will be aware that in no other part of the world is the Dendy-Marshall system employed because it is not a proper calculation. Practically, without opposition this Parliament, only last year, agreed to discard the old system of calculation and to adopt the one employed in other parts of the Commonwealth and, I think, the great majority of the world. This is not a matter of policy to assist the railways, the Government or anyone else. It is merely to wipe off the statute book the Dendy-Marshall formula which is not recognised or honoured by anyone.

Mr. Ackland: You will agree you have found one mistake in the legislation of last year, and have accepted an amendment in regard to tractors.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I think that of the 100 or so Bills introduced into Parliament every session, probably 90 to 95 are amendments to existing statutes. I think experience shows there is a necessity for modification and amendment.

Mr. Ackland: Just a few minutes ago you said that we accepted without discussion the Bill of last year. Already, however, you have realised that part of it was wrong.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: I said nothing of the sort.

Mr. Ackland: You read your script when you get it back.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: There were many hours of discussion on the Bill. The point I mentioned was in connection with the change of calculation of horsepower from the Dendy-Marshall to the R.A.C. formula. I do not know that I need add any more.

Mr. Nalder: Is it going to affect the transport owners?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: In some cases it will make a slight variation, yes, but that is something that has

to be faced. After all, less than twelve months ago Parliament accepted that proposition in respect of traffic fees. I honestly think it is absurd that in the State Transport Co-ordination Act, we should retain a method of calculating the horsepower of vehicles when so recently we have virtually stated that it is wrongly based and that some other system should be employed. There is no politics about this; it is a matter of plain commonsense.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I think I could subscribe to the Minister's point of view in regard to the substitution of one formula for another. Having done it under the Traffic Act, there is some merit in doing it here, too. What I object to is the result which, obviously, is to increase substantially the licence fees payable for public vehicles. I have already said that these people—the owners of these public vehicles—are already paying considerably increased licence fees as a result of amendments to the Traffic Act and the substitution of the R.A.C. formula last year. But now they are to have imposed upon them an additional charge, because of the substitution of formula, without any reduction in the charge per power weight.

If, in the power weight fees charged under this Act, the necessary alteration had been made in order to reach the present level of licence fees, I would have no objection, but that has not been done and so the change of formula means a considerable increase in licence fees.

Many people have just submitted tenders to the Transport Board for the carriage of superphosphate, wheat and other grains in the various districts where railway lines have been closed. Many of them have tendered as low as possible in the hope of obtaining the contract. They do not want to have their licence fees increased; and they certainly do not deserve it in the circumstances. If the fees are increased the net result in the long run must be to induce them, as they get the opportunity, to increase the rates they are asking the people to pay under the contracts that the Transport Board is making.

That, if the Minister wants to get down to details, is the trouble. It is not the change in the formula, but the result of it. I do not mind the change in formula if the Minister will agree to adjust the figures so that the result will be the same. I am not asking him to fix licence fees lower than they have been. I know perfectly well that the Government does not pay this money into the Treasury and I did not say it did.

Mr. Bovell: Nobody suggested it did.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I believe that is so. As far as I know, there is no demand for these increased licence fees, and there is

no necessity for them as they have already been increased under the Traffic Act. This will do no good, but rather some harm.

Mr. HEARMAN: The Minister rather set out to give the Committee the impression that the R.A.C. formula was relatively new and the Dendy-Marshall an old one. The R.A.C. formula is probably the oldest in existence, and the Dendy-Marshall formula came into being in the first place to overcome the anomalies created by the R.A.C. formula, because it takes no account of the length of stroke of the motor. I still suggest that the R.A.C. formula is having the effect of increasing the cost, particularly in the light of modern trends in engine design. I agree with the Leader of the Country Party. I do not know that I would object to the change of formula, if it did not mean increasing the cost.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: Perhaps I can go part of the way, and I hope to meet the objections of the Opposition. When the traffic fees were increased as a result of the legislation passed last year, the Government agreed to a reduction in the charges payable to the Transport Board in respect of omnibuses. So, virtually, no additional burden was loaded onto them. I will, with the same measure of sympathy and generosity, examine this proposition in connection with commercial goods vehicles in order to bring about approximately the same state of affairs. I do not think I can say more than that.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—FREMANTLE HARBOUR TRUST ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 3rd September.

MR. HALL (Albany) [8.28]: The time, I believe, is now opportune to have this amendment made, and I therefore rise to support the Bill. This measure will enable members of the Painters and Dockers' Union to receive payment of appearance money to which I consider they are justly entitled. I also believe the measure will assist the union to retain the services of skilled personnel essential to the efficient carrying out of the work that they do. The payment of appearance money I consider to be a small compensation to these tradesmen.

The question may well be asked: What do these so important men do? The answer is that—

The work covers a very wide field and embraces practically all kinds of work met up with in the maritime industry. For example, it includes highly skilled riggers such as are necessary

to the dismantling of a ship's masts and derricks and machinery; men who are capable of repairing (or making new) rigging including all manner and type of splicing of wire or rope including the very heavy wires used in naval boom defence; men who are capable of working aloft or overside, winch men and highly skilled hatchmen such as are required on the work of fitting out ships; men who are able on demand to take over and man a ship on deck and in the engine rooms and stokeholds of ships; men with the requisite knowledge and experience of handling explosives; boiler scalers and ship painters including the high quality painting needed in ships' cabins; dockers whose experience and ability includes a high degree of agility at the moment of placing vessels on the slipway cradle; men whose knowledge of ships and training render them competent to perform an endless variety of tasks in the repair and maintenance of ships and in the preparation of those ships for the carriage of bulk grain cargoes.

So it will be seen that these men do a variety of work. They do a great job in the sealing down of cargoes and that must be of great help to the insurance companies. Some of the insurance companies, I am sure, would prefer to have the ship go down with all its cargo on board than have to try to sort out the wreck that is left when cargo has not been properly tied down and the vessel has struck a storm.

The waterside workers at the port of Albany do not enjoy the same privileges as other waterside workers elsewhere, or at most of the ports in the State. At present a decision is pending as regards the port of Albany and what is termed a port order. The question is shortly to be rediscussed and we hope that it will be made an A class port.

In this regard I would like to quote some figures to substantiate the men's claim and I do not in any way belittle the claims made by the painters and dockers. I quote these figures to show how reluctant the employers are at times to meet the employees on equal ground. In 1950-51, 59 vessels entered the port of Albany with a gross tonnage of 433,777 tons. The inward cargo for that year was 55,942 tons and the outward tonnage 8,503. The oil bunker supplies in the same year totalled 11,972 tons and the total tonnage for the year amounted to 76,417 tons.

In 1951-52, 68 vessels entered the port with a gross tonnage of 493,774 tons. The inward cargo was 50,740 tons and the outward cargo 5,609 tons, while the oil bunkers on that occasion covered 21,817 tons or a total tonnage for the year of 78,220 tons. In 1952-53, a total of 50 vessels entered the port with a gross tonnage of

380,352 tons. The inward cargo was 39,269 tons. I shall not weary members by going through the figures but I shall simply make a comparison with the year 1956-57. In that year 87 vessels entered the harbour as against 59 in 1950-51. The tonnage in 1950-51 was 433,777 tons and in 1956-57 the gross tonnage was 627,000. So members can see how the amount of tonnage handled at the port has increased.

As regards the different types of cargo handled, the main imports included rock phosphate, 47,242 tons; sulphur 9,041 tons; jute 1,343 tons; petroleum products 49,002 tons and general 4,925 tons. The main exports were wheat, 108,915 tons—

Mr. Nalder: Which went to Albany by rail.

Mr. HALL: I cannot argue about that. Barley totalled 12,338 tons; apples 329,900 cases, wool 6,089 bales and meat 1,135 tons. So members can see the amount of imports and exports that have gone through the port of Albany. Also from the increase in the number of vessels and the increase in the gross tonnage, members will readily see the necessity to have a skilled working force at the shipping companies' disposal. The same thing applies as regards painters and dockers. The employers must have a force at their disposal, and I believe that these people should be entitled to some compensation by way of appearance money.

The men in this union at Albany muster at the Waterside Workers' Union office and they are probably forced to hang around all day—that is so on many occasions. Would members like to do the same thing? Appearance money would at least be some compensation for them and would make sure that the employers had a capable working force on hand. It is as much in the employers' interests as it is in the men's interests. If these men were assured of some income, they would take more pride in their work and the industry would face fewer hazards.

Before concluding I would like to make some comments on why I regard the present as an opportune time for the introduction of this legislation. Robert Owens introduced factory legislation in England to prevent children under the age of 10 years from working in the textile factories and children under 18 years of age from working any longer than 10½ to 11 hours a day. His Bill was not agreed to because it was contended that the time was inopportune. In 1890, when a former Chief Justice in the Queensland Court legislated for a subsistence wage—it was claimed at the time that it was not opportune. In 1907, the same argument was used against Mr. Justice Higgins when the Commonwealth Arbitration Court dealt with the Harvester case. It was said, "The industry is not in a position to pay the wage you wish to award." The retort by His Honour was, "If an industry is not in a

position to pay a bare subsistence or a basic wage, it is better that the industry should go out of existence."

In 1920 we had a case for the reduction in the working hours from 48 to 44 per week and it was then claimed that the time was not opportune. A similar claim was made later when there was a request to reduce the hours per week from 44 to 40. The Government has considered all these aspects and says that now is the opportune and acceptable time to pass this legislation. So I ask members to support the Bill.

MR. LAWRENCE (South Fremantle) [8.39]: I do not want to waste the time of the House by going into facts and quoting figures that have been given by previous speakers, such as the Minister for Labour, the member for Albany and others. Members here have been circularised and have been presented with facts regarding the industry. This industry is a peculiar one. The quota at present comprises 128 men and that quota is laid down by three people, the registrar of the Arbitration Court, a representative of the employers and a representative of the men.

Whilst I say that the industry is a peculiar one, it has changed somewhat over the last few years. I have had a close association with the waterfront and with the union involved, and I have noted the particular type of work that the men do. The member for Albany pointed out some of their duties but there are other aspects of it which should also be mentioned. I have seen these men called out at all hours of the day and night. At the wish of the employers these men have been sent for at night time. Taxi cabs have been used to bring them to work even though they had to stop at their roster centre pick up for two hours on that particular morning. That precluded them from obtaining any other casual employment and with the members of that union the only casual employment offering down there is in the wool store and similar places. They pick up at 8 o'clock and these men must be there at 7.30 a.m. and must remain there until almost 10 o'clock.

The roster is very well handled. I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has had experience of it because he has seen it, and I am sure he would agree with that statement. I shall not weary members by telling them the work of these men but they have done some important jobs. They did a big job on the "Strathnaver." It was highly skilled work in the engine-room. They also did a big job on the "Empire Elaine." They had to strap down the cargo and when the vessel was out in the Indian Ocean it encountered a typhoon but, because of the fine work done by the members of this union, the cargo did not move and the Chief Officer of that

ship in a statement to "The West Australian" said that the ship came through unscathed because of the high standard of workmanship of the men in Fremantle who secured the cargo. That speaks for itself.

There is one other factor as regards this industry. It is that it serves not only secondary industries but also those which are most important to our State—the primary industries. The men fit up the bulk wheat ships. This is highly skilled work and, in addition, they have to dunnage and secure much of our fruit cargoes which are sent abroad. Also they have to secure and dunnage much of our frozen cargo such as beef, mutton, lamb, etc. I shall not dwell on that aspect.

What I want to bring to the attention of members is the payment of attendance money, which is envisaged in the Bill. It must be understood that attendance money is not to be regarded as a substitute for lost time. It is a payment made as compensation for daily attendance and the availability of the worker for that particular industry—a payment for enforced idleness at an engagement centre organised to meet the ever-changing demands of the industry.

Every member has a copy of those figures, therefore I shall not waste the time of the House by reading them. Actually, the provision of the attendance money scheme would result in a degree of security to the person following this industry who is forced to attend at the pick up, under the roster system agreed to by the Arbitration Court. His only security, if he fails to secure employment, is the payment for attendance.

We cannot argue about rates of pay in this House because it is not within our ambit, but if this House agrees to the Bill, it will be the duty of the Arbitration Court to fix the rate of attendance money. Should there be any alteration to the hourly rate of pay, that is a casual rate at the moment, that matter will also be left to the discretion of the court, which will attend to it. In this regard, the late Mr. Justice Beeby of the Commonwealth Arbitration Court stated—

Every step that can be taken towards the decasualisation of this industry is desirable. Lost time will still be the unfortunate lot of the workers in this industry, even when attendance money is a condition of employment in the industry. Attendance will mean a certain guaranteed weekly income.

As I stated before, that is more or less what the court in this State said.

Parliament is not being asked to concern itself with the merit of the claim. It is not being asked to weigh up the related issues. That is purely a matter for the Arbitration Court because the court, and the court alone, I would suggest, is

competent to bring the matter of attendance money and lost time into balance. The court has said in its judgment that it will, and I think the member for Nedlands will agree with that statement.

Mr. Court: What will?

Mr. LAWRENCE: That the court has said in its judgment that it will bring into balance the matter of attendance money and lost time.

Mr. Court: The president of the Arbitration Court said that that matter would be taken into consideration, but the court never said that.

Mr. LAWRENCE: What does it mean by taking into consideration? Naturally one cannot presuppose what is in the judge's mind. The whole crux of the matter is that Parliament is being asked to affirm a principle, and nothing more. That principle is the principle of arbitration which members on the opposite side of the House have supported. I have heard them in this House for the last five or six years demanding that nothing be done industrially except by arbitration. Is that not so?

Mr. Court: We subscribe to the principle of conciliation and arbitration absolutely.

Mr. LAWRENCE: That is a very good gesture on the part of the hon. member.

Mr. Court: It is not a gesture. It is a statement of fact.

Hon. D. Brand: What is more, we are consistent.

Mr. LAWRENCE: That is true. Let us be consistent on this issue because the judgment specifically says that this matter is eminently desirable.

Mr. Court: The judge said that, not the court.

Mr. LAWRENCE: The court said that, and not Court's court, either. This Parliament in days gone by created an authority on this matter. I repeat it created an authority when it established the Arbitration Court. If the Arbitration Court desires a certain thing, surely it is our duty as members of Parliament, to support it, even on principle.

Mr. Court: We have always stood by the Arbitration Court.

Mr. LAWRENCE: If members opposite agree in principle, then when the court says such and such a thing ought to be done, we should support the court.

Mr. Court: I stated last week what I thought, and still consider,—the court decides, not what Mr. Justice Neville decides.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I shall come to that in a moment. The Arbitration Court has said in its judgment, in unmistakable and unanimous terms, that the introduction of such a scheme is eminently desirable.

When I refer to the words "eminently desirable," I would like to point out to members who may be opposed to the Bill that this term is much stronger than the term "desirable." It is very much stronger. It is eminently desirable, which means it should be available. Can one not see that?

Mr. Court: I am not disputing the grammar used by Mr. Justice Neville.

Mr. LAWRENCE: He said, "eminently desirable," not merely "desirable." That further makes the point that we should agree unanimously with the decision of the president of the court and his two colleagues. The same considerations that led the British Parliament to decasualise dockers' employment and also led the Commonwealth Arbitration Court to decasualise the waterside workers, apply to the casual workers engaged in this industry in Western Australia. In the same judgment the court stated that any practical scheme must depend on action by Parliament. Can anybody argue that is not so? In his judgment, Mr. Justice Neville said that the only way this can be done was by an Act of Parliament, and that it was eminently desirable for it to be done by an Act of Parliament.

Mr. Court: I do not disagree with what he said, because his decision is in writing. The only difference of opinion is whether the court said so, or Mr. Justice Neville said so.

Mr. LAWRENCE: We shall look at that in a moment. Here then is the position. The court has power to make an award, but it has no power to make its award effective. That was exactly what he said in his judgment. There cannot be any two ways about it when he said that some such scheme was eminently desirable, and that decasualisation of work on the waterfront had to a large extent been achieved in recent years both in Great Britain, and, so far as waterside workers are concerned, in Australia.

Interpolating there for a moment, in regard to the work done by a waterside worker and that done by a docker—that is the person to whom we refer in the Bill—there can be no comparison, because the docker is much more highly skilled than a waterside worker in very many respects. The dockers are called upon to perform some very hard tasks, some filthy and dangerous jobs, and some very highly skilled tasks. One cannot go among the waterside workers and find 10 men out of the lot able to do the work which the 128 dockers in this State are skilled to perform. I want to point this out, and I do so without any animosity. I trust that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition realises it. The letter produced and read by him from Mr. Christian was in very poor taste indeed.

Mr. Court: On Mr. Christian's or on my part?

Mr. LAWRENCE: On the hon. member's part. I do not tell lies, and I tell him that straight out.

Mr. Court: I told you that I had Mr. Christian's complete approval to read the letter.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Mr. Christian did not say that. Why did the hon. member not get a letter from Mr. Davies?

Mr. Court: Why should I?

Mr. LAWRENCE: Why should not the hon. member?

Mr. Court: I do not have to.

Mr. LAWRENCE: The member for Nedlands compared the statement of Mr. Christian with the statement of Mr. Davies and said they were different.

Mr. Court: I did not say they were different at all.

Mr. LAWRENCE: The hon. member did. Do not think for one moment that Mr. Davies would not have agreed with the president in this case, therefore it would have been a majority decision of the court. Would that not be so?

Mr. Court: Are you going to produce a letter from Mr. Davies to that effect?

Mr. LAWRENCE: I would not do that. I do not require somebody else to make up my mind. I can do that myself. Surely the hon. member should also be able to do that! In any case, accepting Mr. Christian's view that he did not agree with the decision, as the hon. member said, the decision would still have been a majority decision of two to one, therefore the principle is to stick by what the Arbitration Court has ruled.

Mr. Court: I think you are on wrong premises. Both Mr. Christian and Mr. Davies agreed with the decision of Mr. Justice Neville.

Mr. LAWRENCE: The hon. member compared the statement of Mr. Davies with the statement of Mr. Christian and said one was different from the other.

Mr. Court: I did not. I said one used more words than the other.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I have the hon. member's speech here.

Mr. Court: I wish you would read it.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I shall not. In any case there is no substance in it.

Mr. Court: Read it. I was very emphatic on this point.

Mr. Roberts: Will you read it?

Mr. LAWRENCE: Why should I? If members opposite were present and were doing their job, they would have heard the letter being read. The member for Bunbury knows that a comparison was made, and that was the only point the member for Nedlands tried to make in his speech.

Mr. Court: That was the vital point.

Mr. Johnson: The member for Nedlands did very well with a poor case. Give him some credit!

Mr. LAWRENCE: Getting back to what the judgment said, it advised Parliament of the position and it left the matter to Parliament to remedy. Where the court is willing to make an award, it seeks the power to do so by Parliament setting up a statutory authority. I do not see any reason in the whole wide world why, as is provided in the Bill, that authority should not be the Fremantle Harbour Trust. Figures have been given and accepted by the Deputy-Leader of the Opposition as being quite true. I know that the union has gone to a lot of pains to get them.

I cannot see any reason why this proposal should not be agreed to. What I mainly want to see is some unanimity on the question in this House. I do not want the Bill to go through with any misgivings or doubts in the mind of any member as to what is aimed at. The Bill is aimed purely at giving a small section of workers some security when they are not employed. I can assure members that these men do a mighty job. They have to attend every morning, and I do not know what kind of a Parliament this would be if we did not clearly express ourselves on this matter.

Hon. L. Thorn: Now you have upset the baby in the gallery!

Mr. LAWRENCE: I thought it was the member for Toodyay! What I was trying to get at was the fact that we believe in the principle of arbitration. We believe that the Arbitration Court as a body has said that some legislation should be passed to give these workers attendance money, the same as waterside workers receive; and I cannot see any reason why there should not be a unanimous vote in favour of that proposal. What kind of a Parliament would this be if we agreed that there should be an Arbitration Court and then proceeded to flout its decision? It amounts to this: Do we accept arbitration or do we reject it?

I will not go into the figures, because I know that all members have copies of them, but the sum of £6,500 which is estimated to be the possible annual cost of attendance money for these workers is infinitesimal in comparison with the profits of the wealthy shipowners. If any of these ships have anything wrong with them, a call is made on the members of this particular union to service them. It is interesting to note—and I refer my remarks now to the Leader of the Opposition who, I know, is going to support this Bill; I am glad to see him smiling—that there are 2,500,000 tons of shipping going to the Kwinana oil refinery, which was set up by the hon. member's Government, and which we are quite happy about.

Those vessels go in free of pilotage charge. I do not see why any ship that uses the inner harbour and has the use of the services of these men should not be subject to some levy so that a fund will be established to provide some benefit for the men when they are not employed.

Mr. Roberts: Are there not pilotage charges on vessels going to Fremantle?

Mr. LAWRENCE: Yes.

Mr. Roberts: You said there were not.

Mr. LAWRENCE: No; into the inner harbour. Those that are free of pilotage charges are the ones that go to Kwinana.

Mr. Roberts: There are no charges there.

Mr. LAWRENCE: No. But there are pilotage charges at the inner harbour. Attendance money is paid in many parts of Australia to waterside workers, but in other places it is paid to dockers. It is paid to them in Belgium, France, New Zealand, the Netherlands West Indies, Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, Norway, Italy, Greece, U.S.A., and Great Britain.

Mr. Roberts: Are not the wharflies in those centres called dockers?

Mr. LAWRENCE: That is true, but there is no difference. They still get attendance money. They are still workers, who do the same job. I have here a copy of the "International Labour Review," vol. 63, No. 4. The date is April, 1951, and at page 383 appears the following:—

The foregoing survey of practices affecting the stability of earnings of dock workers in different countries of the world has revealed that the size of their income is ceasing in most ports to be dependent solely on the number of tons of cargo which they are asked to handle. For it has come to be realised that the service which they perform—a service which is indispensable to the continued and efficient operation of the port transport industry—includes not only the actual handling of cargo but also their constant availability—

I stress the words "constant availability"—

—in sufficient numbers to undertake any work that may arise, whether in fact it arises or not, and their willingness to work intermittently, at a varying pace, for varying periods of time. They stand ready to make special efforts at busy times and to accept enforced idleness when traffic is slack.

Surely that publication is authentic and fair in its outlook.

I have seen these men at work. I know what they do, and I know their calibre: I remember that a few years ago there was a ship called "Papischristdos Vassilios" which was in trouble at sea. It appeared that there would be a loss of life but the

tug "Yuco," which was manned by members of the union, went to its aid on a Saturday afternoon. The men went out at great risk to their lives because the tug was unfit. But because the crew of the disabled ship was in danger, these men risked their lives. They had to plug holes in the side of the vessel with broomsticks, but they never faltered. They went straight out and did the job.

The rigging of these men is second to none, and I can assure members that they attend faithfully every morning for duty. I shall not quote figures. There is a fairly high percentage of compensation paid; but as a whole, they stand to their roster system. It is well run. In fact, these men have brought the industry out of chaos to smooth running; and I feel that this House should stand by them and give them rights equal to those enjoyed by people who are not as skilled as they are. Therefore, I support the second reading.

MR. CROMMELIN (Claremont) [9.12]: In the first place, I would like to read two paragraphs from a letter, a copy of which all members have received. It is from the Federated Ship Painters and Dockers' Union of Australia and is dated the 22nd August, 1957. It is signed by the secretary of the union. The last paragraph on the first page reads as follows:—

The Court of Arbitration has unanimously decided that the workers concerned should have the condition of employment known as "attendance money." All the union asks is—quite respectfully—that Parliament should abide by arbitration.

If the court had unanimously decided that point, I would be all in favour of supporting that paragraph. The letter goes on to say—

In conclusion, I offer the opinion that the introduction of an attendance money scheme will most assuredly result in more employment in the industry for which we all so earnestly strive.

I cannot follow that reasoning. I am given to understand there are 128 men in the union. If attendance money is granted, how is more employment going to be created? Yet that is what this paragraph clearly says. I do not know that there is going to be more employment unless there is more work to do; and from what I can understand, there is not enough work available at present.

A week ago I attended a pick-up at Fremantle wharf with a view to learning a little about the system. Quite frankly, I thought the way it worked was a credit to the organiser. We stayed there till about 8 o'clock on the day in question; and when we left, I think there were only 16

men available for work, and we were informed that half of them would be picked up before 10 o'clock. I went among the men to get their ideas regarding the request for attendance money. I spoke to men who were going out to work on a disabled tanker and from what they said it was obvious that the expense of doing the work on that vessel would be met by the company which owned it. I thought that that was a reasonable way for the system to work, but, on the other hand, if attendance money were granted, the cost of it would be spread over a lot of people who might not use the facilities, provided by the men of this union, to the same extent.

Knowing some shipwrights who live in the Claremont electorate, I asked one man, "What happens to the shipwrights when they do not get work on a wheat ship, such as structural repairs, or preparing the ship to hold bulk wheat?" He replied, "You do not have to worry about the shipwrights. They are experienced men and if there is no work on ships, they can get work carpentering." That surprised me as I thought that the shipwrights could have a claim, possibly, under the same conditions. From reading the judgment of the court and so on, we seem to arrive at a basic point, and that is to substitute attendance money for a higher rate of pay, which is the existing system, under which the union works—

Mr. Lawrence: The court will decide that.

Mr. CROMMELIN: Yes, under the existing system the loss-of-time factor through going to the wharf and not getting work, has been met by a lost-time allowance of £2 13s. 1d. a week or 16 per cent. of the total allowance. That means that the current rate of pay for painters and dockers is the basic wage, plus a margin for skill, plus an allowance for annual leave, plus an allowance for public holidays, plus an allowance for sick pay and, lastly, an allowance for lost time.

I appreciate that these men are skilled to a certain extent, but I feel that some of them are even more skilled than others because when another man told me he was a winchdriver, I asked how many winchdrivers there were and he said they always have a waiting list of people wanting to become winchdrivers. I think at that time they had 12 or 18 men on the waiting list. I asked, "Do you teach some of these men to be winchdrivers?", and he said, "Yes." I felt then that to a certain extent, the winchdrivers were a little more skilled than the men who painted the rigging, but he did not seem to think there was any difference.

We therefore get down to the same argument, which is whether the court was unanimous in its decision and what was the decision? It was unanimous in

its decision that the union's claim be not allowed, but it did not support unanimously the verbiage of Mr. Justice Neville concerning the decision agreed to. However, it may be attempted to show that Mr. Christian agreed with Judge Neville's comments, as well as with his decision on the union's application. The following extracts from Mr. Christian's remarks in the final judgment in the Arbitration Court case involving the Ship Painters and Dockers' Union show that he does not agree with any change in the method of employment and payment of ship painters and dockers.

The case cited is taken from the W.A. "Industrial Gazette" No. 36, page 542, Ship Painters and Dockers' (Casual Workers) Case No. 7 of 1956, in the Court of Arbitration of Western Australia, Tuesday the 18th December. The union applied for an award. It was granted, giving liberal margins and allowances. In his comments when the decision was handed down, Mr. Christian said—I now quote from page 544 of the "Gazette"—

Historically the margin of these workers has always followed the Federal ship painter and docker and I see no reason for departure from this practice. . . . these unskilled men will now receive about 9s. 7d. per hour compared with 8s. 7½d. received by a shipwright who serves a 5-year apprenticeship at his trade and for whom these men act as labourers fetching and carrying as directed. . . . This union has, particularly during the period of its de-registration—a matter of some years—obtained by strikes and threatened strikes many concessions which the employers did not wish to grant and from which the employers have now legally asked to be relieved. I can see no reason why these workers should be treated differently from any other casual workers except so far as a few conditions are concerned . . .

Holding these views, Mr. Christian does not appear likely to agree with the principle of granting these men appearance money, and his letter stating so, which was read to the House by the member for Nedlands, should be accepted. Those remarks are, as I said, quoted from Mr. Christian and so, having been down there and being interested and speaking to the men, I asked one of them whether conditions were good and he replied, "Yes, very good." I asked, "What are the earnings?" and he said, "We get about £15 per week for four days." I said, "Do you ever get 40-hours?" and he said, "Not often." I asked, "What do you get if you do?" and he said, "We get about £19, but, after all is said and done, the compensation we get for not getting the full 40-hours is reasonably fair." As some of the men down there appear to me to be getting on

in years, I do not think they really felt that they cared whether they had the extra day's work every week in the year.

Mr. Lawrence: You would not be a chicken yourself.

Mr. CROMMELIN: No; is the hon. member? After all, it is a moot point; some people prefer to go grey while others prefer to go bald, and that may have advantages. In conclusion, I feel that if the painters and dockers are not satisfied with present conditions—it appears that they are not—and with existing rates of pay and appearance money, they have still the right to appeal to the court, and seeing that this is the only State where an award of attendance money is being asked for, as it is in no other State in the Commonwealth—

Mr. Lawrence: But they appealed to the court.

Mr. CROMMELIN: They have not appealed further to the court for extra compensation.

Mr. Lawrence: They appealed to the late Mr. Justice Jackson.

Mr. CROMMELIN: Mr. Justice Jackson is not "late" yet. If there is something wrong, these men have the remedy through a further appeal to the Court.

Mr. Lawrence: Rubbish!

Mr. CROMMELIN: I oppose the second reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR (Hon. W. Hegney—Mt. Hawthorn—in reply) [9.25]: I will deal first with one or two of the matters mentioned by the member for Claremont and I think we can discard in this debate what he said to one man there and what the men said to him—

Mr. Crommelin: Why?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I think it was just an informal conversation which is not relevant to the issue. When the hon. member read some remarks by Mr. Christian in connection with the case, I think Mr. Christian apparently pointed out that these men, in connection with whom he used the word "unskilled," would receive more than shipwrights, but the member for Claremont earlier indicated clearly that a great degree of skill was required for much of this work. He then mentioned that the dock, rivers and harbours employees would receive more than a qualified tradesman.

The court has determined in the aggregate what these men should receive, and since the member for Claremont referred to certain allowances, I will mention in detail what they get for a 40-hour week. They get the basic wage of £13 5s. 2d., a margin of £1 19s. 6d., an allowance in lieu of annual leave and public holidays amounting to £1 4s. 4d., a sick leave allowance of 3s. 8d., a lost time allowance of 16 per cent.

or £2 13s. 1d., making a total of £19s. 5s. 9d., now £19 13s. 4d., or the equivalent of 9s. 10d. per hour.

The average for tradesmen is £3 15s. margin and the very fact that these men get an allowance of £2 13s. 1d., or 16 per cent., indicates that with the margin for skill that is added, it could easily exceed the tradesman's remuneration. But these men do not get £19 13s. 4d. every week. Their aggregate wages over a period are averaged, and that is the reason why the court allowed the men something for lost time. The hon. member asked why they do not appeal to the court again. They appealed to the court last year, and I will not belabour this point of the unanimous decision of the court or argue about it. Suffice it to say that if any member will read in cold print the judgment as announced by the president of the Arbitration Court, he can decide for himself what the two lay members of the court did agree to.

We will assume that neither Mr. Davies nor Mr. Christian agreed with the president. But the president of the court, who is an impartial party in the Arbitration Court, made the decision and he also made the remark. I am not going to quote word for word what Mr. Justice Neville said. He said the court had authority to make an award. They could make an award as against the previous employer, or the subsequent employer, but in either case it would be unfair and unjust; and then he said it was eminently desirable that some form of attendance money be provided for these men, and indicated that an Act of Parliament was necessary. That was said by the present president of the Arbitration Court.

I am now going to quote the opinion of the previous president of the Arbitration Court, who is now a judge of the Supreme Court, namely Mr. Justice Jackson, when this union submitted a case to him in 1951. He said that they must try to get this attendance money by compulsory means and suggested that their first move should be an Act of Parliament. I have already quoted his remarks word for word and they will be found in a previous Hansard. Accordingly we now have two judges of the Supreme Court, one a previous president of the Arbitration Court, and the other the present president of the Arbitration Court, both indicating that the only way this union can get attendance money is by means of an Act of Parliament.

Mr. Court: That has not been disputed.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Does the hon. member agree that two judges of the court indicate that if this organisation desires the principle of attendance money to be implemented, an Act of Parliament is needed?

Mr. Court: That is so.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: We are clear on that point, and that is why this amending Bill is here—for that reason and for that reason alone. When the case went before the court the Government indicated to the tribunal in very clear terms that if this was an industry considered by the court to warrant the principle of attendance money being implemented, then we would leave the matter to the Arbitration Court. I am not going to report what the judges have said, but suffice it to say that two judges of the Supreme Court said that the principle needs an Act of Parliament, and the present judge of the Arbitration court said it is eminently desirable that parliamentary action be taken so that some such scheme be implemented.

Now let me deal with the matter of lost time in relation to attendance money. When I introduced the Bill I mentioned that the president of the Arbitration Court had said that if Parliament implemented legislation to provide for attendance money and it was granted, then the Arbitration Court might feel disposed to reconsider the ingredient of lost time in the aggregate of the men's wages. The member for South Fremantle hit the nail on the head when he said that the payment of attendance money is not a substitute for lost time. We are not arguing that at all. What we say is that if this Bill passes and is made law, the Fremantle Harbour Trust will be empowered to create a fund from which attendance money can be paid, and the amount of the attendance money will be determined by the Arbitration Court, which will make any variation in the ingredient of the aggregate wage paid for a 40 hour week.

Mr. Court: Are you putting forward the proposition that attendance money is not a substitute for the higher casual rates?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: No. If this Bill passes a fund will subsequently be created from which attendance money will be paid, and the amount will be determined by the Arbitration Court. That court has already indicated that it might feel disposed to make some alteration, say, in the lost time factor, which is now a part of the ship painters and dockers unions' award. We leave the whole matter to the court. All we are doing is providing the machinery whereby the Fremantle Harbour Trust will be able to raise a fund in the Treasury from which attendance money can be paid. The amount of the attendance money will be determined by the Arbitration Court and it will make any adjustment in the present aggregate charge for these men that it considers necessary.

Mr. Crommelin: How will attendance money increase employment?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I did not say that it would. If this principle of attendance money is adopted, it will.

raise the dignity of labour for the men concerned. What is more, I think it will help stabilise employment.

Everybody understands that a pool of labour is necessary. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition quoted figures provided by the secretary of the union. I have them with me, but I do not propose to quote them. For a period they were favourable, but for another period they show that there was a little unemployment. It means that attendance money would not be paid if they were in full employment. There are, of course, figures to which every member has access which indicate that there may be 30 or 40 men who are required to be at the pickup place for two hours and who may be turned away because there is no employment. As I have pointed out, "They also serve who only stand and wait," and they are entitled to some reasonable compensation for offering their services.

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

Ayes	26
Noes	17
Majority for	9

Ayes.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Evans	Mr. Moir
Mr. Gaffy	Mr. Norton
Mr. Graham	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Potter
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Heal	Mr. Sewell
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Toms
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Kelly	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Ackland	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Bovell	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Brand	Mr. Owen
Mr. Court	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. I. Manning
Mr. W. Manning	

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Cornell
Mr. Nulsen	Mr. Oldfield

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—KING'S PARK AQUATIC CENTRE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 3rd September.

MR. MAY (Collie) [9.40]: I would like to say at once that if this Bill has done nothing else, it has brought many people to this House, who have possibly never been here before.

Mr. Court: They are all going now.

Mr. MAY: I would further express the hope that the many visitors we have seen here tonight will take an interest in legislation apart from that about which they are particularly concerned. The Lord Mayor of Perth is very anxious about the matter contained in this Bill, and if he has done nothing else he has helped to popularise this place, the galleries of which we see empty so very often.

Before dealing with the Bill, I would like to point out that I do not intend in any personal way to attack those who are responsible for its appearance in this Chamber; nor do I intend to delve into the history of King's Park or why it was set aside, and how it was set aside, and all the rest of it, because the previous speakers have done their job well. My main concern is with the people who have expressed themselves in connection with this measure—what they are saying and what they are feeling in connection with it—and I intend to confine my remarks more or less to that aspect. First of all, I would like to say that the country people in particular consider King's Park to be something sacred.

Mr. Evans: Hear, hear!

The Minister for Lands: That is not so.

Mr. MAY: The Minister has had his say, and I am now entitled to express my opinion. The country people generally say that Perth without King's Park cannot be imagined; that is their opinion in regard to this matter. They say that the park belongs to the people of this State generally; not only to those who live in the metropolitan area, but also to those far back in the bush. When these people come to Perth, they expect to be able to use the park, as many people do, as a place where they can sit and think and rest.

The Minister for Lands: Just sit!

Mr. MAY: They do not regard it as a centre where buildings should be erected, nor do they consider that they should be exempt from participating in the enjoyment of any area of the park. I say that we should see that the park is protected, especially from commercialism. What the people do with the park 50 years hence will not be our business, but they will be able to see from the record that the people of this generation and those in control of the Parliament of this day did study their interests, inasmuch as we took every precaution to protect it.

I think it would be fitting at this stage if I ensured that a complete record of those members who signed the memorial memorandum—it was not a petition; it was just a memorandum intended to be

handed to the Premier for his information in regard to what members were thinking in regard to this proposed legislation—

The Minister for Transport: Which they had never seen.

Hon. L. Thorn: There is East Perth again!

The Minister for Transport: There will always be an East Perth.

Mr. MAY: I will read the list of names, which is—

S. E. Lapham, North Perth; J. B. Sleeman, Fremantle; T. D. Evans, Kalgoorlie; H. D. Andrew, Victoria Park; J. J. Rhatigan, Kimberley; J. M. Toms, Maylands; F. Marshall, Wembley Beaches—

The Premier: Present.

Mr. MAY:

—C. J. Jamieson, Beeloo; H. May, Collie—

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: How did you get in?

Mr. MAY:

—R. P. Lawrence, South Fremantle; E. M. O'Brien, Murchison; A. M. Moir, Boulder; D. Norton, Gascoyne; W. J. Gaffy, Canning; S. E. I. Johnson, Leederville; J. Hegney, Middle Swan; W. H. Sewell, Geraldton; R. Hutchinson, Cottesloe; J. I. Mann, Avon Valley; G. F. Roberts, Bunbury—

The Minister for Transport: Comic opera.

Mr. MAY:

—W. S. Bovell, Vasse; I. W. Manning, Harvey—

Mr. I. W. Manning: Present, sir.

Mr. MAY:

—A. F. Watts, Stirling; R. C. Owen, Darling Range—

The Minister for Transport: Darling, too!

Mr. MAY:

—C. D. Nalder, Katanning; W. A. Manning, Narrogin; C. C. Perkins, Roe; G. M. Cornell, Mt. Marshall; E. P. Oldfield, Mt. Lawley; W. L. Grayden, South Perth.

Mr. Bovell: From the four corners of the State.

Mr. MAY: I have mentioned these names because they are the members who represent people in the far-flung portions of the State and it goes to support what I have been saying in regard to the people and their desires in connection with King's Park. I feel it is our particular job to hand it down to posterity free and unfettered.

I could give examples of what will happen if this Bill is agreed to. First of all we have the King's Park tennis courts and, secondly, the King's Park Bowling Club. Both of these institutions are on ground which has been set aside for their use in King's Park, and they are absolutely shut away from the rest of the public, unless one pays to go in. That is the feature of this Bill.

Hon. D. Brand: Who gave the land to them?

Mr. MAY: If an aquatic centre is erected in King's Park, the same thing will apply; that portion will be completely isolated.

Mr. Ackland: There will not be a restricted membership in regard to the pool.

Mr. MAY: That does not matter; one will have to pay to go in if one wants to see inside the pool. It would not affect the member for Moore very much because he could take a daily dip somewhere else.

The Minister for Transport: Daily dip?

Mr. Ackland: Monthly dip.

Mr. MAY: In my opinion, it serves to show that if this Bill goes through and the aquatic centre becomes an established fact, all these organisations—there are dozens of them; I have never received so many letters before in connection with any proposal before this Parliament—representing sporting bodies and supporting this proposal, will be found to have had an ulterior purpose in that regard.

Mr. Hearman: No, cut that out!

Mr. MAY: They are not only supporting the Lord Mayor of Perth, but have an eye to the future. Therefore, if this Bill goes through and an aquatic centre is established in King's Park, every sporting organisation or body of any description will make an application for space and eventually there will be no King's Park left of any value. I want to warn members against this pressurised propaganda that has been sent to us. So far as I am concerned, it has left me completely cold—colder than swimming in the aquatic centre in King's Park. For this very reason alone, the Bill should be resisted to the utmost.

One can imagine the quiet atmosphere and the splendid natural surroundings of the park being completely spoilt by those people who would use the pool. I say, no, a thousand times, no. Do not let us be a party to this. I say we should continue to be proud and jealous of this heritage, and let us protect it from those who would destroy it, and so we shall earn the eternal gratitude of the people in this great State and those who will come after us, who will. I have no doubt, express their approval of the steps taken to prevent the alienation of such a beautiful spot as King's Park.

I want to refer to the hot spring at Dalkeith and what has happened there.

Mr. Hearman: What do you know about it?

Mr. MAY: I should imagine by the smiles of some members they have been there.

Mr. Ackland: We are surprised at your knowing anything about it.

Mr. MAY: I know what has happened there and I know that the people, whose authority it was to control it, could not do it, and the same thing will happen to an aquatic centre in King's Park.

Mr. Court: I do not think that is fair comment.

Mr. MAY: I do not doubt for one moment the sincerity of the Lord Mayor in connection with this matter. I do not know the man and have never met him, and there is nothing personal in my remarks about this matter, but my attitude towards this Bill has not changed one iota due to the pressure which has been brought to bear on members in regard to it. If that propaganda did anything at all, it put members against this Bill. I say we should have been free in this Chamber to deal with this Bill in exactly the same way as we deal with other Bills, without the propaganda which has been sent to us over the last three or four weeks.

Hon. D. Brand: Minus a petition.

Mr. MAY: So far as I am concerned, the propaganda cut no ice.

Hon. L. Thorn: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAY: I want to say, in connection with the people outback with whom I have come in contact, that their cry is, "For God's sake, don't let them destroy King's Park."

Mr. Ackland: What about the Collie coalfields?

Mr. MAY: The words I have just used were those of a woman who spoke to me in Collie in connection with the matter.

The Minister for Lands: Only one.

Mr. MAY: She asked my attitude and I told her, to which she replied, "Thank God."

The Premier: Is she single or married?

Mr. MAY: It must be now gathered that I am in opposition to this Bill, and I oppose it.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe) [9.56]: First and foremost I would like to say, lest there be any doubt about my stand on this matter, that I oppose the Bill. Before carrying on further, I would like to ascertain whether or not the Minister in charge of the Bill has changed his mind since he has found that he is to be appointed Agent General in London for Western Australia.

The Minister for Transport: Cheap stuff that!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I hope the Minister will, when he is over there, soft pedal his views on Western Australian flora in that great city of the British Empire.

The Minister for Lands: I will have to be careful not to tell them about some members in this Chamber, or we will not get any more migrants.

Mr. Bovell: They may take the Minister as an example.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I hope the Minister will not bruit abroad his views on flora, because he made that false statement some time ago, that there was nothing beautiful in King's Park except that which was man-made. I can see the Minister is still going to stand on that point, and I regret it.

The position regarding the siting of an aquatic centre and the possibility of the future policy of the King's Park Board is, I consider, quite an important one. It is possibly not as important as general interest indicates, but nevertheless it is very important in its sphere. The siting of the aquatic centre is a challenge to people. I wonder whether the people as a whole are big enough to face up to this challenge. We are confronted with this choice: Should we destroy something that is beautiful or would it not be better to beautify something that is ugly? In considering the first choice we must conclude that we would certainly destroy something that is beautiful.

Mr. Potter: Veldt grass.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Obviously the hon. member has not been near the area in question because the 20 acres that it is intended to use for the project is indeed a very beautiful part of the park; and I am sincere when I say that. The bush in this particular spot has not the majesty of a karri forest, but it has some of the qualities of a jarrah forest and it certainly has a rare quality of its own.

Mr. Rodoreda: How lyrical can you get!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The hon. member does not know what a jarrah forest is.

Mr. Rodoreda: You could say the same about any other 20 acres.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I find it extremely difficult to argue with those who believe as the member for Kimberley does.

Mr. Rodoreda: The member for Kimberley did not say anything.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am sorry, the member for Pilbara. It is difficult to argue with people who think along those lines. The hon. member's view runs parallel with that of a school of thought which claims that there is nothing beautiful in King's Park at all. As a matter of

fact, I think the Minister himself subscribes to that view; and I only respect the view because I believe the people who hold it are sincere in their belief, and I only trust that they feel I am sincere in mine.

If I happen to wax a little lyrical, I am sorry. I have been exhorted by my colleagues to refrain from becoming emotional or lyrical on this subject, and I do not want to do the wrong thing in that regard. I do not want to become over-emotional, but I do say simply that I believe this to be a very beautiful part of the park.

Mr. Rodoreda: Just relax, and get on with it.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Some members, like the hon. member who recently interjected, would surely see some beauty in it at present although they might not at other seasons of the year. But at any season it presents moods and faces that many people in the State have learned to love. This area of 20 acres would be destroyed for the project the Minister has in mind. I consider it would be far better to take the other choice and try to beautify a section of the metropolitan area that presents an ugly face to the public view.

Mr. Potter: There is not one.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There are such in many places. At Burswood Island there is a site that presents an ugly picture, and I go so far as to say that in the future that area will present a colourful picture, particularly on a week-end when we will find sporting amenities and facilities of every kind there. In the metropolitan area we have plenty of room for the siting of an aquatic centre or an olympic pool. Indeed, there is plenty of room for many such sites. I believe there is room for all. I see no reason why the member for Pilbara and the Minister who has introduced the Bill should not come along with us and allow those people who believe—

The Minister for Lands: I am prepared for a select committee to inquire into this. How do you feel about that?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I do not think a select committee would do any good.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: It depends who we put on the select committee.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I hope that in this regard the Minister takes the point I make, which is that we have to face up to the question of destroying something that is beautiful to put something that may be equally beautiful in its place. I will go as far as the Minister wants me to in that regard. The proposition is to destroy something beautiful and to put something man-made there, or to beautify some other place that deserves to be beautified because it presents an ugly face to the public view.

The Minister for Lands: I do not mind Burswood Island being made beautiful but it is not a proper suggestion, I think, to ask that there should be an aquatic centre there.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Why does not the Minister think an olympic pool should be put there?

The Minister for Lands: Not this one, because of the high cost.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Later I will come to that point.

The Minister for Lands: In any case, I am prepared to have it examined by a select committee. Why aren't you?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I do not think a committee of this House will be the slightest bit of good. The Leader of my party has said he will not have a bar of this committee, because he will not appoint anybody to it. Who is he going to appoint to the select committee? Is he going to appoint me, because I am one who is opposed to this proposition; or is he going to appoint the member for Nedlands, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, because he is in support of it? If the Minister will allow me to make my point, I will appreciate it.

The Minister for Lands: I am not interrupting you. You keep talking to me.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am on the second choice and that is to take some area and make something of it. I have suggested Burswood Island, but there are other areas. Reabold Hill is mentioned. I have not looked into this; I do not think it is my concern, really. Today someone brought to my notice another site—one at City Beach—for an olympic pool. This appears on a page from the "Weekend Mail" dated Saturday, the 18th June, 1955.

The Minister for Transport: That paper pushed the "Mirror" out of circulation.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Minister is sometimes very fatherly in his interjections. He is more often than not most resentful of anyone interjecting on him.

The Minister for Transport: No, I appreciate it.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: His comment was not really appropriate.

The Minister for Transport: It goes to show how much substance there is in that rag, anyway.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There is no substance in either the view the Minister is expressing or in what lies behind it. Let me go on. This half page of the paper shows a plan of the City Beach area that was prepared by Professor Stephenson who was brought here by the

Government to give us a town plan. The Perth City Council commissioned him to draw up a plan for the City Beach area.

Mr. Potter: That is for 1984.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: This gives a clear indication of the type of sporting facilities that the Perth City Council desires to have in that area.

Mr. Rodoreda: We have not any choice of where we are going to put the pool.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: We have been continually requested to give some other views. The Perth City Council has these other sites in mind, and here it asked Professor Stephenson to draw up a plan for City Beach and amongst other things to include in it an olympic pool. I think this was one of the things that was really wanted by the proponents of the pool in the park scheme.

Mr. Rodoreda: We are dealing with a particular Bill for a particular site.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I suggest the member for Pilbara is very edgy tonight. I cannot see where I am infringing on matters that I should not be touching on. The City Council then had other plans in mind.

The Minister for Lands: How far inland, from the sea, is it proposed to build according to that plan?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It does not say here, but from the plan I would think about half a mile. The plan includes provision for open air dancing, roller skating, an olympic swimming pool, an aquacade, football fields, athletic stadium, tennis courts, bowling green, jubilee park—a huge man-made park incidentally—a theatre, an 18-hole golf course, a hotel and restaurant, and half a dozen other things. It is quite a comprehensive plan.

The Minister for Lands: What sort of land is it?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It would make an excellent site for the whole of these activities; and it is facing City Beach proper.

The Minister for Lands: What is on it now?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Nothing apart, possibly, from a few houses. In the main, it is available for the proposal as we see it outlined here.

Mr. Potter: There is some lovely banksia out there.

Mr. Rodoreda: Beautiful flora.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I leave the listener to judge the worth of the interjections.

The Minister for Lands: You are not worried about destroying the flora there?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: No, not there. I am not concerned with that at all, but I am concerned with the preservation of the King's Park area, because it is in the very heart of the city. I did not think there would be any necessity to put that point of view to the Minister.

The Minister for Lands: I only wanted to know.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Is the Minister quite satisfied now?

The Minister for Lands: I am not satisfied, no.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There has been a great deal of talk about the fact that King's Park makes an ideal site for an aquatic centre or an olympic pool. Indeed, King's Park would make an ideal site for any sort of sporting facility or amenity that we would like to put there. It would be an ideal site for a hospital, and that point, as was mentioned by a previous speaker, was discussed many years ago. The Premier of the day, at the time left no doubt in anyone's mind as to how he wanted the park to remain, namely, in its present state of preservation.

Mr. Hall: Who was the Premier at the time?

Mr. O'Brien: Phil Collier.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: King's Park is a site in a million for an indigenous floral reserve. Various cities all over the world have parks for this purpose and that purpose in the heart of the city. Well, they can have parks that provide for every form of sporting facility, pleasure gardens, restaurants, hotels and all the rest—I think that is ideal—but they have not got a park such as we have here. I believe we can still have the sort of parks that some people envisage, but let us have this one.

The Minister for Lands: Do you want to retain 900 acres of it?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Yes. The Minister has raised a pertinent point and although I had not intended to refer to it at this juncture, I shall comment on it. I say it is imperative that we have every one of these 900 acres. In many respects, it is a pity that any portion of the park has been alienated. The reason I say that is fairly obvious to anyone who has made a study of the situation. In order to preserve the natural bushland, it is essential that the area be as large as possible. It is a pity that the park is not larger than 1,000 acres.

The Minister for Lands: It is a pity we knocked trees down at all.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There is no necessity for that remark. The Minister might feel there is a necessity for it, but I cannot see the logic in it.

The Minister for Lands: You would have us all living up trees like monkeys.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: In order to preserve the indigenous flora, it is necessary to have a large area and any portion that is excised from the overall natural bushland means thrusting the natural frontier of the park further and further back. The impact of civilisation on the natural bushland leads to a deterioration of it, and there must be very careful handling of the native flora in order that it can be preserved over the years. If 20 acres were excised for this particular purpose, we would not see any immediate deterioration in the park during the Minister's lifetime, or possibly in my lifetime. But we would certainly chop off many years from the lifetime of this park as an indigenous flora reserve and that is what most of us have in mind—that when we have been dead for hundreds of years, this park will still be there.

But if we are going to take one section for this and another section for that, how can we preserve the indigenous flora? So the arguments of those who say that they are in agreement with the preservation of indigenous flora but also feel that some sections of the park should be utilised for this purpose or for that purpose, are off the beam because if we excise those portions, we threaten the life of the park as an indigenous flora reserve. I feel that the metropolitan area is big enough to have an indigenous flora reserve and also the type of man-made park which some members would like to have, and which some organisations would like to have—and which I would like to have, too—with all the necessary sporting facilities.

I am all in favour of having an olympic pool in Perth but the point at issue is the question of the site, and more importantly, the question of the future policy of the King's Park Board. I think it is significant that had this area not been preserved for posterity, somewhere around the year 1870—there seems to be some doubt as to whether it was 1871 or 1873—this problem would never have arisen because the whole of the area concerned would have been completely covered with houses.

The Minister for Labour: That is right.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Where then would the olympic pool have been placed? It would have been placed somewhere else and all the technical and engineering difficulties would have had to be overcome. Various boards have had control of this park for less than a hundred years and in that time the question of the alienation of certain sections of the park has been debated; at least it has been debated over the last 50 years. But in order to preserve it for all the people all the time, it is essential to retain the whole of it that remains in order that we can keep our native bushland. I feel, too, that as the years go by, the park will be

regarded by the people as more and more of a treasure and as having more and more value.

As a race, Australians are young; we are a young people and there are a large number of us who do not think as much of the cultural side as do others. When I say that, I am not slighting the proponents of this scheme; but I feel that there is a cultural background in King's Park that the public in future years should not be denied. The present King's Park Board has had some small success along certain lines over recent years.

Recently there has been a change of policy regarding the preservation of the indigenous flora and with that change of policy I entirely disagree. This change of policy has led to a rank failure as far as the preservation of flora is concerned. The prime object over many years, traditionally, has been the preservation of this indigenous flora, but over recent years the King's Park Board has begun to tidy up the park. It has begun to cut down the dead trees, and trucks have driven through the bushland to pick up large cords of wood that have been stacked there.

The Minister for Lands: And planted 5,000 trees.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Yes; I do not deny the good work the board has done. But allow me to criticise what I feel to be the bad work. I would say that the greatest condemnation we could offer to the present administration of the park is that they are tidying it up.

Mr. Heal: That is a terrific crime!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It is a crime so far as the prime object of the park is concerned.

The Minister for Lands: You mean that you want the undergrowth to grow so much and get so out of hand that nobody will be able to go in there.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I want it to be natural—nature as it was.

The Minister for Lands: I think that is pitiful.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The natural bush is wild, unruly and tangled.

The Minister for Lands: That is nonsense.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: That is as it should be, because it is natural. It is the tidying up of the park that I do not like because it is those parts that have lost their natural character.

Mr. Heal: Don't you like the tennis courts and the Hale school grounds?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Yes, but I would have preferred them to be elsewhere.

Mr. Heal: You use them enough.

The Minister for Lands: You know that if these things were elsewhere, nobody would ever go into the park.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Minister said that John Forrest put them there, or that John Forrest was wanting to put them there, or that someone else was wanting to put them there. Much debate went on at that time as the Minister well knows; but I am not greatly concerned as to whether Lord Forrest said this or said that. I can get as many quotations from Lord Forrest's speeches to prove my point as possibly those with the opposite view could get to prove their point.

The Minister for Lands: It is not what Lord Forrest said about this, but what he did.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: On the particular point at issue, I am not greatly concerned with what he did.

The Minister for Lands: I cannot work out what you are concerned about.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I suggest that the Minister should endeavour to pay a little more attention to what is going on. The park should be left in its natural state and the golden rule in regard to the preservation of the indigenous flora should be to leave the park well alone. There are many walks which have been made through the park; special bitumen paths have been constructed including bridle paths along which people may walk and enjoy the bush. I can see that the member for Pilbara is about to tell me that nobody ever goes through that area or that some dead man was found there, and that he had been there for about four years; or some other such nonsense. But I cannot see that that has any bearing on the situation. The question of King's Park remaining in its natural state is much the same as the question of whether we should have an art gallery or not. Because the great majority of people do not use an art gallery is no reason for saying that we should do away with it.

The Minister for Lands: But in an art gallery there must be pictures; otherwise nobody would go there.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There is the widest variety of pictures that one could ever wish to see in King's Park. If only the Minister would go there—

The Minister for Lands: I know it well.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There is the viewpoint of the Minister, and once again the listener can judge for himself the quality of the Minister's remarks.

The Minister for Lands: But you just said you want the whole lot to be overgrown and left in its natural state so that nobody can get in there.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I have just pointed out that there are paths bisecting all angles of the park. Bridle paths

have been constructed so that people can go through the park and see it in its natural state.

The Minister for Lands: They become overgrown in a few years.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: They do not become overgrown at all.

The Minister for Lands: They do.

Hon. D. Brand: Are they natural or artificial paths?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The King's Park Board is there for certain purposes—to provide for the pleasure and recreation of the people and to assist in the preservation of the indigenous flora.

The Minister for Lands: But you just said that you wished that nobody had touched the park.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Minister does not believe that there is anything beautiful there. I am putting my points of view but he continues to interject on me. It is not a sophisticated beauty, but the park presents an ever-changing face. I feel that the members of the board who by their policy and by their actions have indicated that the park is doomed as a natural floral reserve, should be replaced. In my opinion, those members of the board are defeatists and should not have the care of the park entrusted to them. But if this medicine is too strong, and I suppose it is, then the very least that should be done is the appointment to the board of certain scientists and particularly the appointment of an ecologist, one who understands the relationship between animals and or plants and civilisation, one who understands the effect that civilisation has upon the natural flora.

Some months ago I asked a question as to whether or not it would be possible to have placed on the board one or more of these scientists, and the Minister's answer was that, it was not considered necessary because the board had recourse to the best of advice from the various Government departments—advice from botanists, entomologists, and the like. I agree with that; the board has recourse to these people, but surely to goodness a board which has under its control a thousand acres of bushland should have among its members scientists who can help formulate a policy with regard to actions in the park. Surely they should be able to comment concurrently on what is happening in respect of the board when it is about to take some action. I would say that the King's Park Board without an ecologist is like a board of directors of an insurance company on which there is no director with any knowledge of insurance; or it is like a political party without a policy.

The Minister for Transport: The Liberal Party.

The Minister for Labour: You are skating on thin ice there.

Hon. D. Brand: It is better than having two policies.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: So I hope that in future the King's Park Board will have placed on it scientists of calibre who will be able to assist in carrying out the work of that body in a proper way. I trust that if this Bill is defeated, two things will take place. Firstly, that a real policy will be formulated by the King's Park Board with regard to the preservation of indigenous flora and, secondly, that the City Council will not be piqued by a rejection of its proposals and that it will crack on with the construction of an Olympic pool or aquatic centre in some other portion of the metropolitan area.

The Minister for Transport: Better establish it in the middle of the Nullarbor Plain so as not to offend anybody!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Minister is most scathing when he is on his feet and someone makes interjections like that. It has no substance whatever and it is not worthy of the Minister to make such an interjection. I want to refer briefly, and I say briefly because I feel sure that the member for Claremont wants me to be brief—

The Minister for Transport: So do a dozen others.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I would have concluded my remarks before this had it not been for the silly interjections on the part of one or two members opposite. I want to comment briefly on the change of policy of the King's Park Board, and in doing so to refer to the change in lettering on the notice boards in King's Park. The notice board that was taken down from the corner of the park proposed to be used for the aquatic centre, carried wording which must have caused a degree of embarrassment to the King's Park Board and possibly to the Perth City Council, because the main notice stated as follows:—

This park was founded in 1873. Its area is 1,000 acres and it has for its—

The following words are in capital letters—

—primary object the preservation of its indigenous flora.

That notice board was erected in the area which was to be bulldozed and upon which was to be constructed an Olympic pool.

The new notice boards that have been placed in the park—I presume they will follow the trend of the wording on the notice board at the main gates and referred to by the Minister—contain wording that leaves out the primary object of the park, that is, the preservation of its indigenous flora.

The Minister for Lands: That was not the primary object of the park. Who told you that?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Over the years it has been the primary object of the various King's Park boards.

The Minister for Lands: If you want to find out the primary object of the park, you should look at the records. You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I do not want to lengthen my speech further. The Minister will have the opportunity to reply. I have already given the Minister enough attention.

The Minister for Lands: I am giving you the opportunity to make a correction.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The wording on the new notice board states as follows:—

This park was founded in 1873. Of its total area of 1000 acres about 940 acres have been retained as bushlands, the remainder being lawns and gardens. Many beautiful flowers are to be seen in the bush areas during September, October and November.

It is nice to know that the board will still have some regard for those flowers. The decay occasioned to the park by excisions of portions of it would be hastened during the years to come when other sporting bodies follow the lead set in this regard by using like pressure tactics to get their pound of flesh from the park. That process of decay must certainly be hastened because how else could we act if we allowed this Bill to go through the House? No legitimate reason could be advanced for opposing any other sporting body from taking its cut of the park. As I pointed out earlier, every acre that is taken away will hasten the eventual decay of the park.

I would very much like to assist my many sporting friends who differ from me in regard to the construction of the Olympic pool in King's Park. I say that quite frankly. I believe that this city does need an Olympic pool. I believe that the worthy objective of gaining such an amenity should not be contingent on the unworthy objective of destroying something that is beautiful. For the record I should make one or two quotations.

The Royal Society of Western Australia wrote me a letter which deserves to be mentioned in full. I feel that possibly some other member at a later stage might see fit to read it in full because it is very pertinent indeed to the subject matter of this Bill, but suffice it to say at this stage that the Royal Society of Western Australia is most concerned about the possibility of any portion of the park being excised for any sort of sporting or other purposes whatsoever. It regards the park as a reserve for indigenous flora. I would just mention that letter and suggest to members that it is a very important document and ought to be deeply considered during this debate.

I would now quote from an article appearing in the Melbourne "Sun" of the 28th April, 1954, headed "Stop Stealing Our Parks." It says—

What a glorious city Melbourne would have been if its great belt of park lands have been preserved intact. In 90 years 880 of the 2,500 acres provided by the original planners have been filched, with the connivance of itchy official fingers.

Albert Park once extended from the bay foreshore to St. Kilda-rd., and the green belt extended through Fawkner Park, the Domain, Richmond Park, Flinders Park, Fitzroy and Treasury Gardens, Carlton Gardens, Princess Park, Royal Park and the Flagstaff Gardens.

Royal Park fronted Sydney-rd and extended westward over a square mile of picturesque land, and the smaller Flagstaff Gardens.

What a magnificent playground Albert Park would have been if its beach frontage and St. Kilda-rd. frontage had been retained.

In the 1860's and 1870's parsimonious shortsighted governments, when Treasury funds were low, put the most valuable park frontages up for auction.

In that way Albert Park, originally known as South Park, lost its bayside and St. Kilda-rd. frontages.

The Minister for Transport: Is it not an important point that there is no proposition that even a fraction of an acre is to be taken away from King's Park? It is still to be a park.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I have to interrupt my quotation of this article to answer the Minister. It is obvious he is not prepared to listen. It has become very obvious from discussions between friends, interested parties and people who have considered this question over the past months that few will listen to the other's point of view. I have not heard of such intolerance in my life.

The Minister for Lands: You are a bit weak on that. Why do you not answer the question?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Leader of the Opposition points a finger at me, but I would like to tell him that I do not entirely absolve myself from blame in that respect.

The Minister for Education: You are making the best speech I have heard from you.

The Minister for Transport: It is still very poor, mind you.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The article goes on to say—

Large pieces have been filched from Melbourne's parklands for roads, railways and tramways, and to provide cheap sites for Government buildings (such as schools and institutions).

Areas have been enclosed for organised sport, for which the owners of the parks, the people, have to pay for admission.

This seems to ring a bell in regard to the venture under discussion.

The Minister for Transport: The same as the Claremont oval or the Perth oval.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Minister will have the opportunity to get up and have his say.

The Minister for Transport: I might even do that.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I would very much like to hear his contribution, but not for the sense in it. The quote goes on—

Albert Park's original 951 acres has been reduced to about 560 acres.

Large pieces of Princess Park, Yarra Park, Albert Park, and other public parklands have been taken for permanently enclosed sports grounds, and the filching process is going on.

Albert Park already has lost about 390 acres, and now its own committee of management is prepared to allow another piece of it to be fenced off for organised sports, for which admission charges are to be made.

Only a little piece, of course! Only a little nibble.

That much of the article from the "Sun" will indicate to us how regretful a great section of the public in Melbourne is over the filching of its public parklands. Mark this: Their parklands have been parklands of more or less man-made nature. They have not the rare qualities that King's Park possesses, the qualities that have made that park world famous.

The SPEAKER: The hon member's time has expired.

MR. POTTER (Subiaco) [10.43]: After listening to the previous speaker, it seems useless to prolong the debate much further. He wound up by referring to parklands. In the "Daily News" over the last few evenings we have had a series of articles telling us what happened in other parts of the world in respect of parks. I concur with the Minister when he stated on introducing this Bill that it would be advisable to get down to a plan in relation to the park. The previous speaker referred to the King's Park Board and the indigenous flora in the park. He became lyrical, in fact.

From time to time over the past 30 years I have walked through the park. I used to walk in and out of the portion referred to on my way to work. I can say that half the flora and trees in that area are not indigenous. They are no more indigenous to King's Park than eucalypti are indigenous to Durban or Palestine, although gum trees are found in those two places. There is the pepper tree and quite a number of others, including the Geraldton wax. As a result of fires that have swept through that area year after year—and nobody perhaps suffers more from them than my constituents—quite a lot of that area has been burned out, and what were once fine stands of jarrah are nothing but naked limbs exposed to the sky.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is far more lyrical than I ever was!

Mr. POTTER: When I made my first speech in this House I referred to the necessity for cleaning up Thomas-st., and some of my constituents feel that the area should be given to the State Housing Commission for the erection of a few buildings. That is what they think about it.

Hon. L. Thorn: That will be the next move.

Mr. POTTER: I am not speaking for all of them, of course. I know that this is a democratic Parliament and that a democratic vote is taken here. But when I heard a previous speaker reading the names of those who signed this notorious petition, I felt that there was some sort of intimidation.

I support the measure, and I want to make my position absolutely clear. I know that aspersions will be cast, and the argument will be adduced that the member for Subiaco and his constituents have everything to gain from this measure and nothing to lose. Let me assure members that if such a proposal had been made in reference to Albany, Bunbury, Busselton or Broome, and the support of this House had been required, I would have supported the proposal. Similarly, if I lived in one of those areas I would give this Bill my support, because I would not have the temerity to butt the local authorities responsible for the plan, or the people in the district concerned.

This House has been charged with the management of the Park and, in the words of the member for North Perth, next week there might be a Bill designed to provide for the park to be used for the grazing of sheep in order to keep down the veldt grass. I think that the member for Mt. Lawley, by interjection, said that we would need goats for the wild oats. That is the situation in which this House will find itself.

Mr. Roberts: You want the centre in Subiaco?

Mr. POTTER: Subiaco has not space for an aquatic centre and the City of Subiaco has not discussed the matter. If this proposal had applied to a Class "A" reserve in the city of Subiaco, I trust that the member for Bunbury would have supported it. I would like to point out that my constituents are divided on this issue—I have had letters from them—but the proportion is roughly 80 per cent for and 20 per cent. against.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Who took the ballot?

Mr. POTTER: It was taken through the paper twelve months ago. A firm with 126 employees took a vote on the issue.

Mr. Norton: What was the question asked?

Mr. POTTER: Whether they would have an aquatic centre or not.

Mr. Roberts: Everybody wants an aquatic centre.

Mr. POTTER: The question was whether it was to be in King's Park. That is what we are discussing. In the vote to which I referred, 123 were in favour and three against; and I think that is a fair indication of public opinion around here.

Hon. L. Thorn: How did the manager vote?

Mr. POTTER: As a matter of fact, it was a spontaneous action on the part of the employees, and the management had nothing to do with it. That is why I take more cognisance of the result than I might otherwise have done.

I trust that members will consider this matter impartially. I have not heard any arguments advanced as to why this part of the park should be preserved and why there should not be an aquatic centre established there. I know that various people have localities in which they would like an aquatic centre to be established. If they were in the same position as the Perth City Council, would they take any notice of anybody else in this matter?

This proposition should be considered on its merits. The pros and cons have been weighed; and I think it is almost audacious to suggest another place for the establishment of this centre, because the whole matter has been gone into by those responsible and they have chosen King's Park. I would not like to take unto myself the responsibility of pitting my views against those of an engineer, or the Commissioner of Main Roads. All the angles that have been referred to have been looked into, and therefore I feel that this measure merits our support. People can argue that Smith's Lake or Loftus-st. or Bold Park or East Perth cemetery—

Mr. Andrew: Or Victoria Park.

Mr. POTTER: Yes, even Victoria Park. Some people have argued that these places would be suitable. Burswood Island has been mentioned; but I understand that if that area were to be utilised, it would be necessary to drive piles as deep as those used for the Narrows bridge; and even then we might have the aquatic centre floating downstream. I would like members to think again.

The Minister for Education: We are thinking all the time.

Mr. POTTER: I know. What I mean is that members should be big enough to look at this proposition again. If I were in the position of those who had reached a decision before this Bill was brought before the House, I would be big enough to reverse my decision after the arguments which have been advanced in favour of this proposition. I think that on a previous occasion I did acknowledge my mistake in connection with a particular Bill.

The purpose for which it is desired to excise this 20 acres of land in King's Park is the establishment of an aquatic centre which would be something different from anything anywhere else in Australia, so far as I know. The establishment of the centre would mark us as a progressive people. It is proposed to set aside only 20 acres out of nearly 1,000 acres for the enjoyment of the people, young and old, where they can disport themselves on the lawns and under the trees, and in any of the pools that are depicted on the diagram at the side of the Chamber. It is a vision splendid, something conceived by those who wish our people to have only the best; who wish them to have a decent standard of living and to be able to show others that we can live graciously.

If this project were brought into being visitors viewing the amenities to be provided could only conclude that we at least know how to live graciously. The City of Perth is the shop window of the West; and it is such enterprises as the one under consideration that will convince tourists, migrants, settlers and investors that we are a progressive people, and that this is a place in which they would like to settle and invest money. These are points that some members of this House need to bear in mind when the time comes to vote on this proposal, rather than attack the Lord Mayor, the City Council or somebody else. After all is said and done, they are only instruments to provide the people with these projects, and it would be wrong to deny such a large number of folk this amenity that they desire.

Already there are tennis courts and bowling greens in the park, and all that has been done in that way was done by the late Lord Forrest during his term of office. It was in 1919 that he relinquished, with his death, the chairmanship

of the Board, and he was responsible for what was done in the Park. No matter what anybody says about proposals that were made in 1921, the fact remains that King's Park was not reserved for the purposes of a hospital, and that sort of argument does not matter.

Let us consider what the setting aside of this portion of the park for the purpose envisaged would mean to the harassed mother with several children. The little toddlers would be able to paddle in the pools that would be provided. Country housewives who came to Perth would have somewhere else to go to other than the sea. Elderly people, people who are rheumatically or crippled, and who have not learnt to swim would be able to use the facilities in King's Park, and thus they would derive some benefit. Children from both private and public schools would also be able to learn to swim there, free from the danger of infection such as exists for those who use the river. It is idle to say there is no danger of infection. I myself suffered a septic infection of the throat in past years. But King's Park pools would be free from the danger of infection and from the chilly winds that sweep the river shore.

Do not let us have thrust upon us the responsibility of having denied this facility to the people! I know that the area concerned was set aside in the horse and cart days, but now most people travel in their own cars to the hills and other resorts—

Mr. Owen: There are 17,000 acres up there.

Mr. POTTER: Yes, and there are even rotting logs, as the member for Cottesloe said.

The Minister for Transport: There was a lot of rot in his speech, also.

Mr. POTTER: If we build this aquatic centre we may be able to hold the Australian championships, or even the Empire Games in Perth. There are running tracks at Leederville and cycling tracks around Monger's Lake, but we should have the aquatic centre in King's Park. The associations that have given their support to the proposal are democratic bodies and have forwarded their opinions as the result of a democratic vote. We would be most remiss from every angle if we did not agree to the measure and, as I have said, the holding of the Empire games or the Australian championships here would place Perth in the forefront of the British Empire as far as the sporting and business worlds are concerned.

I am thankful that here we are able to take necessary action from time to time. The sugar gums would never have been removed from King's Park-rd. had the Perth City Council not taken executive action. Without bold action, we

could never have had the Narrows bridge. The people who become the leaders of various parties are the doers. As Professor Murdoch said in the week-end Press, there are five per cent. of the people who are doers and do things and I am glad that we have doers on our executive.

We will hear a lot about the trees that will have to be destroyed to make way for the aquatic centre, but we will plant more trees. Four trees were removed in Subiaco to make way for a hall but 22 were planted in their place. Our car parks are being lined with trees and our roads are hemmed with bushes and trees. It may be said that the member for Subiaco is against trees, but no. I think country members have great temerity if they vote against this measure. Have they not devastated the country areas, all of which are sacred to me, and not only the 20 acres in King's Park? The ravages of man have caused floods both here and in the Eastern States.

Mr. Bovell: Crocodile tears!

Mr. POTTER: Floods and wind erosion have been caused by the removal of trees. Bogie after bogie has been raised in opposition to this measure. In conclusion, I would quote from "Peace News" of the 9th August last, where we read—

The Bogeyite.

Fear is an incurable prepossession. Against it reason and argument are unavailing. Man must have his bogey and no man insists upon his right to that inheritance more persistently than the Englishman.

Mr. Hall: It makes him a bogeyite.

Mr. POTTER: Yes. To continue—

The more you are able to prove that the particular project is practicable in an engineering point of view, the more hopeless will be your chance of persuading the bogeyite that his fears are groundless. When at last the canal has been cut, or the railway is made, and it is found that the world still goes on as before—except that there has been a great increase in the comfort and convenience of the general public—everybody exclaims: "Why was not this grand work done sooner?" But the bogeyite is not a bit abashed. He merely transfers his attention to other fields of enterprise, and he scans the horizon of civilisation for the appearance of a new enemy.

The strange thing to note about these bogies is that they are always directed against works of utility.

That seems to be the position in regard to this Bill. What a protest there was when we built the flats at Subiaco, and how many protests were raised. It was said

the flats would become slums. Subiaco was deprived of a hall for 25 years because a site could not be agreed on. A referendum was held, eventually, but no hall was built. However, some of my opponents in the last election have gone ahead with the hall and built it. I have no protest to voice about it. I might not like the location or the architectural design but I trust I am big enough not to stand in the way of any form of progress. I will never allow my body, dead or alive, to hinder the wheels of progress.

On motion by Mr. Ackland, debate adjourned

House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 11th September, 1957.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Assent to Bills	1395
Motions : School bus contracts and routes, to inquire by select committee	1399
Select committee appointed	1401
Bills : Licensing Act Amendment (No. 3), 1r.	1395
Traffic Act Amendment (No. 3), 1r.	1395
Stipendiary Magistrates, 2r., Com., report	1396
Associations Incorporation Act Amendment, 2r., Com.	1399
Newspaper Libel and Registration Act Amendment, 2r., Com.	1402
State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment (No. 2), 1r.	1403
Bank Holidays Act Amendment, 2r.	1403
Adjournment, special	1422

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

- 1, Nollamara Land Vesting.
- 2, Western Australian Marine Act Amendment.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Licensing Act Amendment (No. 3).
Introduced by Hon. E. M. Heenan.
- 2, Traffic Act Amendment (No. 3).
Introduced by Hon. L. A. Logan.