

# Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 23rd November, 1955.

## CONTENTS.

Questions :	Page
Police, Midland Junction property .....	2007
Housing, (a) homes for mill workers, Dwellingup .....	2007
(b) war service homes funds allocation .....	2007
Electricity supplies, Serpentine and Jarrahdale extensions .....	2008
Hospitals, (a) accommodation at Jarrahdale .....	2008
(b) regional buildings, Bunbury .....	2008
Harbours, (a) water depths, Fremantle berths .....	2008
(b) Leschenault Estuary, plugging .....	2008
Education, (a) Bluff Point school repairs .....	2009
(b) Geraldton west end school construction .....	2009
Havelock-st. buildings, use and opening date .....	2009
Sewerage, main extensions to Rivervale and Lathlain Park .....	2009
Drainage, (a) Bayswater works, expenditure .....	2009
(b) Lake Sadle-Wilson Inlet Scheme Water supplies, feeder main, Walter-rd-Beechboro-rd. ....	2009
Railways, (a) pedestrian subway, Bayswater .....	2010
(b) "Master Mechanic" spark arrester .....	2010
Trotting meetings, proceeds for country clubs .....	2010
Roads, expenditure in Great Southern districts .....	2010
Annual Estimates, 1955-56, Com. of Supply, general debate .....	2032
Speakers on financial policy—	
Mr. Bovell .....	2032
Mr. Moir .....	2036
Bills : Public Service Act Amendment, 1r. ....	2010
Albany Harbour Board Act Amendment, 1r. ....	2010
Licensing Act Amendment (No. 4), 3r. ....	2011
Government Railways Act Amendment, 3r. ....	2011
Members of Parliament Reimbursement of Expenses Act Amendment, Message, 1r., remaining stages .....	2011
Licensing Act Amendment (No. 1), 2r., remaining stages .....	2011
Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment, returned .....	2023
Public Works Act Amendment, 3r. ....	2023
Road Closure, returned .....	2027
Reserves, returned .....	2027
State Electricity Act Amendment, returned .....	2027
Trustees Act Amendment (No. 2), 1r. ....	2027
Town Planning and Development Act Amendment, 2r. ....	2027
Supply (No. 2), £16,000,000, returned ....	2048

## QUESTIONS.

### POLICE.

#### Midland Junction Property.

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Police:

Further to my questions last week relative to police activities at Midland Junction—

- (1) Is it a fact that additional property has now been purchased?
- (2) If the answer is in the affirmative, will he state for what purposes the property was required?

The MINISTER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) It is intended to use the ground floor as soon as possible for the Midland Junction Traffic Branch and the upper floor later as offices for a district inspector who will have his headquarters at Midland Junction.

### HOUSING.

#### (a) Homes for Mill Workers, Dwellingup.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY asked the Minister for Forests:

(1) What number of houses have been erected at Dwellingup, in preparation for the transfer of the Holyoake mill to that centre?

(2) What is the total number of houses to be erected, and over what period?

(3) What will be the weekly rental charged?

(4) Has any provision been made for septic systems to be provided for each house?

(5) If not, why not?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Three completed and three in course of erection.

(2) Twenty altogether. Balance over approximately 18 months.

(3) Rental to be charged has not yet been assessed.

(4) Matter is under consideration.

(5) Answered by No. 4.

#### (b) War Service Homes Funds Allocation.

Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) What was the amount of money originally allocated for war service homes in Western Australia for 1955-56?

(2) What is the amount of the reallocation?

(3) What applicants for war service homes will be considered when the recent allocation of funds is being made?

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

The MINISTER replied:

- (1) £3,181,950 as against £3,975,322 for 1954-55.
- (2) £3,485,000 (an additional £303,050).
- (3) Approximately 40 building cases previously postponed and a number of applications lodged in May and June, 1955, to take over existing properties.

### ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES.

#### *Serpentine and Jarrahdale Extensions.*

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has any priority been given to an extension of electricity supply to Serpentine and Jarrahdale?
- (2) If so, what is the priority?
- (3) When is it considered that these towns can be supplied with electricity?

The MINISTER replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) See answer to No. (1).
- (3) This depends on the availability of loan funds in the year 1956-57.

### HOSPITALS.

#### *(a) Accommodation at Jarrahdale.*

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has any decision been arrived at regarding improved hospital accommodation for the Jarrahdale district?
- (2) If not, when can it be expected that a decision will be made?

The MINISTER replied:

I will be visiting Jarrahdale in the near future to discuss proposals with the board. I advised the board to this effect a few days ago.

#### *(b) Regional Building, Bunbury.*

Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) Have detailed plans been drawn up for the erection of a regional hospital at Bunbury on the site set aside for such a hospital?
- (2) If so, when is it anticipated building operations will commence?
- (3) Has consideration been given to the implementation of certain sections of such a hospital, such sections to ultimately dovetail into the major plan?

The MINISTER replied:

- (1) Preliminary sketch plans have been prepared.
- (2) The need for a regional hospital is recognised but its date of construction is indefinite, due to unavailability of loan funds.
- (3) This is considered to be economically impracticable.

### HARBOURS.

#### *(a) Water Depths at Fremantle Berths.*

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

- (1) What is the depth of water at the 18 berths in the Fremantle harbour?
- (2) What depth of water should there be at these 18 berths?
- (3) If the depth is not what it should be, to what does he attribute the cause?

The MINISTER replied:

- (1) Depth of berths below lowest low water (inner harbour):—

Victoria Quay: A—34ft.

B—30ft. 9in.

C—34ft.

D—34ft.

E—31ft. 9in.

F—31ft. 5in.

G—34ft.

H—32ft. 5in.

North Wharf: No. 1—33ft. 10ins.

No. 2—29ft. 3in.

No. 3—31ft. 6in.

No. 4—31ft. 10in.

No. 5—32ft.

No. 6—33ft.

No. 7—29ft. 7in.

No. 8—27ft. 10in.

No. 9—30ft. 10in.

Bouy Berth: 36ft.

- (2) (a) Alongside berths (Victoria Quay and North Wharf): 34ft. aimed at, but actual permissible depth depends on stability of adjacent quay structure.

(b) Buoy berth: 36ft.

- (3) (a) Silting.

(b) Rock bottom.

(c) Undesirability of dredging lower than stability of quay structure will allow.

(d) Lack of availability of suitable dredging plant.

(e) Lack of availability of freeing berths of ships in busy port.

#### *(b) Leschenault Estuary Plugging.*

Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) When the decision was made to place a plug at the mouth of Leschenault Estuary at Bunbury, were provisions made to divert the town effluent drains from the estuary area?

(2) If not, will consideration be given to the early commencement of such work?

The MINISTER replied:

- (1) No.

(2) The diversion of effluents from a number of town drains that discharge into the estuary, by a collector pipe discharging into the harbour, is not considered justified under existing conditions.

Such an installation would be undesirable in view of the council's development of the north shore as a camping area. It is considered that the ultimate disposal of these effluents outside the estuary will be by a properly designed sewerage disposal scheme.

### EDUCATION.

#### (a) *Bluff Point School Repairs.*

Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Can he say when the repairs and renovations to the Bluff Point State school will commence?

(2) When can it be expected that a start will be made on the levelling and grading of the playing area at the Bluff Point school?

The MINISTER replied:

A limited amount of grading and levelling has been included in the contract for repairs and renovations but, on account of the present financial position, it has been necessary to defer this matter until the end of January next.

#### (b) *Geraldton West End School Construction.*

Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Education:

(1) When does he expect that work will commence on the construction of the primary school that is to serve Geraldton (West End), Francis-st., Dampier-st. area?

(2) How many classrooms will there be in the new school?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Tenders for the erection of the Geraldton (Back Beach) primary school will close on the 6th December, 1955. The commencement of the work is entirely dependent on a satisfactory tender being received.

(2) Four.

### HAVELOCK STREET BUILDINGS.

#### *Use and Opening Date.*

Mr. HEAL asked the Minister for Health:

(1) To what use will the buildings situated at No. 1 Havelock-st., West Perth, be put?

(2) When is the approximate opening date of such buildings?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Psychiatric outpatient clinic.

(2) It is expected to open the clinic in January, 1956.

### SEWERAGE.

#### *Main Extensions to Rivervale and Lathlain Park.*

Mr. J. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Has any consideration been given or have any funds been approved to extend the sewerage mains into the Rivervale and Lathlain Park areas?

(2) If the answer is in the negative, can he give any indication when these proposals will receive attention?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Consideration has been given and plans been prepared for these works, but insufficiency of loan funds has precluded moneys from being made available to commence the work.

(2) Commencement of the work will depend upon provision of funds in the next and succeeding financial years.

### DRAINAGE.

#### (a) *Bayswater Works Expenditure.*

Mr. J. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

What was the expenditure on the drainage works now under construction along Bowden-st., Bayswater, which will connect the main drain in Sussex-st. with May-st.

(a) to the end of June, 1955;

(b) to the end of October, 1955?

The MINISTER replied:

(a) £24,100.

(b) £39,100.

#### (b) *Lake Sadie-Wilson Inlet Scheme.*

Hon. A. F. WATTS asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

Will he lay on the Table of the House all papers relative to a drainage scheme in the Lake Sadie-Wilson Inlet areas?

The MINISTER replied:

Yes.

### WATER SUPPLIES.

#### *Feeder Main, Walter-rd.—Beechboro-rd.*

Mr. J. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) What is the estimated cost of the 18in. feeder water main which has been approved for laying along Walter-rd. through Morley Park to Beechboro-rd.?

(2) What is the total length of pipe to be laid?

(3) When is it expected that a start will be made on the construction work?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) £48,000 for 18in. section. The proposal also includes £5,000 for 6in. main in Beechboro-rd. and £4,000 for 4in. reticulation main in Walter-rd.

- (2) 18in.—14,870ft.  
6in.—5,180ft.  
4in.—10,960ft.

(3) Early in the new year, when pipes will be available and ground conditions more suitable for working.

### RAILWAYS.

#### (a) Pedestrian Subway, Bayswater.

Mr. J. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is he aware that the agitation for the construction of a pedestrian subway at Leake-st., Bayswater, has been before the Railway Department for more than 15 years?

(2) Is he aware that the Railway Department constructed a pedestrian subway at Bassendean about 1934-35?

(3) Can he inform me, and through me, the organisations interested, whether provision has been made on this year's Railway Estimates for the early construction of the subway?

(4) If provision has not been made, and having in mind the offer of £1,000 by the Bayswater Road Board, will he further consider giving approval to the proposal?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) Provision was made in the 1955-56 loan programme, but the work was deferred due to lack of loan funds.

(4) The proposal has been approved and will be put in hand when funds are available to supplement the amount offered by the road board.

#### (b) "Master Mechanic" Spark Arrester.

Mr. MAY asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) How many W.A.G.R. locomotives are fitted with the "Master Mechanic" spark arrester?

(2) Are these spark arresters considered to be effective in preventing fires arising from the use of Collie coal?

(3) If so, will consideration be given to installing more of this type of spark arrester?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) One hundred and fifty-two.

(2) The "Master Mechanic" type of spark arrester is the most effective type yet devised.

(3) This type has been adopted as the standard for the W.A.G.R. and is being fitted to all coal-burning locomotives as circumstances allow.

### TROTTING MEETINGS.

#### Proceeds for Country Clubs.

Mr. MANNING asked the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

(1) On what dates were the three metropolitan trotting meetings held from which the proceeds went to the Country Clubs Benefit Fund?

(2) What was the net profit of each such meeting?

(3) Is a balance sheet available of each meeting?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING replied:

(1) The 18th September, 1954.

The 23rd October, 1954.

The 12th February, 1955.

(2) £471; £127; £196.

(3) These are recorded at the W.A. Trotting Association and included in the annual statement submitted to the department in accordance with the Act.

### ROADS.

#### Expenditure in Great Southern Districts.

Hon. A. F. WATTS asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What Main Road Department funds have been expended on the undermentioned roads during the last two financial years—

(a) The road between the Blackwood-rd. in the Kojonup road district and the Frankland River in the Cranbrook road district?

(b) Mt. Barker-Denmark-rd.

(c) Cranbrook-Frankland River-rd.

(2) What funds (if any) are to be expended on such roads during the current financial year?

The MINISTER replied:

	1953-54	1954-55
	£	£
(1) (a) Road between Blackwood-rd. in the Kojonup Road District and the Frankland River in the Cranbrook Road District		2,880
(b) Mt. Barker-Denmark-rd. ....	840	600
(c) Cranbrook - Frankland River rd. ....	4,070	2,690
(2) (a) £1,290.		
(b) £8,430 (includes £8,000 already spent this financial year).		
(c) £6,450.		

(2) (a) £1,290.

(b) £8,430 (includes £8,000 already spent this financial year).

(c) £6,450.

### BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Public Service Act Amendment.  
Introduced by the Premier.

2, Albany Harbour Board Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Mines.

**BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.**

- 1, Licensing Act Amendment (No. 4).
- 2, Government Railways Act Amendment.

Transmitted to the Council.

**BILL—MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT  
REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES  
ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Message.*

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

*First Reading.*

Introduced by the Premier and read a first time.

*Second Reading.*

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [4.47] in moving the second reading said: This Bill has become necessary because of the alteration of electoral boundaries as the result of the recent redistribution as carried out by the Electoral Commission.

Under the parent Act, the amount of expenses to be reimbursed to members of Parliament is clearly set out in respect of each particular section of the State. The parent Act is so worded as to provide that the payment for electorates in the metropolitan area shall be on the basis of £200 per member, and the name of each metropolitan electorate is set out in the Act, which then goes on to state that an additional amount for reimbursement of expenses shall be paid in respect of all other districts in the State, with the exception of the North-West, for which a separate amount again is provided.

Under the recent redistribution of boundaries in the metropolitan area, a district has been created, which has been given a completely new name, and consequently, this name, which is Beeloo, is not included in the parent Act as one of the districts in the metropolitan area. If the Act were not to be amended to include that new name, the member for Beeloo would be able to claim the amount of reimbursement of expenses which applies to agricultural districts and which, of course, is higher than that claimable in respect of a metropolitan electorate.

I would advise members that the present member for what is the new district of Beeloo brought this matter under my notice and suggested that the Act should be amended—not because he had any thought of claiming the higher amount if the Act were not amended, but that he thought the position should be put right in the Act. I greatly appreciate the action he took along those lines. This

Bill, of itself, does not, in fact, place in the principal Act the name of Beeloo as a metropolitan electorate. It proposes to give the Governor-in-Council power to include this district as a metropolitan electorate and the Bill, as worded, will allow the Governor to take similar action at any time in the future when such action is required.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Why could not the name of Beeloo be inserted in the ordinary Act?

The PREMIER: If the matter were approached on that basis we would have to amend the Act every time there was a redistribution of boundaries out of which would come a new name for a metropolitan electorate. By doing it this way we amend the Act this once and it will not become necessary to amend it again in the future. The Governor will take the appropriate action when required and thus obviate the necessity of bringing the matter to Parliament every time a new name is given to a metropolitan electorate. We think that this is a very effective and more efficient way to solve the problem. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**HON. SIR ROSS McLARTY** (Murray) [4.52]: I cannot see that any objection can be raised to the Bill. It appears—

The Minister for Lands: Pretty late in the day!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Do not make me hostile! It appears to be far-sighted and, as the Premier has explained, a practical method has been adopted. I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

**BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT  
(No. 1).**

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 9th November.

**MR. McCULLOCH** (Hannans) [4.55]: I have listened to the previous speakers in debating the Bill but, in my opinion, none of the objections they have raised against it seem to be logical. We heard that some steps would have to be taken prior to this facility being established at Perth Airport,

but I do not see what prior steps would be necessary. However, there may be some preliminary arrangement of which I know nothing before such a facility can be made available to air passengers. It was also stated that this facility does not at present exist in any other airport in Australia. Because it does not exist elsewhere it does not mean that we in Western Australia should remain in the old horse and buggy days.

We should keep abreast of modern times. Air travel is becoming more popular and is continually advancing, and every facility that is necessary at an airport should be provided. We also heard that the Bill is discriminatory. I cannot understand that statement, either. I have heard members, on previous occasions, raise objections to various happenings that take place on the Goldfields, and claim that because they do not happen elsewhere they should not happen in that part of the State. In my opinion that is a dog in the manger attitude.

If this facility were established at Perth Airport and it proved to be successful, I am sure that similar facilities would be provided at other airports, whether in the Eastern States or overseas. The time is fast approaching when such amenities, in view of the growth of air travel and the airports themselves, will be provided. Even at Kalgoorlie many people visit the airstrip to welcome people arriving by plane or to bid goodbye to passengers who are departing. Therefore I think it would be an advantage to have provided at Kalgoorlie such a facility as that proposed in the Bill.

Mention was also made of people under the influence of liquor travelling on aeroplanes. I do not travel on them very frequently, but on one occasion I was a passenger in one of the MacRobertson-Miller planes on which were available whisky, beer and many other types of liquor, but I did not see anybody drunk. I heard someone say that the MacRobertson-Miller Co. had recently expressed the view that the proposed facility was not necessary, but apparently it is prepared to supply liquor on its own planes. Even if there are facilities to secure liquor at the airport, the suggestion that drunkenness will become common is not sound. A person can go to any hotel these days to obtain liquor but it is not usual to find him drunk.

There may be an odd one here and there who does become intoxicated, but we must realise that there is always one bee in a hive that will do the wrong thing. Surely we should not punish the mass of the people who travel by air because of the action of a few individuals who abuse the privilege of obtaining liquor at the airport. As I see the provisions in the Bill, I support them in full. Suggestions

have been made about amendments and if the sponsor decides to accept them, it is up to him to do so.

I would point out that it will be the Licensing Court that will have the final say as to whether a liquor licence shall be granted, as to how the establishment is to be conducted, whether meals shall be provided and the times when they will be served. I have seen cartoons in the local newspapers about people racing along to the airport to get liquor after the hotels have closed at night. I have some experience of the practice that goes on in some hotels here; it is not difficult for a person to obtain liquor after 9 p.m. at some hotels if he so desires.

As the Licensing Court will have the biggest say in this matter, I am prepared to pin my faith to it. I am sure it will see that the establishment is conducted properly, in the same way as are hotels. Reference was made to the refreshment rooms at the railway stations but there can be no comparison between them and Perth Airport. In some of the refreshment rooms between here and Kalgoorlie liquor can be obtained at anytime of the day or night.

The proposal contained in the Bill is an innovation to bring Perth Airport up to date in keeping with modern times, and is an attempt to get away from the conditions which prevailed in the horse and buggy days. I commend the mover for introducing the Bill. I have read in the newspapers where he has made attempts to popularise Perth as an air link and to persuade planes to include it on their routes instead of by-passing it. To a certain extent the member for Cottesloe has been successful. That being the case, why should we not give the people the facilities asked for in the Bill. Those facilities are provided in the airports of other countries. I do not know whether they are available in any of the other airports in Australia. In my opinion, that is of no consequence; we should not have to wait for someone else in this country to start on anything new because our ideas may be in advance of theirs.

I have heard much said about the tourist traffic, but I have my own views on that. If I were a wealthy man travelling around the world seeking sport, I certainly would by-pass Western Australia at the present time. This Bill will at least fill a small want; in my opinion, it can do no harm whatsoever. I feel certain that the establishment will be conducted properly; if it is not, the alternative is to close it up. I remember coming here by plane and landing at Maylands many years ago. The place was so small that I could hardly get into it. Today there is a very large airport at Guildford with modern hangars and up to date facilities for planes landing and taking off, yet when a proposition such as that contained in the Bill is put before the House some members complain to the

effect that some of the people will not be able to make use of the facilities at the airport, therefore the airport should not be given a liquor licence. I support the second reading.

**MR. RHATIGAN (Kimberley) [5.5]:** I am not very keen on the proposals in the Bill as they appear in the present form because they cater only for a favoured few. I have no objection to liquor being supplied at the airport. I think that North-West air passengers are more entitled to the privileges than overseas passengers. After all, passengers from overseas can make use of the bar aboard the plane and they are able to get liquor up to 20 minutes before landing.

However, on the M.M.A. planes to the North-West, despite the remarks of the member for Hannans, who obviously has not travelled on them very much, there is not that facility. He has travelled on a plane chartered by Wapet and was able to obtain liquor supplied by that company. It was only made possible through the courtesy of Wapet. Here is one anomaly: An air passenger travelling by M.M.A. from Darwin to Perth will be able to obtain liquor at Perth Airport, but the passenger from Wyndham will be denied that privilege, yet the difference in flying time between those two routes is only 1½ hours.

I would like such anomalies to be cleared up in the Bill. I would ask the mover to explain how the proposed establishment will be policed because in this connection I can see many difficulties. Whilst I am the last person to vote against the granting of privileges to people, I am not in favour of a few being given the facilities whilst the majority are denied them. I support the second reading in the hope that some amendment will be made to the Bill to cater for all air travellers.

**MR. YATES (South Perth) [5.7]:** The member for Kimberley has overlooked the point that air passengers using Perth Airport are in transit. It is not a terminal point where the passengers disembark and will see it no more on the journey. Usually an aircraft comes in, the passengers disembark and are checked by the customs; they have a shower and clean-up and then they wait for the plane to go on. In most cases the passengers remain at the airport. In that respect these circumstances do not apply to North-West air passengers who commence their journey from Perth Airport, or who end their journey there and go to their homes.

**Mr. Rhatigan:** It could apply to North-West passengers arriving by plane and waiting to travel by air to the Eastern States.

**Mr. YATES:** That would be possible, but such cases would not be frequent. I see no reason why the facilities proposed in the

Bill cannot be extended at a later date. This is the first opportunity the House has had to legislate for any type of liquor licence to be granted at an airport in Western Australia. If the innovation proves successful, then later on the member for Kimberley can assist in procuring a licence to meet the needs of passengers using the North-West run.

The position has been very well covered by the member for Hannans. He has carefully analysed every point in connection with the proposed licence at the airport and he said he considered that it could be policed adequately. In that regard, where can one find a more difficult place to police than a railway refreshment room? The practice of granting a liquor licence to railway refreshment rooms has been in operation for 30 to 40 years, and still continues. This proves that the Licensing Court has been, and is, satisfied with the conduct of those rooms in supplying the needs of people who purchase liquor from them.

We have seen the liquor booths on railway stations for a great number of years but there have been very few complaints about them. In my view they are the hardest establishments to police. I know only too well the conditions that exist at the Kalgoorlie railway station, especially in the summer when trains arrive from the Eastern States, Leonora and Esperance. In those instances there is a far greater movement of people than there is at Perth Airport.

**Mr. Rhatigan:** The railway refreshment rooms are restricted to the hotel licensing hours.

**Mr. YATES:** Not necessarily. As most Goldfields people know, it is quite easy for through passengers to get liquor at the Kalgoorlie railway station. In any case, the important point is that the establishment has been policed successfully. It is far easier to police one licensed area in an airport than a large number of railway stations. I consider that the set-up at Perth Airport is far better to meet the needs of the general public than the set-up at railway stations which are confined to small buildings. In many instances the stations are not the best buildings from which rail passengers can obtain their liquor requirements. In my opinion, and looking at this measure through unbiased eyes, I do not like liquor being consumed in Australia any more than it is consumed at present nor am I in favour of the increased sale and usage of liquor, but in fairness to overseas air passengers they should, after travelling long distances, have the right to obtain liquor at the airport.

**Mr. Nalder:** How many air passengers would arrive from overseas in a period of 12 months?

Mr. YATES: They would run into thousands, because planes arrive and depart from Guildford daily and the service will be increased.

Mr. Norton: Are you in favour of the airport officials and other people being able to obtain liquor?

Mr. YATES: I am not the one to decide who shall be permitted to make use of the facility. Let us first establish it. Let us first pass the Bill and at the end of 12 months we will be in a better position to determine whether the facility to supply liquor should be increased or restricted. Let us be fair in this matter. With all innovations a start must be made some time. If, after a trial extending over 12 months or two years, we find anomalies arising under the Act, they could be rectified by amending the legislation or by stricter supervision of the licence, if the sale of liquor should get out of hand; but I doubt if such a position would arise. It has been said that the facilities to obtain liquor freely at Perth Airport would be conducive to pilots partaking of more liquor than they normally would. From inquiries I have made in the last few days, I learned that pilots are the most critical of men and jealous of their reputation. In all cases they have been hand-picked for the jobs.

Mr. Lawrence: You do not suggest it should be otherwise?

Mr. YATES: I do not. I agree they should have those qualifications. So strict is their initial training that it has become a habit with them to be 100 per cent. perfect in their work. That is the reason why there are so few air accidents in Australia due to the neglect of pilots. The few accidents that do occur are very rarely sheeted home to the pilots. They have occurred either through a mechanical fault or through weather conditions.

We need have no fear that the sale of liquor at Perth Airport will be conducive to pilots partaking of more liquor than is good for them. If that had happened in the past, the privilege to obtain liquor at international airports in other parts of the world would have been taken away from pilots. I suggest that the Bill be passed in its present form to give it a trial. If necessary, at a later date, it can be altered to make for stricter control of the licence. I support the second reading.

MR. O'BRIEN (Murchison) [5.15]: This Bill proposes to amend Section 28 of the Licensing Act. In that section reference is made to quite a number of licences that may be granted, ranging from publicans' general licences to occasional licences. Members will recall that last year I endeavoured to have this Act amended to include canteen licences, and my proposal would have been of great benefit to the airport.

The object of the measure before us is to amend Section 28 by adding after paragraph (o) another paragraph, (p) "Airport Licences". The measure also proposes to add Sections 44A, 44B, and 44C. I travel quite a bit on the planes and I consider that, on account of our hot climate there should be provision for the court to grant airport licences in order that liquor may be available at airports.

However, I would like to see the words "or visiting" in line 5 of page 3 of the Bill struck out. This would enable all persons travelling through that airport to have the same concession. To stipulate that it should apply only to those travelling outside the State is a little restrictive. It would also be necessary to delete the words "out of the State" in line 23 on page 3. In my opinion, these amendments are all that are necessary to make the Bill workable and have application to all people travelling by air and utilising the airport.

We have heard a lot about the general public visiting the airport after 9 o'clock. If the Bill were amended along the lines I have suggested, that would debar people from making a sports club of the airport, and it would be fair to people who have publican's and general licences in that area or close to it. It would also protect those who have other licences under the Act. As the member for Hannans and others have said, there is provision for meals to be supplied and the matter would be controlled by the Licensing Court, in the members of which I feel all in this House have every confidence. I propose to support the second reading, and I trust that the member for Cottesloe will give consideration to the amendments I have suggested.

MR. JAMIESON (Canning) [5.21]: I am inclined to favour the suggestions of the member for Murchison, and I hope he will move relevant amendments in the Committee stage. The member for South Perth referred to the Bill as being a starting-point, and said that later the measure could be further amended in the light of experience. However, I think every member knows very well just how hard it is to secure amendments to the Licensing Act.

If we are to be just, we must be fair to people travelling from the north-western part of the State. People arrive at the airport and ring up a friend or a relative to take them to where they are going to stay. Surely there could be no objection to their partaking of refreshments while awaiting the arrival of their friends or relatives! The member for Cottesloe would be very unfair if he were not prepared to alter the Bill to accommodate such people.

The Bill is a move towards uniformity. I understand it is the practice right throughout the world—even in countries

where there are strict liquor laws—to permit the establishment of bars of some sort at airfields so that people who are used to partaking of liquid refreshments may be able to do so. I am inclined to support the second reading in the sincere hope that the hon. member will give thought to the amendments suggested by the member for Murchison.

**MR. LAWRENCE** (South Fremantle) [5.24]: It seems incredible that there has been so much debate on this Bill. It appears to me that we are living under conditions that applied 100 years ago, when we should be living under 1955 conditions. These facilities should be made available to all people who engage in air travel. The member for Murchison submitted a good argument, and I consider that the member for Cottesloe, when he has our support for his Bill, should amend it somewhat so that people travelling interstate or intrastate would be able to enjoy this privilege.

There are people travelling intrastate and overseas. Are they not all entitled to obtain a drink—and not only for a period of 30 minutes before the arrival at the airport of any aircraft and for a period not exceeding six hours during the time after its arrival that the aircraft is grounded at the airport? Incidentally, I do not know what is meant by the term "grounded," and I do not think that many members here know.

The facilities proposed in the Bill for travellers outside the State should be extended to those travelling intrastate. I support the second reading in the hope that the member for Cottesloe will amend the Bill accordingly.

**MR. NALDER** (Katanning) [5.26]: Like the Premier, I have not much enthusiasm for the Bill. The do's and don'ts in the measure are quite objectionable, inasmuch as I cannot see how the position can be supervised. I presume that the police would be called upon to see that the law in this respect was policed; but there are so many restrictions that I do not see how it could be done.

**Mr. Yates:** There are policemen at the airport all the time.

**Mr. NALDER:** But the policemen would have to find out whether a person partaking of liquor at the airport was a bona fide traveller.

**Mr. Ross Hutchinson:** Would you support the Bill if amendments were made to it?

**Mr. NALDER:** They would have to find out whether the person was travelling interstate or within the State. When we pass legislation, we should endeavour to see that effect can be given to it; but I think that one of the weaknesses of this Bill is that there are so many restrictions that the measure could not be policed.

There is ample opportunity for anybody travelling by air to procure all the liquor he requires. I saw a reference in the newspaper to the fact that "drive yourself" cars are to be made available at the airport for the benefit of those who wish to make use of the time aircraft are grounded for refuelling or some other purpose. These cars will be available to people who wish to drive themselves to any part of the city. Such people would be able to procure liquor if they desired it.

Although I asked a question of the member for South Perth, by way of interjection, I have not been able to find out how many people travel from overseas to Australia by air. Those figures have not been given. I doubt very much whether a large number call at Guildford from overseas and whether the story that has been put up by those supporting the Bill is as sound as they would have us believe. There are many other points, but I just rise to voice my objections to the Bill. I do not intend to vote for the second reading.

**THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING** (Hon. H. E. Graham—East Perth) [5.31]: On every previous occasion when a Bill dealing with licensing matters has come before this Parliament, I have been in favour of a more generous outlook. On this occasion, however, I find myself very definitely in opposition to the Bill.

I take the strongest possible exception to special privileges being extended to special people. Because of this sort of thing, we have a set of licensing laws in Western Australia which simply do not add up. In certain places a person can drink until 9 p.m. and in others until 11 p.m. In some places he can drink for one hour in the morning and one hour in the afternoon on Sundays, and in other places for two hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon on Sundays; and in other places people can drink for much longer hours on Sundays.

In certain places it is possible to purchase bottles on a Sunday, but in others it is not. So we have this sort of nonsense which makes drinking legal in one locality and a serious offence in another. Now, for some unaccountable reason, a special dispensation is sought for those who travel beyond the State, or who enter the State from elsewhere. I cannot think why this should be. What special merit is there about travelling by aeroplane, to warrant a glass of beer or whisky, or anything else.

**Mr. Lawrence:** None whatever.

**The MINISTER FOR HOUSING:** Why should someone from Afghanistan, Timbuctoo or elsewhere be able to drink for several hours late at night or early in the morning when citizens who are taxpayers of the State are denied a similar right? It is because that person happened to travel by air. You, Sir, and I might have travelled by some other means and we would not have that right.

Mr. Brady: It is to induce him to return.

**The MINISTER FOR HOUSING:** Does it mean that if a man comes here and takes a fancy to the State he will, if this is agreed to, remain for a few hours to see more of it and its people; or does this legislation merely provide that for the several weeks an overseas visitor is in the State he shall be allowed to drink until 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning while every one else is denied the same privilege. Where is this going to stop? There is no logic, or rhyme or reason about it.

I suppose the most pleasant form of travelling for most people, apart from the small percentage who suffer from air sickness, is by air. It is clean; there is no dust and very little noise in the modern plane, which provides swift transport, and so on. Contrast that with what a person from the far outback, who has to bounce along rough and dusty roads, and run all the hazards connected with his journey, has to endure. Yet, if he arrives somewhere at 3 o'clock in the morning he cannot call at the nearest inn and ask for a drink for himself and his friends.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: He can if he travels by boat to Rottnest.

**The MINISTER FOR HOUSING:** That may be so. That merely indicates what I stated at the outset, that our licensing laws have got completely out of hand; there is no common rule applying anywhere. The Bill seeks to bestow a special favour upon many persons who, no doubt, have never before set foot in this country.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: It is only to enable a first-class restaurant to be provided at the airport. That is only natural, is it not?

**The MINISTER FOR HOUSING:** If we allow a first-class restaurant at the airport, let us make provision for first-class restaurants throughout the length and breadth of the State, and I will most heartily support the proposition.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Let us start.

**The MINISTER FOR HOUSING:** Where are we starting?

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: At the airport.

**The MINISTER FOR HOUSING:** With what type of person?

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Do not we want the tourists to come to Western Australia?

**The MINISTER FOR HOUSING:** If the prospect of having an odd whisky at 3 o'clock in the morning at the airport is the determining factor, I do not know that such a visitor is any great asset to the State. Who are the people who will be mostly affected? They will be wealthy sight-seers and business men of high standing coming from overseas.

Mr. O'Brien: Many people travel for health reasons.

**The MINISTER FOR HOUSING:** Not too many of the people I represent in East Perth travel overseas by air for health reasons. Those who either have the funds or are privileged—such as a Minister of the Crown who attends a conference in another State—to travel interstate by air, can, in accordance with the law, drink on the plane at 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning and now, possibly, they will be able to sit down when the plane arrives for another guzzle for a period. I have no objection to a person drinking at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning, but I have a rooted objection to there being a favoured few who can enjoy this privilege.

Mr. Yates: You enjoy that privilege in the Parliament House bar after 2 o'clock.

**The MINISTER FOR HOUSING:** That is so, and I am protesting at these favours in certain directions for some people, and the limitations so far as others are concerned.

Mr. Bovell: Cut it out in Parliament House.

**The MINISTER FOR HOUSING:** No. I am not in favour of cutting it out anywhere. One of the faults with our liquor laws is the number of restrictions. At the time when we had to use clothing coupons, we would, towards the end of the year—most of us were guilty of this—race along and buy clothes for the purpose of exhausting those coupons. Because there is an early closing time for premises, there is a tendency for people to rush. My experience is that drinking on the Goldfields is far more orderly than it is in the metropolitan area; and certainly very much in advance of the situation round about closing time in the Eastern States where the hour is 6 o'clock.

I venture to suggest that the position in certain Eastern States has improved tremendously because of the extension of the hours. I do not want to be misunderstood; I do not want members to think I am seeking to make our present licensing laws more restrictive; on the contrary. I am, however, opposed to this higgledy-piggledy method of endeavouring to provide a particular concession for a certain section of the community. If there is no harm in a person having a drink at 11 or 12 o'clock at night at an airport, I cannot see why there is harm in other persons in other localities being able to do the same thing if they feel so disposed. For these reasons I intend to vote to oppose the Bill at every stage in the hope that it will be rejected.

**MR. MANNING (Harvey) [5.40]:** I desire to offer some objection to the Bill. As has been indicated by other speakers, these facilities have not been provided at any other airport in Australia.

Mr. Yates: You can buy milk out there, too.

**Mr. MANNING:** This might curtail the sales of milk somewhat, therefore I object to it on those grounds also. The introduction of liquor at the airports will, in my view, lower the standard of the airport. It is possible that Perth Airport could become known as the "beer swill" airport.

**Mr. Cornell:** It might lower the standard of the parliamentary debates.

**Mr. MANNING:** It could, and it could lengthen them. I believe the future will bring increasing air traffic, and while it was the intention of the member for Cottesloe, when he introduced the measure, to ensure that the drinking facilities would be of a limited nature, the increasing air traffic of the future will mean that the service will be a 24-hour one. If the provisions sought by the member for Cottesloe are introduced, then the service must surely become a 24-hour service. Therefore his restrictive clauses or his limitations do not mean a thing, in my view.

**Mr. Lawrence:** What could be wrong with 24 hours?

**Mr. MANNING:** That is not the intention of the member for Cottesloe. The hon. member knows that when the bona fide clauses were taken out of the Licensing Act and Sunday drinking was introduced, the drinking on Sundays increased, and in many cases the privilege has been exploited. There are hotels where the position could be described in no other way than as a Sunday beer swill. In my opinion, that could happen at Perth Airport. I hope this will not come about. I consider that what is suggested here would bring a lowering of the standard and the good name of Perth Airport. I hope the measure will not be passed at the second reading stage.

**MR. BOVELL (Vasse) [5.43]:** I support the Bill because I believe we must progress with the times. I may be permitted, perhaps, to recall some of my experiences during my travels through Africa last year. In company with other members of Parliament from the British Commonwealth we travelled from Northern Africa and arrived at the international airport in Johannesburg. In that airport there is a first-class restaurant. I believe that this move will mean the establishment of a first-class restaurant for international travellers at Perth Airport.

Before leaving Johannesburg to return to Perth via Mauritius and Cocos, we were served with refreshments, not restricted to alcoholic liquors, in the early hours of the morning. It is a great facility for travellers to receive refreshment after having spent long hours in travelling. It is quite permissible to get refreshment on the aircraft itself; it is served in moderation. My experience of international travel is that there is no abuse of the privilege of being able to obtain alcoholic refreshment during the time that one is travelling.

**Mr. Yates:** Are those airports well conducted?

**Mr. BOVELL:** Yes. I would say that the luncheons we had at the Johannesburg international airport—known as the Jan Smuts Airport—were of the dimensions one would receive in any of the world's first-class hotels. Admittedly, we were entertained by the South African branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, but I have never seen such a congregation of people at an airport as I saw on that Sunday. I believe it was a Sunday, although perhaps somebody in this Chamber could correct me, if necessary.

In addition to members of Parliament, there were other people coming in and going out of that airport; they were arriving from and departing to all parts of Africa, and indeed to other parts of the world. The refreshments available were as good as those that could be obtained in a first-class hotel and, to my knowledge, no one abused the privilege; at least, I did not witness any abuses. I believe that we have to establish ourselves, as other nations have done.

**Mr. Ross Hutchinson:** The passengers did not rush off the plane and begin guzzling beer, as the Minister for Housing suggested.

**Mr. BOVELL:** They did nothing like that.

**Mr. May:** Have you any more leading questions?

**Mr. BOVELL:** The passengers conducted themselves as do all passengers who travel internationally. I believe we should try to establish here the same conditions that are already established at other international airports. I believe this Bill, introduced by the member for Cottesloe, is a move in this direction, and I shall certainly support it.

**HON. J. B. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [5.47]:** I am not too enamoured of this Bill because I do not think there is any necessity for it. I am not against any person having a drink, and I think, if members care to check the point, they will find that I have supported every liquor Bill that has been introduced into this Chamber since I have been a member of it. But it is more than passing strange that there are members here who spoke against the measure which would allow people to have a drink on Sundays, yet now they suddenly find that it is a good thing for passengers on aircraft to be given a place where they can have a little party.

In my opinion, this measure will not do much good for the country. If I had my way, I would allow hotels to remain open until 11 o'clock at night; that proves that I am not against liquor, but I do not

think this Bill is necessary. I have travelled a few times on planes, and there has always been plenty of liquor to drink, both before the arrival at and after the departure of the aircraft from an airport. I think our liquor laws in this country need revision in other directions more than they do in this regard. In my opinion, a man or a woman should be able to have a drink after the pictures or the theatre. But at present people are not permitted this amenity.

If this measure is passed, people will be able to get a drink at any hour of the day or night, before a plane arrives, while it is on the ground, and after it leaves. I cannot see any necessity for it. As I said, I think people should be able to get a drink, if they so desire, after the pictures, but I do not agree with the proposal contained in this Bill. Some members spoke against people being permitted to buy a glass of beer on a Sunday; but they appear to have eased their consciences and are prepared to vote for this measure. I shall vote against the Bill.

The Minister for Housing: Hear, hear!

**MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON** (Cottesloe—in reply) [5.50]: Firstly, I should like to thank members for the interest they have shown and the views they have expressed in regard to this Bill. I am pleased that I have introduced it because it gives members an opportunity to do something about social progress in connection with a form of transport which is as modern as this age. Perth Airport has only recently reached international status, a status that I personally have desired for some time. Through our airport now come airliners carrying passengers in the greatest comfort; they are travelling via Perth Airport instead of, as they all used to do, going through Darwin.

Mr. Yates: That was a major achievement.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Perth Airport is a transit airport on the Kangaroo route to London, and I submit that it is relevant to the Bill to explain how important it is to have an international air route going through our State. It would be wise for all of us to get away from our own parochial and often silly little reasoning with regard to certain social amenities or facilities that are accepted in other countries. I suggest that many members have forgotten that Perth Airport stands on ground that in many a sense is international ground.

Mr. J. Hegney: That is out at Middle Swan.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: These areas are to be found all over the world and, in a sense, they all have an international status. They link the countries of the world. The meaning behind it is, of course, that each country is important to

the others, and countries are being drawn closer and closer together through air travel.

Mr. J. Hegney: What about the port of Fremantle? That links countries, too.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I agree. At odd times in this House I have tried my best to persuade Premiers—and I might say that they were easily persuaded—to press the Prime Minister as regards the proposals to give the Perth Airport international status. I pointed out that an international airport was as important to this State as the Fremantle harbour is with respect to sea routes. I ask members to appreciate the fact that we have an international airport and we have passing through it people who are accustomed to broader views on licensing facilities than we have here. But, irrespective of whether their views are broader or not, let us conform to their social progress. I think we must go beyond our own parochial reasoning.

Let me compare the international airport of Karachi with the Perth Airport. Karachi is one of the transit airports on the Kangaroo route to London and it is, as members are aware, the capital of Pakistan, a Moslem country. Liquor in any shape or form is abhorrent to Moslems, and they will not touch it. But the international airport, in the centre of this, what might be termed, teetotal country has facilities for serving liquor to passengers who are travelling through the airport. These passengers have travelled many thousands of miles; they are way weary and, of course, are bona fide travellers. Possibly they need refreshment, but not all of them get off the plane and begin guzzling any and every sort of liquor. Quite a number of them avail themselves of the opportunity to drink iced coffee, tea, coca cola and other forms of refreshment.

Mr. Manning: What about milk?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Yes. As the member for Harvey suggested, some of them would probably drink milk. The Moslems, who refuse to drink liquor, are sufficiently broadminded and tolerant to understand that certain people under certain conditions desire to partake of liquor and the facilities are provided for them.

Mr. Yates: What about Indonesia? Is there an airport there?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Yes. There is another airport on the Kangaroo route at Djakarta.

Mr. Ackland: You could not get any liquor there in 1952.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It can be obtained now. It is generally thought that Asian countries are backward in their approach to social matters; they do not believe in this or that, or in the provision of amenities in certain directions. But it is interesting to note that there is a first-class restaurant at the Djakarta Airport.

I am told that a person can obtain a very fine meal there—the best to be had in Djakarta, and if anyone desires a drink, that too is available.

I would like to mention another airport; this is not on the Kangaroo route but is an important airport, and I refer to the airport of Stockholm. I was informed by a member of this House that the airport there has a fine restaurant, and licensing facilities are available. Stockholm is the capital of Sweden, and for many years that country had prohibition laws. Only in recent months has there been a relaxation of them and they are still not completely free. But at their airport in Stockholm, liquor is available.

We are a young country and we have just gained a transit airport, the value of which is difficult to assess. It will have far-reaching effects. I do not want to go on for too long because of the possibility of stonewalling my own Bill; but I feel that some members were so adamant and so fearful of the outcome of this legislation that I must mention a few points. I wish to reiterate that we have been granted international status for our airport and yet it is the only one on the Kangaroo route to London that has no licensing facilities. Sydney is in a different position altogether. That is a terminal airport, and when people arrive there they disperse and go their various ways.

Perth Airport is a transit airport and people do not disperse when they land there. The plane remains on the ground for an average of about 3½ hours, and during that time the passengers are checked in. Some of them go through the Customs and others are subject to quarantine procedure. Though these passengers are weary, they have plenty of facilities at the airport and are able to shower and have a change. During the second reading debate I suggested it would be a good thing if members could visit the airport and have a look for themselves.

There is an excellent dining-room where passengers have their meals. Some passengers can have drinks with their meals while others cannot. This Bill will help to rationalise that situation, as I explained when I introduced the measure. Some members, the Premier notably among them, felt that we should not have licensing facilities here because no other airport in Australia had them. I have covered that point, but whether I have done so satisfactorily or not remains to be seen. If Perth were not a transit, but a terminal airport I would not have introduced this Bill, but the importance of licensing facilities is obvious at a transit airport.

Some members suggested that we should bring all air passengers within the ambit of this Bill, but I feel we should guard against that. It was said that the North-West plane passengers should have

a similar facility. If I included the North-West passengers in this measure, I know of at least one member from the North-West who would not support the Bill. Why should I antagonise members and jeopardise the measure because of that form of support which, actually, is no support at all?

I was asked why the bar should be open half-an-hour before and half-an-hour after the arrival of the plane. I must admit that that provision was taken straight from the parent Act as it relates to railway refreshment rooms. At the time I felt that what was right and just for rail passengers would be equally right and just for air passengers. The member for Collie said that the Bill was playing with people's lives.

Mr. May: I did not speak on the Bill.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The hon. member made an interjection to the effect that the Bill was playing with people's lives. To say the least, a remark like that is most unfair because the pilots and air-crews do not play with people's lives. As I mentioned when I moved the second reading of the Bill, there are certain regulations to which the pilots and crew and passengers must conform.

Mr. May: I was not referring to the pilots but the passengers already on the plane. That has happened on the North-West plane.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I admit it has happened recently, and passengers have been put off a plane because they were inebriated.

Mr. May: I was not talking about the pilots.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: But that sort of thing is likely to happen anywhere. Air travel in Australia and throughout the world is one of the safest means of transport. We do read of crashes occasionally, but for the number of passengers carried, air travel is a remarkably safe means of transport. There is another query I should like to answer and that relates to the policing of the licence. In the first place, I became rather worried when a certain Paul Rigby featured a cartoon in the "Daily News" showing a crowd of people leaving a hotel bar at one minute past 9 o'clock and about to hop into taxis. One of them was made to say, "Let us go to the airport and stoke up."

Mr. May: You must admit he is generally on the ball.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: In this case, he is very far off the mark.

Mr. O'Brien: I think he should take a trip in an aeroplane and see the silver lining.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I think so, too. I got in touch with the local manager of Qantas and asked him whether it would be possible for people at a certain

time to go out to the airport and proceed to get really drunk. I was told verbally that such a likelihood did exist, and that it was probable that a carload of people might go out, attempt to breast the bar and imbibe liquor when they should not. The likelihood also exists that they may break the law in many other ways.

The Minister for Housing: That would not be breaking the law.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: If the Minister for Housing would study my speech, he would find that they would be breaking the law.

The Minister for Housing: No.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I was informed that the Commonwealth police would strictly control that side of the business. It is quite obvious when a crowd of people comes into a place and tries to take over the bar and drink unduly. I received a letter from the manager of Qantas Empire Airways Ltd. which reads as follows:—

Your reaction to a recent cartoon in the "Daily News" on the airport liquor licence, at present before the House, is no doubt the same as ours, in that we feel that it gives a wrong impression as to what is likely to happen if such a Bill is passed.

As you know, we are anxious to obtain the facilities to serve drinks to our passengers travelling from, to and through Perth, on our overseas services, and to have similar facilities extended to friends of such passengers, and those travelling by interstate services. The licence, if granted, would be controlled by the Department of Civil Aviation, and the policing of such a licence will be adequately covered by the Commonwealth police officers employed by that department at the airport. It would be quite impossible for such a situation as that depicted by the "Daily News" cartoonist, to develop.

I wanted to say something about the member for East Perth who made an extraordinary speech.

Hon. A. F. Watts: No speech he ever made should astonish you.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I feel his views on this occasion were rather anachronistic, and not in keeping with his general views on the subject. In some of his statements he made out a part case for the abolition of the members' bar in the House.

The Minister for Housing: No. An extension of similar facilities to other people.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The hon. member's words could quite easily be misconstrued. I hope the Bill will be passed. I think it is something that is bound to come as a form of social progress which

we lack at the moment as far as our international standards are concerned. I can assure members that the fears they have expressed concerning drunkenness, and the extension of drinking habits, are quite unfounded and would not be realised.

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

Ayes	....	....	33
Noes	....	....	15
Majority for	....	....	18

#### Ayes.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. Moir
Mr. Andrew	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Bovell	Mr. North
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Cornell	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. Court	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Heal	Mr. Owen
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Hill	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Watts
Mr. Lawrence	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. Yates
Mr. McCulloch	Mr. Hutchinson
Sir Ross McLarty	(Teller.)

#### Noes.

Mr. Ackland	Mr. Manning
Mr. Brady	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Doney	Mr. Norton
Mr. Graham	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Styan
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. May
Mr. McConnochie	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

#### *In Committee.*

Mr. J. Hegney in the Chair; Mr. Ross Hutchinson in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Sections 44A, 44B and 44C added:

Mr. O'BRIEN: I move an amendment—

That in line 5, page 3, the words "or visiting" be struck out.

This relates to other persons utilising or visiting the airport.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I appreciate the hon. member's viewpoint, although I do not think the inclusion of the words would be dangerous because the paragraph refers in a general sense to what the court may do in granting a licence. In deference to his wishes, I would be agreeable to the words being deleted, but I ask him not to persist in moving his amendment here but to leave it to be made in another place. There is only limited time left in which to deal with the measure, and if it is amended here, it will have to be reprinted before being sent to another place.

Mr. O'BRIEN: I agree to the hon. member's suggestion, realising that we are so near the end of the session. Therefore I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. O'BRIEN: I should like to hear the views of the member for Cottesloe on the proposed new Section 44C (a). I think the words "out of the State" relating to any aircraft conveying passengers should be deleted.

Mr. ANDREW: I have a prior amendment. The proposed new section stipulates that liquor may be sold for a period of 30 minutes before the arrival and 30 minutes after the departure of an aircraft, and I consider that 15 minutes would be sufficient. It is not necessary for such a bar to be open for half-an-hour before and after the arrival of an aircraft. I move an amendment—

That the word "thirty" in line 14, page 3, be struck out with a view to inserting the word "fifteen" in lieu.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I should like to meet the hon. member's views, but for the reasons I gave to the member for Murchison, I am diffident about accepting any amendment at this stage. The reduction of 15 minutes in the time would make little difference.

Mr. BRADY: The member for Cottesloe should accept the amendment. To refuse to accept any amendment is unreasonable on his part. We could go even further and restrict the trading time to the period during which the plane was grounded. I see no necessity to provide for a margin of a quarter-of-an-hour before the arrival of a plane and after its departure. It is all very well to maintain that we must provide this, that and the other for tourists, but I point out to the hon. member that minorities have rights that should be respected.

Mr. ANDREW: The hon. member will not help himself by adopting his present attitude. He said that the amendment would not make much difference; therefore why not accept it?

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: You know that Parliament will probably be closing tomorrow and the amendment could be moved in another place.

Mr. ANDREW: If the hon. member will give an assurance that he will agree to his sponsor in another place accepting the amendment, I shall withdraw it.

Mr. MAY: I give notice of my intention to move a further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the member for Victoria Park withdraw his amendment?

Mr. Andrew: Not unless the hon. member will give me an assurance along the lines indicated.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I appreciate the hon. member's views, but would prefer to have the Bill passed by this Chamber in its present form. If the amendment were made in another place, I would raise no objection.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. MAY: I move an amendment—

That the words "and thirty minutes after" in line 21, page 3, be struck out.

Some members have stressed the necessity for entertaining aircraft passengers on their arrival, but they cannot be entertained after their departure and this 30 minutes would go a long way towards creating at the airport the situation we wish to avoid.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: As in the previous instance, if the measure returned from another place containing this amendment I would not oppose it.

Mr. MAY: I do not see why the member for Cottesloe should prefer to have the amendment made in another place.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: You know why. We have seen many Bills killed.

Mr. MAY: We can continue sitting till next year, as far as I am concerned, rather than pass detrimental legislation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are not discussing sitting till next year.

Mr. MAY: The measure should not be rushed through haphazardly. I will be satisfied if the member for Cottesloe will give an assurance that these words will be struck out in another place.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Since the hon. member is adamant and the Premier has interjected to the effect that I would be wise to accept the amendment, I will ask the sponsor of the measure in another place to have these words struck out.

Mr. MAY: Then I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. O'BRIEN: I move an amendment—

That the words, "out of the State" in line 23, page 3, be struck out.

If the amendment is agreed to the measure will cover passengers travelling within the State as well as those travelling overseas and interstate.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: If I accepted the amendment that would be virtually a breach of faith with those who have so far supported the measure. When replying to the debate on the second reading, I stated that had Perth been a terminal airport, I probably would not have introduced the measure. The points I had in

mind were the international and transit aspects of the airport. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. O'BRIEN: It is hard to say what route the overseas aircraft will be taking in the near future and I think there should be no objection to the amendment as the clause already provides for passengers being conveyed into this State. The amendment would mean that passengers travelling within the State would be able to enjoy the facilities provided.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I understood the Bill was intended only to provide facilities for persons who travel in aeroplanes which are not travelling only in Western Australia. The amendment would bring within the ambit of the Bill all plane services flying in Western Australia including, even, the Rottneest service—I believe—and that would cut right across the basis upon which I was prepared to support the second reading and would induce me to vote against the third reading. For those reasons I oppose the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 11, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

### *Third Reading.*

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe) [7.58]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. DAME FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco) [7.59]: I am sorry I was not here this afternoon to vote against the measure, which I think is iniquitous, but I will vote against the third reading even if in doing so I am alone in this House. There is none here who has travelled more than I have—

Mr. May: Why did you not vote against the second reading?

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: Do not ask questions! I could answer the question, but will not. I was not here and did not vote, but will vote against the third reading. I repeat that there is no person in this Chamber who has travelled further or seen more of the world than I have. We, in Australia, are a peculiar people—

The Minister for Lands: You're telling me!

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: —because where alcohol and eating are concerned, we might be termed swillers and guzzlers.

Mr. Oldfield: That is unfair.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: I said we might be termed that. We are perfectly aware that this country is immature and that its people have not learned to be as cultured as they should be; that we do not eat as we should or drink as we should. The result is that we have many alcoholics in our midst and numerous traffic accidents occur through the consumption of alcohol. Yet it is intended to bring in a Bill which will make it possible for passengers to embark on aeroplanes under the influence of liquor. Those who have travelled know how awful it is if there is only one person on the plane who has had too much to drink. He is a confounded nuisance.

The Minister for Lands: I have never seen that yet.

Mr. O'Brien: They will not let anyone on the plane who is under the influence of liquor.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: No one knows whether a person has had too much to drink until he is on the plane. I have known people who have had too much liquor before they got on the plane and further, they could obtain more drink on the aircraft. Therefore, surely we should try to prevent people from obtaining drink before boarding a plane. Instead, we are now going to aid and abet those people who desire to obtain drink before embarking on any aircraft.

The Minister for Lands: You must have a terrible time wrestling with your conscience sometimes.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: I do not ask the Minister to believe me, nor do I ask any member to say, "She is merely trying to put forward a point because she does not believe in the consumption of alcohol." I am merely pointing out that I have been on planes with people who have had too much to drink, and it is an extraordinary and horrible experience. Therefore, I do not think we should pass this Bill to allow greater facilities to be taken advantage of by those people who are in the habit of consuming too much liquor.

The Premier: Does the hon. member know whose Bill this is?

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: I do not care whose Bill it is! I still oppose it! The Premier knows full well that he and I have sat alone in this House in voting against legislation on lotteries, liquor and other matters of such nature.

The Premier: I am asking the hon. member if she knows who introduced this Bill?

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: Of course I do! Does the Premier think I am silly?

The Premier: Who did?

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: I am not going to answer these irrelevant questions. All I am saying is that if the Premier acts as he has done in the past, he will vote against this Bill.

The Premier: I voted against the second reading this afternoon.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: Well, I hope the Premier will vote against the third reading. If every man here considers he has the welfare of young men at heart, all will vote against the Bill. The member for Guildford-Midland referred to what could happen when a family or a group of people visited the airport to see their friends embark upon a plane or to welcome them home on disembarking. He said that if drink was available at the Perth airport, the family would be split up and they would not be able to bid their friends goodbye as a family group. Members will commit a wicked act if they pass this Bill in the last hours of the session, and I appeal to them to vote against it.

The Premier: It is the Bill introduced by the member for Cottesloe that the hon. member is criticising.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: I know it is!

Mr. O'Brien: Why did you not say so before?

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: I have a conscience and if other members have one too, they will vote against this measure. As a person who is a mother, I know perfectly well the curse that alcohol is throughout the world, and I am asking members not to make it easier for young people, who are seeing their friends off on a plane, to be given the opportunity to wander off and consume drink instead of bidding their friends goodbye as was their original intention. I am definitely going to vote against the Bill. It would not have made the slightest bit of difference if I had been here for the vote on the second reading, because it would still have been carried. However, that is not the point; I am going to vote against the third reading now. Further, I will not only voice my protest now but I will continue to protest against the measure through the Press.

The Minister for Education: You were here when the vote on the second reading took place and you walked out.

Hon. Dame FLORENCE CARDELL-OLIVER: Does the Minister know why? He kept me awake all last night! So I went to sleep this afternoon and the result was that I came into the Chamber too late for the vote on the second reading. If the men in this Chamber would conduct the proceedings as they should be conducted, there would be no need to keep me here till 2 a.m. and they would permit me to have a full night's rest. Members now know why I did not vote against the

second reading, but I will vote against the third reading. I shall not only vote against it now but in the future I shall keep in mind every man who votes for the Bill.

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

Ayes	.....	32
Noes	.....	14
Majority for	.....	18

#### Ayes.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. Moir
Mr. Andrew	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Bovey	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Brand	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Court	Mr. Owen
Mr. Heal	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hill	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Styants
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Lawrence	Mr. Watts
Mr. Mann	Mr. Wild
Mr. McCulloch	Mr. Yates
Sir Ross McLarty	Mr. Hoar

(Teller.)

#### Noes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. Manning
Mr. Doney	Mr. May
Mr. Graham	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Norton
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Johnson	Dame F. Cardell-Oliver

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

### BILL—PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

### BILL—PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.

Third Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. J. T. Tonkin—Melville) [8.13] in moving the third reading said: Last night I endeavoured to argue as strongly as I could that the Bill before the Committee should not be amended to provide for an appeal before a magistrate as that would be taking away an executive function from the Minister and the Government and placing some outside person in control of administration.

I used all the arguments that I had at my command to impress upon members the importance of this matter and how administration could be seriously affected, but the Committee agreed to the proposal put forward by the member for Greenough and inserted it in the Bill. This morning, when I arrived at my office, my senior officers of the various departments—Metropolitan Water Supply, Main Roads

and the Public Works Departments—were in a state of consternation and they pointed out to me how very seriously the administration of the State would be affected under this proposal.

For example, it was pointed out by the Commissioner for Main Roads that after months had been spent in surveying a route for a road—having regard to the shortest distance which could be traversed—the route which would involve the least costly resumptions and so on—knowing that negotiations could take place with the majority of land-owners along the route who would agree to sell their land to the department for the purpose of making a road—it could then be held up because a few owners would want to avail themselves of this right of appeal, which could take very many months.

An illustration was given to me of how long it now takes to get a simple traffic case before a court. If the department is proceeding against a person for having an excess of axle load, it takes as long as six months in some instances before the case is heard. It was pointed out to me that, because acquisitions of land run into some hundreds per year, a situation could arise where there would be 12 months' delay before cases were dealt with by a magistrate on appeal. So it could transpire that road-making in this State could be seriously affected where work connected with water supplies and the like would be held up so as to throw the department into a chaotic condition.

I endeavoured to indicate last night that that would be the position as a result of the ill-advised amendment that was passed. Having heard officers of the various branches of my department this morning, I am perfectly satisfied that if the amendment remains in the Bill, and the Bill becomes law, it will be a very sorry day for Western Australia and very much against the general interests of the State. When the Bill reaches another place, it is hoped that wiser counsels will prevail and the effect of the Bill will be considered from the State viewpoint rather than for any political advantage.

This is a very serious matter. Governments come and go. Although the amendment may embarrass me as Minister and the present Government, when a change takes place, as it must sooner or later, then the new Government will experience the same difficulty. In the meantime, the development of the State will suffer because of the amendment which will confer no real benefit on the owners of land, but will inevitably result in very great delay to important public works, with a consequent increase in costs and expenditure. Thus the State will be adversely affected. If the amendment could be of any real benefit to owners, the position might be different. If members will consider what will transpire, they will see that in very

few instances, if any, would an owner of land be likely to receive a decision in his favour.

Take, for example, when a route has been surveyed and designed for a road; the factors guiding those responsible include consideration of the route to be traversed and whether such route would involve the resumption of properties already built on, or whether the route should traverse vacant land. Wherever it is possible to place the route so that it traverses vacant land, that is the inevitable route selected. It is only when there is no other alternative that roads are built in such a way as to interfere with properties on which residences have been erected. If such a road is designed and surveyed but owners of property exercise their right of appeal under the provisions of this Bill then the appeals will have to await the pleasure of the court before being heard.

Inquiries have satisfied me that, because of the large number of resumptions which go through yearly for public works, the provision to permit appeals to the court could involve a delay of many months. When eventually such an appeal gets before the court, the head of the department, say the Commissioner of Main Roads, will have no difficulty whatever in establishing that the land which he is seeking to acquire is essential for the purposes of the highway. In those circumstances, I cannot imagine a magistrate agreeing that the owner should retain his land and that the highway should not be constructed. Inevitably, the final result will be that no change will be made in the original route but a very long delay could occur which would result in additional expense and in the slowing up of the State's development.

Is that the sort of thing which ought to be encouraged and provided for, without corresponding benefit? I suggest that careful thought be given to this question and the implications of the action taken. When it is I have little doubt that wiser counsels will prevail and an alteration made in the Bill so that the power of land resumption already on the statute book in Western Australia will be made workable to meet the needs of a growing and developing State.

It is very significant that over all the years it has been recognised in nearly all Parliaments and countries that the Government should have power to resume land for public works, and that when such works are urgent, it should have power to enter such lands before resumption. Throughout the years that question has been argued by Parliaments and Governments, but there has been very little difference of opinion between the Opposition and the Government on the desirability and necessity for giving the Government requisite power to proceed with the development of public works.

Here we are faced with the situation that this is the only State in the Commonwealth in which development could be retarded by the inclusion of a provision which can give very little benefit to owners of land but which must of necessity slow up the activities of the Government and curtail the progress of the State. I submit that the interest of the State is paramount in this matter to any desire to score a political advantage. This matter ought to be dealt with in the most serious way possible, with a full appreciation of what is involved in the action taken.

So I suggest to those members who participated in the debate last night and early this morning that surely this is a question which transcends party politics or political gain because land resumption has never before been a question of party politics. Down the years there have been changes of Government, but no attempt has been made to take from the Government the power to acquire land on behalf of the State for public works. The member for Stirling, when Minister for Education, resumed plenty of land for school sites, as he had a perfect right to do, and as was his obligation. One of the resumptions affected people in my electorate. One such person was a widow who pointed out that she had lived on the resumed property with her husband for many years before he died, that she had reared her children in the house and wanted to stay there.

She questioned why her property should be taken over to enable a school playground to be enlarged. She had to be told that the growth of the school was such that the school playground was no longer adequate for the number of children attending that school and that therefore it was essential that the opportunity be taken to enlarge the playing area for the benefit of the children then attending school and those who would attend it in future.

Hon. A. F. Watts: But she was not shifted from that property for five years.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I know that, but she lost her title to the property and her land was resumed. The fact that she was not shifted for five years is beside the point.

Hon. D. Brand: In the event of an appeal, that would be the situation. She would appeal against the resumption, but the resumption would have been upheld.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is exactly what I am saying: In the ultimate the resumption would be unaffected, but in certain circumstances a resumption could be delayed very considerably. The member for Greenough knows that in a period of 12 months it is possible for resumptions or acquirement of land to run into some thousands of parcels, according to the amount of work that is being undertaken—whether roads are being surveyed and

made, or whether railway lines are being constructed. The resumptions could involve thousands of persons.

Suppose only half of them exercised their right to appeal to a magistrate 14 days after the 30 days have expired and the Minister had decided that the appeal should not be granted. The appeals could run into months and even years before all the cases were heard. In the meantime, the road construction programme and the water supply work would be held up; nothing could be done until the magistrate heard the cases. Probably the magistrate would, in practically all cases, because so much care has been exercised beforehand by the department on the particular resumptions, dismiss the appeals.

Mr. Court: You are reading more into the existing situation.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, I am not. I am endeavouring to tell members about a position as it was emphasised to me this morning by the senior officers of the various branches under my control. There was no exception; they are all in a state of consternation—the officers of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department, the officers of the Public Works Department, and the officers of the Main Roads Department. They realise how greatly their work could be held up, with no benefit to anybody in the ultimate, but with very considerable disadvantage to the State in the meantime. I trust that wiser counsels will prevail in this matter and the interests of the State will be considered, not some other interest which the amendment seeks to serve for the time being. I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. D. BRAND (Greenough) [8.29]: In supporting the Bill, I would say in reply to the Minister for Works that he has exaggerated the position, no doubt in order to impress members.

The Minister for Works: Tell me where I have exaggerated it.

Hon. D. BRAND: The Minister talked of months and months of delay, and so on.

The Minister for Works: It is a matter of simple arithmetic.

Hon. D. BRAND: I would point out that the inclusion of the amendments was an endeavour to ensure that the individual had some right of appeal against a resumption.

The Minister for Works: He has that already.

Hon. D. BRAND: To the Minister.

The Minister for Works: Yes, the same as in other States.

Hon. D. BRAND: That may not give a great deal of satisfaction. I am not adamant in respect of the amendments. My objective was to include in the Bill a principle that would cover the right of appeal against resumptions. I have every regard and respect for the senior officers of all the departments, especially the Public Works Department. Naturally they would protest. They would hope that such an amendment would not be included, because there must inevitably be some delay. As against that, we have the rights of the individual to be considered, bearing in mind—and I repeat what I said last night—that except for the huge resumptions that have taken place there would never have been protestations, and I should think there never would have been public support for some request for an appeal against resumptions of land and titles.

The Minister for Health: Your amendment will ultimately make no difference to the individual. But it will make a big difference to the progress of the State.

Hon. D. BRAND: Even if there is some curtailment of the grounds of appeal laid down in the amendment by the deletion of the provision with respect to hardship and the other three are retained that would give some satisfaction to every individual who feels he has been wrongly treated even in the interests of the State as a whole, inasmuch as he could appeal to someone outside the Public Works Department.

The Minister for Health: The effect would be only psychological.

Hon. D. BRAND: I will not rigidly oppose any changes made in the other place in respect of this Bill if they are thought desirable as a result of further information brought to hand. My only hope is that we will give to the people generally the confidence which they had originally, and of which they have been robbed as a result of the actions of Governments—of this Government and our own. That is the only reason the amendment was included.

HON. A. F. WATTS (Stirling [8.33]: As one who took some part in the debate yesterday on the inclusion of the amendments which have just been discussed, I would like to say that I fear the Minister has been busy painting the lily in this regard. Particularly do I say that in connection with his claim that months must elapse in nearly all cases before the appeals will be heard.

Might I point out that the amendments contained a paragraph expressly designed to ensure that the proceedings of the local court in this matter will be governed by regulation. In the amendments, the Governor is empowered specifically to make regulations necessary to give effect to the provisions of that paragraph.

Secondly, I suggest it would be a mighty poor Government that would stand around and leave the local court in such a position that it would be months before it could hear an appeal in connection with a matter which, in the opinion of the Minister, could upset the national or State interest. I suggest that steps could be taken to ensure under one power or the other—either the specific one in the Bill or the administrative one reasonably possessed under instructions from Cabinet—that there was not unnecessary delay.

But let us look at the effect of these amendments in two ways—the first, what I will call their practical effect; and, secondly, their effect on individuals concerned. In nearly every piece of legislation we have, there is a right of some sort of appeal to an independent tribunal. Even the other night we had an addition to the Government Railways Act enabling temporary employees to appeal against punishment, whereas hitherto only permanent employees—if I understood the matter aright—have been allowed to do so.

In nearly every piece of legislation where any right is likely to be taken away from anybody, or any obligation imposed upon him, there is a right of appeal to some independent tribunal. In cases such as this, is it so extremely unreasonable to allow a right of appeal in the paragraph inserted last night to people who are likely to lose, in many cases, their most cherished possession—particularly when, as I have indicated, I believe that in the light of the amendment itself the ordinary procedure is eminently practicable to ensure that no unnecessary delay ensues? It is extremely reasonable and of considerable psychological value that that opportunity should be available.

Let us look once again at the amendments. The first provided that there should be a ground of appeal that there was suitable Crown land in the vicinity. In addressing myself to the matter at the Committee stage, I said that I was of the opinion that there would be very few cases that would ever reach the court under that heading because, in view of that paragraph being inserted in the measure, the departments concerned would be doubly careful and on their guard that they did not seek to resume land where there was Crown land in the vicinity that could be used for the purpose.

So I do not think that any great number of appeals would be ventured on that ground; and if there were one that could be ventured, I suggest it is just as well that the individual should have the right—as most other individuals have in anything like similar circumstances, under our legislation—to ventilate his case before an independent body.

The second was that where there was a residence on the land to be resumed, the occupier of that residence, if he could

show there was unoccupied land that could equally reasonably and satisfactorily be used, could lodge an appeal. I think that precisely the same applies to that.

The third was if the public work was of such a nature that it could have been put somewhere else, on Crown land or unoccupied land rather than on resumed land which was not unoccupied. I do not think that is very unreasonable, either.

The last one, as I said by interjection, was the only one that might present some difficulty. But I thought that, on balance, when the court was obliged to take into consideration the importance and urgency of the public work, it would—if the department was able to establish the urgency of the work—equally override the claimant's appeal; but, if it did not so override it, then the court would be justified in giving the decision against the department and in favour of the claimant. As I said last night, and repeat now, that is the only amendment that could present any real practical difficulty.

So I suggest to the officers of the Public Works Department, whose commonsense and sound knowledge are well known to me, that they should go back over the ground before they allow their consternation—to which the Minister referred—to become uppermost in their minds, and just consider carefully, and not only in the light of their own knowledge of the circumstances surrounding them, but also in the light of a careful analysis of the appeal clauses; and I think that they will find that the situation is not going to be nearly so bad as they anticipate. In fact, I suggest that their consternation will dwindle very rapidly.

But I do think that the effect, on people concerned with resumptions, of having these clauses in the Bill will be to make them feel that the department must be doubly careful before it proceeds with a resumption; and that, if the department does by any chance make a grave error, within the grounds of appeal they will at least have a chance to be heard, as nearly every other section of the community in one way or another in its rights or obligations, has the right to be heard by some outside body.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

### **BILLS (3)—RETURNED.**

- 1, Road Closure.
- 2, Reserves.
- 3, State Electricity Act Amendment.  
Without amendment.

### **BILL—TRUSTEES ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).**

Received from the Council and read a first time.

### **BILL—TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT.**

#### *Second Reading.*

**THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING** (Hon. H. E. Graham—East Perth) [8.45] in moving the second reading said: Members will recall that some two years ago Professor Stephenson commenced work on the preparation of a metropolitan regional plan. His report was submitted to the Government earlier this year and was released to the public in September last.

The Government decided upon the appointment of an advisory committee representative of the Government, members of the Opposition, and certain local authorities. That committee gave attention to some matters in general, and some in particular. It endorsed the plan in principle and also a number of its provisions. Of more recent date I understand, because I am not a member of the committee, it has been the opinion of the members that there should be some authority to give effect to the provisions of the plan.

Consideration was given to the introduction of legislation of a preliminary nature, and I believe that the majority of the principles embodied in the Bill now before us are in accordance with the wishes of the members of that committee, although several additional requirements were sought by some of the members representing the Opposition parties. Steps have been taken to give effect, completely or as far as possible, to their wishes. Therefore, those who have been actively associated with these proposals have some knowledge of the provisions of the Bill and its general intent.

It is of no use our having invited an eminent town planner to the shores of Western Australia, and he having produced a plan, unless we do something to give effect to it. A start has to be made somewhere. The regional plan, copies of which I have had placed temporarily on the wall of this Chamber, shows the affected area which comes within the ambit of a number of the local authorities mentioned in a schedule to the Bill. It should be pointed out that the plan does not have effect on the whole area of some of the local authorities.

The smaller plan which has been placed on the wall defines more precisely the limitations of the metropolitan region. As copies of the report and plans have been made available to members, I daresay they are acquainted with the general proposals. The purpose of this legislation is to give power to make an interim development order. I have a copy of one such order before me which I am prepared to make available to any member who might be interested. It is one that was issued in

Victoria in March of this year, and it gives some idea of the nature and form of the order that it is proposed to issue.

The intention of the legislation following the issuing of the order, would be to provide for a holding power; that is to say, whilst details of the general plan are being worked out, there shall be a minimum of development which is likely to interfere with the proper implementation of the proposals. Superficially it might appear that that would interfere seriously with the rights of those who own property, but it is intended, within certain limits, to allow as much elasticity as possible, and that where it seems that a project is to be established on a site likely to interfere with some proposals, endeavours will be made to find, in the case of a main road or a proposed railway, an alternative route that could skirt the building proposed to be erected on a property.

This legislation provides that the order, which it is proposed shall be issued to operate from January next, shall continue until the 31st December next year to provide a breathing space while those who are charged with the responsibility of the greater detail work of the plan can work out more particularly what is required. Whereas at the present moment certain main arterial roads are proposed, which are merely lines in the general direction shown on this plan, it is sought to have them located so that there can be a definite route affecting certain properties, following which it is not intended that any action shall be taken in connection with those properties other than to prevent development on those areas that are likely to interfere with what is planned as the final route of the main arterial highway; again, subject to the qualification I mentioned earlier that there could be some deviations.

Where it is a matter of the purpose to which the land can be put—that is to say, an industrial area as against a residential area—there would probably be still greater freedom because in the final analysis it probably would not matter, particularly in the more undeveloped areas, just exactly where the dividing line ran. Where it was a matter of providing an open space for the use of the public, it will be appreciated that there would be considerable room for negotiation so as to interfere to a minimum extent. This, I repeat, occurs whilst the final plans are being worked out. The final plan itself would still be subject to variation from time to time in view of the trends in population, and innovations, perhaps, in forms of travel, modes of living and so on.

I think it is understood by everyone who has paid any attention to this question, that all that is sought is that progress and development shall proceed on an orderly basis, but there will no doubt, from time to time, be the need to make departures from the original conception to

meet the conditions of a changing world. The Town Planning Commissioner has asked me to point out that since the preparation of the plan by Professor Stephenson, there have been quite a few developments which have interfered with the original conception. Therefore, the longer we delay in making some provision to check this haphazard development, the greater will the problem become and the more difficult will it be to follow, even approximately, what was worked out by Professor Stephenson and his staff.

To give one example, it will be seen that because it appears there will be hopeless chaos in the matter of motor traffic centred around the West Perth subway, with all the housing proceeding north of the city along the coast and in the Osborne Park-Wanneroo area, there is a proposal, in order to relieve that chaos to some extent, for a railway to proceed westerly from the city and then turn northwards up the coast. Since that proposal was conceived, hundreds of houses have, in the last couple of years, been built in the Scarborough area, and they are now occupied. They are on the route of the proposed railway line.

It will, I think, be generally appreciated that in a State such as ours, developing with the rapidity that it is, incalculable harm can be done to the major concepts every month that we delay in taking some action to correct the position. That, I understand, was appreciated by all the members of the committee. Whilst realising that it was late in the session to bring down a Bill, they wished nevertheless that action should be taken urgently by the introduction of as short and as simple a Bill as possible. That, therefore, is the reason for the legislation being introduced at this late hour. It might well be fatal to delay for a further period of 12 months or thereabouts.

Mr. Court: You mentioned some houses in Scarborough that interfere with the railway proposition. Are they State housing places?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: Some of them would be, but it will be realised that early developmental work in the construction of roads, the extension of water supplies and electricity has taken place in advance of home building, so that when ultimately the proposals of Professor Stephenson were shaped and the details made available to the State Housing Commission, work was under way. But not only the activities of the State Housing Commission are concerned. I merely quoted that as an example. To a greater or lesser degree in different places there has been that effect.

Mr. Court: Has any action been taken to influence the local authorities to bear in mind the possible outcome of this plan regardless of legislation or lack of legislation?

**The MINISTER FOR HOUSING:** In what way?

Mr. Court: There is much they can do to try to anticipate by co-operation the needs of the plan.

**The MINISTER FOR HOUSING:** That has actually been done by a number of local authorities. The Perth City Council which had some knowledge of Professor Stephenson's proposals even before the plan was finally developed and presented, withheld more or less indefinitely certain building permits because it knew, from the proposals in the plan, that the area in question was to be developed for an entirely different purpose. To avoid the situation where there would be recently built industrial establishments having to be pulled down in a very short space of time and, of course, the additional compensation having to be paid, the Perth City Council co-operated to that extent, and, shall I say, at the same time to the extreme annoyance of those individuals and concerns who sought to proceed.

I am afraid that there will inevitably be some upsets in people's plans as more and more of this scheme is given effect to; but it is either that or develop in an irresponsible higgledy-piggledy fashion thereby building on and accentuating the difficulties we have at present, particularly in the heart of the city and indeed in the siting of some industrial premises. For instance, one could point to the East Perth power house, the gas works, loco. yards, plaster works and establishments of that nature which are causing considerable discomfiture to residents of the area; and we know only too well the effects of the cements works which are just across the river. Those irritations to the people round about have occurred because at the time of the development of those concerns there was no plan; a person just built what he wanted where he wanted.

This matter of determining and influencing the use of land will be applied in two different ways. If any development which affects these proposals is intended, it will be considered by the Town Planning Board, and if there is no way of adjusting the proposal to allow the development to continue, it must be refused for the time being. In such cases, where the owner of the land suffers loss, he is either compensated or the land acquired from him because, in effect, it is needed for a public purpose. This, of course, has particular reference to the open spaces and where land is required for highways, roads, railway marshalling yards, harbour facilities and installations and so on.

It will be appreciated that quite a lot of this is long term and that a person owning property could be allowed to continue in residence, or continue to conduct his business, quite normally for 10 or 20 years, or perhaps longer, until such time as the

land was required for the ultimate purpose in accordance with the conception of the plan. It would be possible, too, that if it was felt that for a reasonable length of time, the land was not required for some purpose, as intended by the plan, that concern could be permitted to erect, say, a steel-framed asbestos building for the conduct of the business for, perhaps, the next 15 years, by which time, if the land were required for its ultimate purpose, the owner would be paid the necessary compensation. He would be paid for the land only because during that time he would have made provision for the writing off of the capital outlay, well knowing before he erected the factory the conditions that were confronting him. He could pack up his factory and erect it elsewhere.

Members will realise that a good deal of tolerance and understanding will be required, and I am certain that the appropriate officers of the Town Planning Board are fully aware of all the implications and the necessity to dislocate people and their plans to the least possible extent.

Mr. Court: There is provision here for authorised temporary use of land.

**The MINISTER FOR HOUSING:** That is so. I have already mentioned road and rail proposals in connection with which there can be some adjustments, although there would be some natural limitations. I have mentioned, too, that so far as open spaces are concerned there is quite a degree of latitude within which the boundaries of the proposed open spaces could be altered or adjusted.

In addition, there is the matter of the siting of what one might call special types of activities, in which respect my attention has been drawn to such projects as future racecourses, drive-in theatres and other large places of assembly, as well as special industries such as noxious or offensive ones. In respect of all of these that I have outlined, I think it could be said that ample provision should be made to see that there is no discomfiture of any sort caused to people who might be living in close proximity. Therefore, surely it is necessary to see that homes are not erected in close proximity to sites for activities of that type! Apart from the specific matters, such as the ones I mentioned, there are the general zoning proposals and the setting aside of areas for industrial, commercial and residential purposes.

Of course, that is not altogether new in the metropolitan area because a number of metropolitan local authorities already have zoning schemes in operation. In respect of these it is not intended, under this Bill, that any compensation should be paid where it is only a matter of zoning areas and that, of course, is

the same as applies at present. If the Perth City Council declares the area east of Lord-st. as an industrial area or, say, the area west of Lord-st., as a residential area, the people still have their land and are still able to dispose of it. Far from suffering any economic loss, it is possible that there would be an increment in their favour because of that particular restriction. In any event, zoning schemes prevent the intermingling of industrial and residential establishments and virtually having them side by side.

Mr. Court: In other words, there is no compensation for injurious affection.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: That is what it would amount to, although it might be very difficult to establish what was, in effect, injurious affection, other than an affection for a particular parcel of land in a particular spot.

Mr. Court: In many cases it would be advantageous, I agree. But there are many cases where it would be injurious to the existing occupiers.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: Yes, but I think that is one of the aspects that must be borne by all affected people in the natural order of events; indeed it is in Western Australia and I daresay the same applies to nearly every country in the world, particularly in more recent times. It is one of those situations which has to faced.

There is nothing in this Bill—and I repeat that it expires, if it becomes an Act, on the 31st December next year—which would interfere with the present use of a person's land or his property. It is, by and large, to prevent any further activity or any new development which could create problems and make it more difficult to give effect to the plan. It is intended that existing town planning schemes and by-laws should continue to operate unless they severely prejudice the proposals under the plan, in which case they would be superseded during the term of the order issued under this legislation.

In that respect there are several cases where local authorities have agreed to variations as proposed in the metropolitan regional plan. My attention was drawn to the Melville road district, as a case in point, where a large area had been set aside for industrial purposes. After consultation, the local authorities have agreed that that area could be considerably reduced, although I understand they are taking no action in that direction themselves, but will raise no objection to its being done through the machinery proposed in this legislation. Generally speaking, what is sought in the Bill should be capable of working smoothly and simply.

At present, before anyone can undertake a building activity, it is necessary to approach a local authority for a building

permit. As it is intended in these general matters to delegate the powers to the local authorities, it would be a reasonably simple matter for them to refer to a detailed plan to see whether a residence or a factory should be built on that particular block of land. Accordingly, there should be no delay whatever. Originally I think it was intended, in the first draft of the legislation, that there was to be a set-up which would cause a certain amount of confusion as between the local authorities and the Town Planning Board and, in the final analysis, some difficulty in sheeting home the blame, if I can put it that way, if a person felt aggrieved at the decision that had been made. But it is intended that that should be definitely established and made distinct so that a person who felt that he had a grievance would know with whom he was dealing and, accordingly, he could lodge an appeal with the responsible Minister—that is, the Minister controlling town planning.

Whilst it might appear that there will be a great deal of interference, or there are possibilities of it, I think it will be found that the overwhelming number of cases will be dealt with and accepted more or less automatically. I daresay that with most of the local authorities, when an application is made to erect a home, business premises or a factory, certain preliminary inquiries are made by the owner of the property and the builder. The person primarily concerned lodges his plans and they are automatically approved, because he knows what goes on in the district. For instance, if I had any intention of commencing a blood and bone factory in Nedlands, I would think twice about it because that would be the last place for a factory of that type.

Hon. D. Brand: You would probably have a protest meeting.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: There might be the possibility of that, too. So it will be seen that in a great many instances concerning individuals there will be no occasion whatsoever for the matters to be referred to the Town Planning Board, but they will be dealt with automatically by the local authorities, the people to whom they have been making reference for many years.

The procedure under this proposed legislation will be for the interim development order to be published in the "Government Gazette". It will also be published in the Press. In addition, there will be copies of the order in the office of the Town Planning Board, and there will also be copies in the offices of the local authorities affected by the order. Accordingly, this should be readily available to the public generally. In addition, there is a provision that the order shall be laid on the Tables of both Houses of Parliament with the usual proviso that either House can disallow, if it feels so disposed.

I realise that in this case there could be some objection perhaps that the order might be a particularly offensive one and yet it would apply for six to eight months before it could be disallowed. But in view of the assurances that have been given, and the sympathetic understanding of members on both sides of the House because of their association with the advisory committee, they need have no real fears in that connection. I emphasise it is intended to make this as elastic as possible, and it is sought merely to prevent some extreme measure, particularly in regard to building activity, which might interfere seriously with the proposals of the plan.

Mr. Court: How precise can the orders be at this stage? I have in mind, for instance, a road or projected railway?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: Already the Main Roads Department and the Town Planning Board have had officers siting or locating roads. No doubt they would be subject to a final survey by licensed surveyors. Accordingly, a fair bit is known. But if there were a certain building operation proposed in a particular locality, investigations would be made as to whether it would be astride a highway, whether that was the only practicable route, or whether the person could be allowed to proceed; and that by a slight deviation there would be no interference with it as a useful and serviceable road.

Mr. Court: They are that far advanced, are they?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: Preliminary surveys have been carried out or are being carried out or, on the other hand, when a particular application is reached that appears to be along the route or the railway, then on-the-spot examinations can be made to see whether the application is to be refused or whether some adjustment can be made to enable that person to proceed.

Where applications are made either to the local authority or the Town Planning Board, depending on the matter under consideration, and the application is rejected, then the applicant has the right of appeal to the Minister, or to a person appointed by the Minister, to determine any dispute. An aggrieved person has 30 days in which to lodge his appeal; that is 30 days after the issue of the decision rejecting his application. If the local authority or the Town Planning Board is using delaying tactics, perhaps to the extreme disadvantage of the applicant, and there is no decision given within 60 days, then that 60 days of no decision is to be construed as a refusal which will give the applicant the right of appeal to the Minister.

In a case where, in accordance with the order, it has been determined that a certain developmental work shall not proceed and there is an act of defiance—that is

to say, a breach of the order—there is then provision for a penalty of up to £50. It is realised immediately that in many instances the penalty would not necessarily be a deterrent. At the same time, however, it is not sought to make this, in any way, vicious legislation. The whole purpose and intent of the Bill is on the basis of compromise and co-operation as far as possible, but at the same time, so as not to render impracticable or unworkable the major conceptions of the plan.

There is provision, too, that the Town Planning Board can take action to stop work that is being done contrary to the order. It is provided that public authorities are required to conform to the terms of the order; the public authorities would, of course, be Government departments as well as others. Assuming there is a point of difference between the Town Planning Board and one of my own departments in the Housing Commission, and if it were found impossible to arrive at an agreement after discussion and negotiation, then the matter would be resolved by the Governor-in-Council. In other words, it would be resolved by the Governor impartially reviewing the whole situation. There is also provision that local authorities are to be consulted where there is a proposed development in their districts by Government departments or by public authorities.

Mr. Court: It is purely consultation. There is no power for the local authority to take steps to prevent it.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: That is so. But I do not think we can have too many authorities with power in this matter. When all is said and done, there must be a final arbiter. The Town Planning Board is the responsible department and that does not mean there is any intention for it to ride rough-shod over anybody. Then, again, there is the appeal to the Minister. In connection with that it might be suggested that there should be, shall we say, an impartial person to whom an appeal could be made. The term used in debate last night was appealing from Caesar unto Caesar. That is to say, the Minister is in charge of the Town Planning Board, which makes the decision, and the aggrieved person then lodges an appeal to the Minister, who is the same person as the one in charge of the department.

Mr. McCulloch: It becomes hopeless.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I do not think so. Speaking of the present Minister in charge of town planning, I am sure everybody will agree that he has been anything but a rubber-stamp in the matter of town planning and local authorities.

In any event, it is a question of town planning. First of all, there is the necessity of giving effect to certain specific

proposals; secondly, there is the exploration of the possibility of there being some alternative to them. It could only be the town planning people who have all the necessary data—the plans and other particulars—in order to determine it. Whilst it could happen that an over-zealous Government official might be too rigid in the matter, I am certain that any Minister would be anxious to do the least damage to any applicant and would review the whole situation and satisfy himself completely before agreeing to uphold the viewpoint of the Town Planning Board.

I repeat that this is for a period of 12 months only; a period when it is designed to halt as far as possible any developments which might seriously interfere with the implementation of the plan. I did not see the Bill until very late yesterday evening, and I did not have an opportunity of investigating it until late today. But if there are any disagreements—although I do not expect too many for the reasons previously given, namely, the appreciation of the situation and the understanding arising from consultations on an all-party basis—then they can be ironed out in Committee. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. D. Brand, debate adjourned.

#### ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1955-56.

##### *In Committee of Supply.*

Debate resumed from the 15th November on the Treasurer's Financial Statement and on the Annual Estimates, Mr. J. Hegney in the Chair.

*Vote—Legislative Council, £7,453:*

**MR. BOVELL** (Vasse) [9.39]: For many years past rabbits have caused inroads and great losses to the primary production of Western Australia. The menace has grown considerably, although various means of control and eradication have been tried, among them being myxomatosis. But these pests seem to continue to thrive to the disadvantage of the primary producer and the ultimate overall production of the State.

Recently, an effective poison known as 1080 has been introduced into this State, and its use is rigidly controlled by the Department of Agriculture under the direction, I believe, of the Commissioner of Public Health. At the request of the Busselton Road Board, whose members include a number of practical and experienced farmers, I have made representations to the Minister for Health and the Minister for Agriculture to permit a more liberal and less controlled use of poison 1080 than exists at present. I can quite appreciate the cautious approach of both Ministers to the use of this effective poison for dealing with the rabbit menace. The replies to my representations have been reasonable, but I consider that the system

adopted by the Department of Agriculture is not expanding to deal with the situation as rapidly as it might.

It should be of interest if I quote something of the procedure that has been adopted with considerable success in South Australia. In the agricultural section of the "Adelaide Chronicle" of the 30th June, 1955, appeared an article headed, "Man Behind The Plan".

The article was as follows:—

One man's brainwave may spell death to the rabbit in South Australia.

He is Mr. W. Stephen Smith who was recently appointed Chief Inspector of Stock at the Department of Agriculture.

Earlier this year, articles on "1080" in "The Chronicle" and "The Advertiser" began a flood of enquires for the poison here. The department acted swiftly.

All available evidence on the poison was collected, sorted and analysed. Mr. Smith was sent on a special assignment to Western Australia to make enquiries into the success that was being achieved there. Western Australia was selected for its similarity of climate and type of country.

Mr. Smith saw the Western Australian system in action. He watched men from the Agricultural Protection Board lay trails. He found that special vehicles and personnel had to be provided for laying the bait. The landholder drew the furrow where they recommended and laid the free feed under their guidance.

"Too cumbersome" he decided.

"To be effective in South Australia it would take from 100 to 1,000 men and vehicles to run the scheme. If it was impossible to let landowners have the raw bait, then sell it to them ready prepared," he worked out.

Apples, thistles, bran—the alternatives were considered.

He picked on oats because—

They ruled out the possibility of deliberate poisoning. An adult would need to eat 1½ lb., and this couldn't be done.

They were readily available.

They were taken by rabbits at all seasons of the year.

They needed no cutting up and were easily handled.

He returned to Adelaide and outlined his plan. The Department of Health co-operated; Cabinet approved.

Thanks to one man's brainwave, an army of inspectors and contractors was avoided. The landholder in this

State will be able to solve his own problem, with no harm to any creature but the rabbits.

I suggest that the Ministers concerned should give very serious consideration to adopting the South Australian system in the matter of the distribution of poison 1080 for the destruction of rabbits here. As previously stated, I have made representations to both Ministers, and I am hoping that they will show confidence in the primary producers by releasing to them for their use a bait that I believe will be the means of eradicating the rabbit pest here.

There are a number of matters affecting the Vasse electorate that I wish to bring before the notice of the Government. Firstly, I desire to refer to the schools in the district. At the Busselton Junior High School, over 800 pupils are receiving instruction. Of this number, more than 130 are post-primary students, and a move has been in evidence for some time to have a high school built in Busselton. I have asked questions on a number of occasions regarding the Government's intentions about the selection of a site and the erection of a new high school. The Minister has replied that negotiations were in train for the purchase of a suitable site that the department had selected. The first intention was to build the school during 1956. I wish to impress upon the Government the need for commencing this project immediately. As I have said, there are 130 post-primary students at the junior high school alone, and it is vital that a commencement be made without further delay with the building of a high school.

I understand that a similar move has been made at Merredin, and that Manjimup, one of the principal towns in the electorate of Warren represented by the Minister for Lands, also needs a separate high school, but I wish to impress upon the Government the urgent need for a high school for post-primary students at Busselton on account of the overcrowding at the junior high school.

For some time past the Capel school has been overcrowded, and the departmental advices in the last 12 months have been that the provision of a new schoolroom has been approved and is an urgent priority. Before the end of last financial year, I was informed, from official quarters, that this new classroom would be commenced before the end of the financial year. Then I was told that funds had been exhausted and that the building of this classroom would be made a first and urgent priority for the new financial year, but nearly half of that period has elapsed without any move being made to provide it. Children are attending classes in the local hall, which is most unsatisfactory. They have been housed in this temporary accommodation far too long.

I have also made representations to the department concerning renovations to the Boyanup school, which I consider has been thoroughly neglected. This school is situated on the main highway to Bridgetown and the lower South-West; there are over 100 children in attendance and the building is in a dilapidated condition. In winter, and especially in the winter just past, the school ground has been completely flooded and it was impossible for the staff and the children to avail themselves of the use even of the toilet conveniences, through their being surrounded by water for a considerable time. I do not know how that impasse was overcome, but it caused considerable inconvenience and embarrassment to the students. The effect of flooding at the school ground has been in evidence for many years?

Mr. McCulloch: Is Boyanup in your electorate?

Mr. BOVELL: It has been for six years, and will be until the next elections, but under the redistribution, it will be incorporated in the Harvey electorate.

The new junior high school at Margaret River is a credit to all concerned. It was officially opened recently, but the accommodation is insufficient and the old school buildings have to be used. At those buildings, the old pan system is in use and it is quite unhygienic. Representations have been made to the authorities for the installation of a septic system at the old school to provide hygienic conditions for the children attending there.

At the Margaret River Junior High School there is no accommodation for domestic science and manual training, and the children in post-primary classes have to journey to Busselton to receive this instruction. A suggestion has been made that some of the disused school buildings should be transported to Margaret River and re-erected there, but I say to the Minister that the dismantling and re-erecting of these old buildings, in my opinion, would cost more than a new centre for manual training and domestic science in architectural design similar to the school recently completed. I ask the Minister for Education to give consideration to the representations I have been making over the past few years.

The State Electricity Commission has continued to expand its South-West scheme but primary producers are concerned as to its future activities. When the scheme was in the embryo stage, it was announced that current would be made available to primary producers but so far that service has been very limited. I ask the Minister for Works to do everything he can to accelerate that expansion and publish details of proposed future developments in that regard so that farmers and other primary producers may have some

advance notification of what the commission intends, in order that they may adjust their arrangements accordingly.

Although the commission may be aware of which it intends to do, it has not so far advised the primary producers, and such notification would be of great assistance to them. If it could be advertised that certain work was to be undertaken in the period, say, from the 1st January, 1956, to the 31st December, 1956, that would be of great assistance to those concerned. If it were known that all farms within a certain radius of Boyanup, Bridgetown, Busselton, etc., for instance, were to be supplied with current, the farmers concerned could plan accordingly.

It is often necessary for a dairy farmer to renew his batteries at a cost, perhaps, of £300 or £400 and if he knew that about six months later electricity would be made available to him he would not undertake that expenditure on new batteries which, if current were made available, would be more or less wasted. I made some representations, by way of questions, to the Minister for Railways in regard to the providing of ashtrays in railways buses, and he advised that they were standard equipment.

When returning to the South-West by railway bus that week-end I noted that the bus to Flinders Bay and that to Margaret River, which were of a newer type, had ashtrays fitted, but three other buses running through the Blackwood and Warren electorates, being of an older type, did not have them.

The Minister for Railways: Let me know the numbers of those buses and they will be so equipped.

Mr. BOVELL: I have mislaid the numbers but will endeavour to obtain them and supply the information to the Minister. I realise, as he does, that when the lush pastures now growing in the South-West dry off, there will be a danger—if no ashtrays are supplied in the railway buses—of people being tempted to throw cigarette butts or matches out of the open windows, thus causing bush fires—a risk that we must minimise as far as possible. For some time there has been a suggestion that the railway line from Margaret River to Flinders Bay be closed down but I think that would be an inadvisable move and I record an emphatic protest against any such action being taken. The Minister was very patient and reasonable and gave me an undertaking—when I went overseas last year—that he would do nothing in that regard before my return to Western Australia.

At this point, I thank him for his co-operative attitude and for having kept that promise. I hope that he will continue to see the need to keep that line operating. It may not pay at present, but the population in the extreme south-western corner

of the State is increasing so much that in the recent redistribution of electoral boundaries the borders of the Vasse electorate had to be drawn in somewhat owing to the greater number of people living in that district. In view of the prospects of that portion of the State, I think it would be inadvisable at this time to end the traffic on the Margaret River-Flinders Bay line.

The Minister for Railways: There has been no suggestion to close the line to Margaret River. The suggestion referred to the section from Karridale to Flinders Bay.

Mr. BOVELL: Even south of Witchcliffe, at Karridale and at Augusta, which is the centre of the great holiday resort, the population is increasing rapidly. The section of the line to which I have referred was taken over from Millars' Timber & Trading Company—it was an old mill line—and needs a great deal of money spent on it. But I think the expenditure would be worth while in view of the progress being made in that part of the district.

The Minister for Railways: About 11 miles of it is in very bad order.

Mr. BOVELL: I will now deal with the port of Busselton. For some considerable time we have been endeavouring to have all the products of the hinterland of Busselton—consisting mainly of timber and potatoes—exported through that port. There are some hundred families there partly dependent on the income they receive from the wharves, and if all the products of the immediate hinterland were shipped through that port, there would be sufficient work to provide those men and their families with the basic wage, whereas at present their earnings amount to only half the basic wage.

Representations have been made to the Minister for Supply and Shipping and to the Minister for Railways by the executive officers and members of the Waterside Workers' Federation, Busselton Branch, and I would like the Government to do everything possible to develop the port of Busselton and maintain the jetty there in such a state as to enable the produce of the district to be shipped through the port. Only last week a meeting was called by the Busselton Road Board, at which representatives of the waterside workers, the Farmers' Union, the Country Women's Association, and the Chamber of Commerce attended. A committee was formed to try to improve the development of the port of Busselton. We ask only for our rightful dues—that the timber, potatoes and other produce of the Busselton district be shipped through that port, thus giving the 100 families I have mentioned the income which is their right.

Mr. Lawrence: Is it an A class or B class port?

Mr. BOVELL: It is a B class port. I wish now to deal with the matter of housing, particularly in the Busselton township. At the conclusion of the 1939-1945 war the housing shortage was acute throughout the State and the then Busselton municipality, of which Mr. B. K. Killerby was mayor, produced its own housing scheme and purchased some disused buildings from the Busselton aerodrome—buildings that had been erected there for war purposes. On the initiative of the then Busselton Municipal Council, those buildings were purchased and the housing scheme was put in hand. After some initial troubles it proved to be a great success, thus relieving the Housing Commission of certain obligations. I have a number of housing problems at present and have submitted them to the Minister and to the State Housing Commission. Never before in my parliamentary experience have I had more such problems than I have today and they extend over the Busselton, Margaret River and Capel districts.

Mr. Lawrence: I thought you were a single man!

The Minister for Housing: You know perfectly well there has been only one application for housing lodged from Capel in the history of the State Housing Commission, and that application was lodged in the last few weeks. That does not indicate any problem there.

Mr. BOVELL: All the more reason why the Minister should give consideration to a community that has made no demand on the commission previously. They have not previously made any demand on the Housing Commission.

The Minister for Lands: How does the Minister know what they want if they do not ask for it?

Mr. BOVELL: But they have asked for it.

The Minister for Housing: About a fortnight ago.

Mr. BOVELL: I do not want to arouse the Minister's ire this evening. We heard his eloquence last night and I do not wish to remain here until 2 a.m. listening to it again, otherwise he might be charged by the member for Subiaco with keeping her here all night tonight. I am now confronted by a number of housing problems and I am surprised that they should occur at this particular period. Let us go back three years. When the Supply Bill was being debated in August, 1953, whilst speaking I asked the House for indulgence to incorporate in "Hansard" the policy speech of the Premier, and I did so for a purpose.

The Minister for Works: It was well worth preserving.

Mr. BOVELL: I quite agree. Members of this Parliament sometimes forget the promises and the statements made on

the hustings, but I believe that this is the first time on record—and I was mildly criticised in some of the Press columns for wasting the time of the House—that such promises were recorded in "Hansard." However, I believe that if a Government is returned to office its policy and its promises to the people should be incorporated in "Hansard" so that Parliament can make sure that the Government honours such promises. I am not going to quote the whole of that speech and weary the Committee with its repetition. No doubt there are some other members of this Chamber who can, for themselves, pick out something that the Government has promised but has not accomplished.

Mr. Brady: That would be very hard to do.

Mr. BOVELL: I have just said, and I repeat, that I have never had so many housing problems to deal with during my nine years' parliamentary representation. The following is a newspaper report of what the Premier said on the 11th August, 1953:—

Labour pledges itself to overcome the housing shortage completely in the next three years, Mr. Hawke declared.

The Minister for Works: Even "The West Australian" admits that that has been carried out.

Mr. BOVELL: I am merely telling the Minister that in my own experience in an electorate that comprises, in area, only one-fiftieth of the State, I have never had so many housing problems as I have at present.

The Minister for Housing: And you have never had so many built at Busselton either.

Mr. BOVELL: That shows the progress the district is making, which is to the advantage not only of the district but also to the State of Western Australia generally. However, that is not the subject of discussion. The subject of discussion is that the Premier on the hustings almost three years ago promised that if his Government was returned to power—which it was, and it has just concluded its three years of office—it would completely solve the housing problem. However, the Government has not fulfilled that promise.

The Minister for Housing: Get out! You know it has been!

Mr. Lawrence: Does the word "completely" appear in "Hansard"?

Mr. BOVELL: Yes. I have heard the Minister himself say in this Chamber that there are many thousands of applicants for houses still not satisfied.

The Minister for Housing: That will always be so.

Mr. BOVELL: Well, how has the Minister solved the housing problem? He has established the Subiaco slum flats.

The Minister for Housing: You can do better than that.

Mr. Lawrence: After that, you are an arrogant Liberal!

The Minister for Lands: You were doing better than that when you spoke about rabbits a few moments ago.

Mr. BOVELL: I am now speaking about rabbit warrens, which is what the Subiaco flats are going to be.

MR. MOIR (Boulder) [10.51]: There are one or two matters I want to mention which affect Boulder and Kalgoorlie. Members of this Chamber may recall that some years ago provision was made for the establishment of a green belt around those two townships. This was done in order to abate the dust nuisance to which these centres had been subjected for many years. The movement started prior to 1940. The Committee will also be aware that for many years a sum of £3,000 appeared on the Estimates which had been set aside by the Government of the day for use in those districts to implement the proposal I have mentioned.

The three local governing bodies established a committee to go into the ways and means of preserving a green belt around those towns. Various suggestions were put forward, a scheme was commenced, but it was never completed, and that amount of £3,000 set aside from year to year by various Governments was never drawn upon. As a result of a policy carried out by the Forests Department on the Goldfields for many years, an area for a considerable distance around Kalgoorlie and Boulder has been rejuvenated by the encouragement of timber growth which was followed by the growth of shrubs and natural grasses which has had the effect of binding the soil and considerably mitigating the dust nuisance.

In addition, over the years, quite a large programme has been carried out in bituminising the streets in those two towns so that today there are very few gravel roads or streets in their vicinity. Further, the people themselves and the local governing authorities have implemented a programme of tree planting and have established lawns and gardens with the result that the appearance of Kalgoorlie and Boulder has been transformed compared with what it was 15 years ago. The dust nuisance is practically non-existent there today.

Nevertheless it is alarming to discover that the efforts of the Forests Department in endeavouring to preserve the timber in that vicinity are being nullified by the Lands Department which is granting pastoral leases within this 12-mile green belt area. Earlier this year, when the Minister for Forests and the Conservator of Forests were on a tour of inspection, I was given the opportunity of accompanying the local forestry officer who drew the

Minister's attention to the devastation that was taking place on the pastoral leases that had been granted to various people by the Lands Department. It was apparent that the stock had destroyed firstly the natural grasses and then, in turn, the shrubs, and one could see a dust bowl developing very rapidly.

It seems a great waste of time for departmental officers—and I might say at this stage that they are very efficient officers—to zealously guard that area for many years during the course of their duty and prevent people from removing timber thus enabling the trees to develop more rapidly and permit shrubs and grasses to flourish, only to discover that another Government department has not worked in co-operation with the Forests Department by permitting people to lease parts of these areas so that they can run stock. There is no doubt it must be very disconcerting to the forestry officers.

We know that some people can think only in terms of £ s. d. and when they see good land offering, they consider that they can profit from it. One of the quickest ways to do that is to run sheep on the area. However, if this policy is allowed to continue it will not be long before the good work that has been done during the last 10 or 15 years will be completely wasted and we will have the townships of Kalgoorlie and Boulder enveloped in dust as they were in years gone by. To allow such practices to continue is not reasonable or sensible.

Following upon my remarks tonight, I hope that the departments concerned will take another look at the district and will not only refuse to grant pastoral leases in the future in that area, but will also withdraw those that have already been granted. Another matter which affects quite a few people on the Goldfields is the attitude that has been adopted by the pastoralists in the surrounding areas towards sportsmen who wish to indulge in the sport of shooting when the game season is open. Numerous ducks abound on the many lakes and lagoons in the Goldfields areas.

For some time these pastoralists have objected to people entering their properties and shooting over these natural waters. It is a moot point whether they have the legal right to do that. Nevertheless, it has not prevented the pastoralists from publishing a notice in the local Press warning the sportsmen that anyone found shooting on their properties will be prosecuted for trespassing. Some time ago the sportsmen on the Goldfields formed a shotgun club and I believe it now has a membership of some 200 strong. This indicates the popularity of the sport on the Goldfields. These sportsmen, at weekends, travel as far as 150 miles distant to various spots where the lakes are situated, and at certain times of the year numerous game abound on these lakes.

In view of the fact that there are so few sporting facilities on the Goldfields, I am of the opinion that this is a sport that should not be discouraged. Today people who own firearms and have indulged in the sport of shooting since boyhood days are not permitted to go out and shoot ducks. I would like the legal position to be clarified, to find out whether pastoralists have the right to warn people off their leases on which are located bodies of water. I cannot imagine that the pastoralists have been granted an absolute right over the leases. There are roads leading to most of these lakes, so people do not have to travel over private property to get to them. They indulge in shooting when they have travelled over those roads and reached the lakes.

Mr. Naider: The pastoralists must have had reason to take action previously.

Mr. MOIR: The member for Katanning has anticipated what I am about to say. Cases of vandalism on the leases have occurred in the past, the same as cases of vandalism have occurred in other parts of the State. I hold no brief for the people who go out with shotguns or rifles and do damage on private property.

Hon. C. F. J. North drew attention to the state of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a quorum present and the hon. member may proceed.

Mr. MOIR: Members of the Shotgun Association have made an offer to the pastoralists. They have met several times in conference in an endeavour to resolve the difficulties. Members of the Shotgun Association are prepared to police the sport to prevent vandalism. Nothing could be fairer. We cannot accept the position that where a few people misbehave, the rest of the law-abiding citizens are to be penalised. The Government has power to set aside reserves of natural waters for various reasons, one being for the enjoyment of people generally.

In other parts of the State duck shooting is carried on over stretches of water. I have not heard of sportsmen being prevented from shooting on natural waters when the game season is open. It certainly cannot be tolerated on the Goldfields that sportsmen are to be prevented from engaging in an activity that is carried on in other parts of the State. We have fauna reserves set aside in which game is protected. In the main such reserves are recognised by the people and are seldom interfered with. In any case, game wardens are appointed all over the State to look after the reserves. It would appear that the whole of the Goldfields area is to be set aside as a game reserve. The public is to be excluded from shooting on the reserves, but the pastoralists and their friends will be permitted to shoot in this sanctuary.

The Minister for Lands: One would still have to get the permission of the owner or the lessee before one could enter the property. That seems to be the law.

Mr. MOIR: I have already said that public roads run through these leases. There are access roads to every large body of water on the Goldfields and in some cases the roads run for miles along the shores. The question of trespass does not arise when people travel over the roads to get to the lakes. The pastoralists claim that trespass is committed when people discharge firearms over bodies of water. They claim the exclusive right over those waters. I do not agree with them. The pastoralists have been the cause of great concern to the sportsmen on the Goldfields.

The Minister for Lands: There is much duck shooting going on round my way. The sportsmen have always been able to obtain the permission from the owners of land, but they still have to get that permission.

Mr. MOIR: If a pastoralist has a lease of 250,000 acres with a lake in the middle of it, it is only natural that permission must be obtained to travel over the land. But when there are miles of roads running along the shore, running up to the lakes or across them, there can be no question of trespass.

Mr. Lawrence: How would you compare that position with Lake Jandakot?

Mr. MOIR: I am not conversant with the position of Lake Jandakot. Another matter which gives me concern is that the pastoralists have erected fences across some of the public roads without having obtained authority for so doing. Those roads have been used for upwards of 50 years by people who go out prospecting. Under the Mining Act a prospector is given the right to travel over pastoral leases. However, today he finds that fences have been erected across some of the tracks leading to prospecting areas. In some cases a prospector has to go many miles out of his way before he can get to the prospecting area. Sometimes he has to travel 50 miles further to do so. The construction of a fence across a track is illegal, but evidently the pastoralists on the Goldfields are a law unto themselves. They break the law in some cases to suit themselves and in doing so they prevent people from having a right-of-way over the leases.

Mr. Court: Are they breaking the law or are they doing something to which they are entitled?

Mr. MOIR: They are breaking the law because they are not supposed to put up fences across the roads.

The Minister for Lands: Has anybody ever reported them?

Mr. MOIR: The Prospectors' Association has taken the matter up. Not long ago, in company with other Goldfields members, I attended a meeting of prospectors. This was one of the complaints raised, and the secretary was instructed to take the matter up. I do not know if he has done so.

The Minister for Lands: The point is whether the pastoralists are allowed to erect the fences.

Mr. MOIR: Evidently they are so doing. Of course, they are permitted to fence off paddocks on their leases, but they should provide gates where tracks exist. Some time ago a prospector mentioned this matter to me and wanted to know what the legal position was. These matters cause some concern to the people on the Goldfields. The Minister for Lands has undertaken to investigate the matter if I provide him with the names and the locations of the pastoral leases and to go into the question of the rights over the waters I have mentioned. I have obtained a list of the leases from the Lands Department and it will be submitted to the Minister in a day or two.

I would like to touch on a few other matters affecting the Goldfields. The people there are very grateful to the Government for the steps that have been taken to bring adequate supplies to the Goldfields. For many years there were water restrictions, and I do not blame the previous Government for these because I know the difficulties which confronted it. I know that the previous Government did quite a lot to provide adequate water supplies for the Goldfields and it constructed a reserve dam in Kalgoorlie. The present Government has also built a large reserve dam.

Hon. D. Brand: Of the same size.

Mr. MOIR: Yes, about the same size. The pipeline and the pumping facilities have been improved considerably. I was agreeably surprised to learn last week that 5,750,000 gallons of water are being delivered to Kalgoorlie per day. This is 750,000 gallons more than the pipeline was designed to deliver originally. The demand for water has increased so considerably over the years and is still increasing that the problem has not yet been overcome entirely. Last year we were fortunate enough to go through the summer without water restrictions; that was the first time it had happened for many years.

This year we have a good chance of going through the summer also without water restrictions. With the increasing demand for water further improvements will have to be made for the conveyance of supplies to the district. When the volume of water to the Goldfields was increased the people became garden-minded. Today more domestic water is used on the Goldfields than ever before. The mining companies, with the increased tonnage of ore

treated, are using more water. One particular company wants to expand still further and it desires to use more water from the Goldfields Water Supply, but it is not available at present.

I would also mention that we have still the spectacle of goldmining leases being tied up and exempt from the labour provisions. Some of them have been exempt for many years. Today there is not the justification that there was a few years ago. There is now no justification for the leases to remain tied up. There is one particular lease which could become a large mine if the owners were made to comply with the labour conditions under the Mining Act. They have been allowed to get away with the exemption for nearly nine years. The Mines Department should take a very long look at a proposition like that.

There are other leases in that area which have been tied up for some years by people who are purely speculators. They have absolutely no intention of spending a penny on the leases themselves but hold them as a speculation, hoping the day will come when there will be an increase in the price of gold, or when a large mining company may decide to extend its operations and become interested in the property they hold, with the result that they will be able to give an option to that company.

It is surprising how, when any mining company becomes interested in one of these properties the values sky-rocket. We have seen properties, lying derelict and held for years by speculators, suddenly have a value of £40,000 or £50,000 placed on them. If, after inspection, a mining company decides to go on with the project, it immediately has that large amount of money placed against the property as a first charge. That is entirely wrong.

If people take up these leases and do not comply with the conditions of the Mining Act, they should not be allowed to go to the warden's court time after time and obtain exemptions under the Mining Act. There is too much auriferous ground tied up in this State at present. If people are not prepared to work the properties themselves, they should not be allowed to retain them and hold to ransom people who desired to work them. I have drawn the attention of the House to this matter before but not very much notice has been taken of my remarks. It is beyond my understanding why the Mines Department does not take action.

Hon. D. Brand: Can you not convince the Minister for Mines?

Mr. MOIR: I do not know.

Hon. D. Brand: You ought to know.

Mr. MOIR: I know of a property south of Coolgardie that was looked at by the Western Mining Corporation five years ago. If the company had wished to work that land it would have had to pay somewhere

in the vicinity of £30,000 or £35,000 for it. The company made it known that the values in that property were not worth considering, and dropped its option. A couple of years afterwards, the people that held the ground just walked out and abandoned it, and the Western Mining Corporation went back on to the property and is now developing it as a mine—or is prepared to do so. This indicates that there were sufficient values to encourage the company to go on with the proposition.

But it was prevented earlier from doing so because of the high value placed on the land by the vendors, which has prevented the property from being developed for some years. The same would apply to a large number of mining properties on the Goldfields. There are people holding the leases for purely speculative purposes. They should not be allowed to do so and obtain exemptions under the mining law. They should be made either to work them or drop them so that they could be taken over by anyone wishing to develop them, without having large overheads on the property.

Vote put and passed.

This concluded the general debate.

Votes and items discussed as follows:—

*Votes—Legislative Assembly, £10,453; Joint House Committee, £21,659; Joint Printing Committee, £19,227; Joint Library Committee, £500; Premier's Department, £29,560—agreed to.*

*Vote—Treasury, £127,750:*

Item, Economics Research Officer, £1,238.

Hon. C. F. J. NORTH: The other night the Treasurer was good enough to refer to some remarks of mine in relation to imports and exports. I pointed out that I thought the economics research officer referred to in Item No. 1 would help the people of this State by explaining some of the figures concerning imports and exports. I said that our exports should be sufficient to cover the big intake from the Eastern States. In his reply, the Premier said that there had been heavy losses through imports exceeding exports. I felt that that situation could not continue without the country becoming bankrupt, unless some other factor was involved.

I analysed the figures over five years and found them very interesting indeed. The imports and exports for successive years were as follows:—

Year.	Imports. £	Exports. £
1949	69,000,000	61,000,000
1950	88,000,000	111,000,000
1951	122,000,000	97,000,000
1952	98,000,000	113,000,000
1953	125,000,000	91,000,000

The totals were: Imports, £502,000,000; and exports, £473,000,000. That shows that the Treasurer, so far as the five-year period is concerned, was perfectly correct in his general deduction. We brought into this State a great deal more than we exported, and that is not a healthy situation.

The question I raised the other evening was whether the economist could teach us something about all these figures, because one would consider that in the last two or three years we had been going ahead by leaps and bounds and buildings up enormous capital in new works like Kwinana, and it seems a false deduction that the total figures are against us.

I came to the conclusion that we must take into consideration the funds made available to us through the Grants Commission. In this way there must be taken into consideration amounts of £6,000,000 for 1949, £5,000,000 for 1950, £5,000,000 for 1951, £8,000,000 for 1952 and £7,000,000 for 1953. That makes a total of £31,000,000. So the whole thing balances out over the five-year period if we add the Commonwealth grants to the sum representing the export figures. That is interesting because it shows that the State is not only gaining in its capital assets; but that, with the grants money added, we are really holding a net balance.

Item, Betting Control Board, £110,000.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I want to obtain some information from the Treasurer regarding this item. The salary of the chairman is set down at £3,290 and the salaries of the vice chairman and members at £8,210, making a total of £11,500. In view of the greatly increased volume of betting—and, I should say, the likely increase—would the Treasurer be prepared to state at this stage whether he considers the Treasury is getting all the revenue from this source that it should, and does he propose to make any increase in the betting tax?

The TREASURER: The men licensed under the Betting Control Board's operations to conduct off-the-course betting have been operating for only a short time. Consequently, it is not yet possible to work out with any certainty whether consideration should be given decisively to obtaining more revenue for the Government, and perhaps for the racing clubs and trotting clubs, from that source.

It has to be remembered that those men were licensed on the distinct understanding and basis that the turnover tax would be at the rate of 1½ per cent. In effect, that was a condition of their registration. It would seem to me to be somewhat a breach of their condition of licensing if, after they had been operating for a few months—some probably for only two or three months—someone came along and

said that the rate of tax on the turnover was to be increased to 2 per cent. or 3 per cent., or some other figure.

This system is hardly yet established. I imagine that if the Betting Control Board were to be consulted, it would say that some additional licences would still be granted in various parts of the State. Some people get the impression, too, that because the turnover in betting shops reaches a certain figure, the people operating those shops are making that much money. I have no idea what individual bookmakers may be making or losing.

Hon. D. Brand: Not too many are losing.

The TREASURER: Perhaps throughout the year none would lose. But I should think there must be particular Saturdays or particular weeks when the punters would have a run of luck.

Hon. D. Brand: That would be a rare circumstance.

The TREASURER: I think it would not be so tremendously rare. On-course bookmakers now and then have a bad day and cannot, as a matter of fact, even with the surplus money they take to the course at the beginning of the day, finance their losses. It could, therefore, easily be that in some weeks—certainly not in the majority of weeks—the bookmakers in the shops would lose.

Mr. Court: I do not think the newspaper estimate of their profits is far out in practice.

The TREASURER: I am not in a position to say; I would not have a clue, really. I do not know how the newspapers have a clue either; I think the newspapers are just stabbing in the dark.

Mr. Court: I think they might have made some pretty close inquiries.

The TREASURER: I do not know, and I doubt whether the member for Nedlands would be in a position to know.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: The gossip is that they make 20 per cent.

The Minister for Railways: That is a wild guess.

The TREASURER: That is a guess or speculation. I rather imagine that the big off-course bookmakers might make a fair amount of money, but they, too, would have losing days. On the other hand, the smaller off-course bookmakers would not make a great deal of money throughout the year. As a matter of fact, many of the small bookmakers lay off a lot of the bets which they initially take. They cannot afford to carry all the risk which would be entailed if they did not lay off some of their wagers.

However, as I say, the system having been operating for only a few weeks is in its infancy, and at this stage I do not think anyone would be justified in altering the rate of tax or the volume of tax

upon the turnover of off-course bookmakers. It might well be that after the system had been operating for nine or 10 months, it could be assessed as well as would be possible; and if at that stage it were found by expert assessment that off-course bookmakers were making good profits, then the State, I think, would be entitled to take a greater share by way of taxation, and out of that greater share it would be entitled to pay racing and trotting clubs a bigger proportion than they now receive.

I think we all agree that the racing clubs and the trotting clubs provide the basis upon which off-course bookmakers operate. Therefore, those who organise the sport and carry it out are entitled to receive a fair share of any Government taxation imposed on the operations of off-course bookmakers.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Do you think the clubs are getting enough out of it, considering the volume of turnover?

The TREASURER: As I have said, no one is in a position to say whether the present rate of tax on the turnover of off-course bookmakers is reasonable. That can only be fairly checked and decided after the new system has been running for nine or ten months. The racing season, from the 1st August in one year to the 31st July in the next, varies considerably during the 12 months. I should think, without claiming to have very expert knowledge, that the spring and Christmas racing seasons are the big seasons of the 12 months, and that after the early new year meetings, the volume of betting would fall off because the great interest which is built up during the spring and Christmas seasons fades away considerably towards the end of January and during February and March.

It might revive around Easter, and then it dies away again through the winter months, and builds up again in the spring, especially at the time of the Caulfield and Melbourne cups. I think the answer to the question of the Leader of the Opposition, which is a pertinent query, is that this position cannot, at this early stage in the proceedings, be satisfactorily assessed with any degree of reliability. I think we have to give the system an additional few months of operation. By that time, the slack season can be weighed against the busy season and some reasonably reliable expert assessment made.

When the results of the assessment are analysed, those in charge of the Government at the time will be in a fairly good position to decide whether the present rate of tax on turnover should be increased and, if so, the extent to which it should be increased. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that any increase in turnover tax which might be levied should be imposed not only to give the State more

revenue from this source but also to provide additional revenue to the organisations which carry on the sports of horse-racing and trotting racing in this State.

Item, Betting Control Board—Incidentals, £750.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The expenditure last year was £1,832. Will the Treasurer tell me what these incidentals are?

The TREASURER: I think the answer to the question would lie in the fact that the Government purchased a motorcar for the use of the chairman of the board, and that item of expenditure would be a non-recurring one. The chairman, particularly, and the deputy chairman, had a great deal of travelling to do in the early stages. They went to all parts of the State to check up on applications for premises and for licences. There is still, and will continue to be, a fair amount of travelling to be done. A car was purchased for the use of the chairman and the deputy chairman, and that was the main item to cause the expenditure to be greater than it is likely to be in future.

Vote put and passed.

Votes — Governor's Establishment, £18,954; Executive Council, £5—agreed to.

Vote—London Agency, £24,986.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I was glad to see that some increase had been made in the salary of the Agent General, because I think it was necessary. On several occasions I have discussed privately with the Treasurer the question of the appointment or future appointments to the position of Agent General in London. I feel that the term of three years is too short. The usual practice has been to appoint a parliamentarian to this position. A number of former Premiers and Ministers, have gone Home as Agents General, and it has been the rule to appoint members of Parliament. I think the appointment of members has a good deal to recommend it because they are au fait with the requirements of the State and have a knowledge of what has been going on in State activities.

It does seem to me, however, that three years is too short a term to ask a person to go to London for. Despite the fact that the State pays some of the expenses, it is costly to get to London. Unless the Agent General had private means, I think it would be difficult for him to carry out his duties because he would find the financial strain too great. Particularly is that the case with this limited term. I suggest to the Treasurer that whichever Government may be in office next year should give consideration to extending the term of the Agent General.

Another matter that comes to mind is that when I, as Premier, was in London some years ago, the position at Savoy

House was discussed. Some proposal was put forward to widen the Strand—the street in which the Agent's General office is situated. If that work is put in hand, it will mean that portion of the present offices will be demolished and the State will have to look for new accommodation. I also understand—I do not know whether the Treasurer is au fait with this matter—that the lease of the premises has not long to run, although I do not know quite when it expires. If it expires within the next few years, steps should be taken to see whether suitable premises can be acquired, because it is difficult in London to obtain premises in a suitable location.

We have been extremely fortunate in regard to Savoy House. We received it on very favourable terms and, furthermore, we have been able to let some of the offices, which has helped us in regard to expenditure. If the Treasurer can give any information as to when the lease will run out and whether steps have been taken to obtain other suitable premises, I will be pleased.

The TREASURER: Speaking from memory, I think the lease has about another seven years to run. The Agent General, Mr. Dimmitt, has been carrying out some negotiations with the landlord, or the owners of the premises, with a view to trying to get an extension of the lease; not upon the same very favourable terms as exist at present but on terms as near to those as might be possible. I think if the State is finally forced into a position, or finds itself in the position of having to obtain other premises, the cost could be very heavy indeed compared with the rental which is now paid for Savoy House.

On the other point, regarding the term of appointment of Agent General, I think there is much merit in the point of view put forward by the Leader of the Opposition. I suppose it could be said that if a person appointed as Agent General for three years proves to be a success, he is certain to get a further term of appointment for three years.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: That is not always a certainty. It depends on circumstances.

The TREASURER: I was thinking back over the Agents General we have had in the past. Each one of them has proved himself to be successful and I do not remember one, during the last 20 years or so, who did not receive a further term of appointment after the first term had expired. One of the worries which Mr. Dimmitt had, soon after he went to London, following his appointment, was in regard to housing. He had a three-year term of appointment and he wanted to buy a house. He had an opportunity to buy one under reasonable terms, but because his term of appointment was for three

years only he felt he might finish up on the losing side if he bought the property which was offered to him at that time.

At that stage I was not able to give Mr. Dimmitt any firm undertaking that his term would be extended, but I did say to him that, judging on the experience of the last 15 to 20 years or more, he could take it more or less for granted that unless he did something radically off the beaten track and to the detriment of Western Australia, the Government would very likely give him another appointment for three years after the expiration of his first term.

However, as members know, the Government did recently decide to give Mr. Dimmitt a further term of three years. I think it would be wise, as the Leader of the Opposition suggested, for the Government next year to look carefully at this question and, speaking without absolute finality, I think I would be inclined to favour a term of five years. An argument against it is that if an Agent General, appointed for three years, does his job, he is practically certain to get another three years; the same sort of argument as we are now dealing with could be applied to members of Parliament. We often hear it said that a period of three years is too short for a Government.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: So it is.

The TREASURER: The argument I have always used in that situation is that a good Government is always assured of a further term of three years and a member of Parliament who does his job properly and looks after his district and his electors is sure to get re-elected for a further three years.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: There is no certainty about that.

The TREASURER: I know that circumstances sometimes develop in such a way as to test that rule to breaking point. However, be that as it may, at this stage I am inclined to agree that it might be wise to make the term of appointment for Agent General in the future five years instead of three.

Vote put and passed.

Votes—Public Service Commissioner, £13,840; Government Motor Car Service, £9,551—agreed to.

Vote—Audit, £63,500:

Mr. JOHNSON: I wish to draw attention to the Auditor General's report, which we have, and to the considerable change in the form of the trading accounts of Government trading concerns. They lie towards the back of the report and there is a change in the method of setting them out. I think it is a good deal easier to understand.

The CHAIRMAN: To what item is the hon. member referring?

Mr. JOHNSON: The Audit Department generally.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should have discussed that on the general debate. At the moment he should discuss items under particular headings.

Mr. JOHNSON: The item I wish to discuss is that covering salaries and allowances, under the heading of audit, paid to the Auditor General and his staff. I wish to draw attention to the work which they do and the report which they are required, under the Act, to place before us. I think it would be better if the report were in a more condensed form and placed in our hands at the same time as the Estimates. I believe it would be an advantage if the modernised method of producing accounts could be applied in greater detail. I would like to see all the points included in a single report so that they would be set out in a manner that would allow us to debate a little more intelligently than we are able to do at the moment. To follow these matters with accuracy during a debate it is necessary to use the Auditor General's report, page by page, along with the estimates of expenditure. I cannot see any reason why all the information should not be supplied on a single page.

A good deal of information is repeated, which seems to be unnecessary. The cost of printing two separate documents is fairly considerable, especially when I think that one would do; and I consider there could be a good deal of reorganisation in regard to the report. The wording of it is almost identical from year to year, apart from little changes which take place in the actual details of expenditure and so on. There is a terrific amount of detail which no member of Parliament reads and yet it really is his duty to do so. The volume of the report is such that it defeats its own purpose.

While discussing this Vote, I would like to suggest that some means be found of producing an Auditor General's report which will achieve its objective of reporting to Parliament in a manner which members can readily understand, and which will draw to the attention of this Chamber those errors and omissions which must take place no matter how good a Government may be. Under the Act the Auditor General is required to point out these things; yet the method of presentation of the report prevents his working effectively. I make those remarks in the hope that someone will do something about simplifying the whole business.

The TREASURER: I will discuss with the Auditor General the remarks which the hon. member has made.

Vote put and passed.

*Votes—Compassionate Allowances, etc., £2,632; Government Stores, £102,870; Taxation, £12,000; Superannuation Board, £13,255; Printing, £360,725—agreed to.*

*Vote—Miscellaneous Services, £2,158,878:*

Item, Basic Wage Increases, £450,000.

Mr. COURT: I was wondering if the Treasurer could give us some further information on this item. I did touch on it during the general debate on the Estimates because from time to time drastic changes take place in the wage level, not only from basic wage rises but also from marginal and certain other rises. It can be that the effect is so great that it throws out the whole of the estimate of deficit; it could be to the extent of £500,000 or more.

I have yet to see the Treasurer in regard to the private contact he suggested we might have. I would be prepared to grant him a little tolerance of £300,000 that he wanted and still feel that I would be on safe grounds. But it was in relation to items of this nature, and the public deficit to date, that I would like some information. Can the Treasurer give us some lead as to whether there is to be any excess of this item of £450,000 and/or marginal increases?

The TREASURER: This item is related exclusively to basic wage adjustments which would have relationship to cost-of-living adjustments which might be granted quarter by quarter by the Arbitration Court. If on a special inquiry into the basic wage itself, the court was to increase the basic wage as such quite apart from any cost of living adjustment, there would be no provision for a decision of that kind in this figure. We have seen the cost of living figures for the last quarter and if I remember rightly there is a slight reduction in the metropolitan area and a slight increase in the South-West Land Division and the Goldfields.

It would appear, therefore, that the cost of living in Western Australia is fairly stable at present. I have no doubt that the tightening up of the availability of money has increased competition with the result that profit margins have lessened, and this has helped to keep the cost of living down. Rents have become more or less stabilised and the cost of living has been kept fairly steady in relation to the rent factor. This figure might not be exceeded during the financial year but no one can be certain about that.

I am not able to estimate with any degree of certainty how the cost of living will move during the current quarter, during the January-March quarter, the April-June quarter or during the quarters of next year. All the Treasury experts can do in connection with this problem is to put in a figure which they think might reasonably meet the situation.

Mr. Yates: For the whole year?

The TREASURER: Yes. If the economic and other conditions work in the wrong direction, the total figure would not be enough for those conditions. But were the swing in the right direction, then the total figure could be in excess.

Mr. Yates: It would be hard to assess the figures.

The TREASURER: It would be impossible to assess it. However, on the basis of the cost of living during the last quarter, when there was little or no movement, this figure could prove a reasonably accurate estimate of the total amount required during the 12 months to meet increased expenditure due to increased payments because of the cost of living adjustments to the basic wage.

Item, Children's Protection Society of Western Australia, £100.

Hon. D. BRAND: I notice that in 1954-55 an amount of £5,100 was expended but this year the amount reverts to £100.

The TREASURER: The committee of this society—I think Sir Charles Latham is the chairman—waited on me as a deputation last financial year. They explained proposals for the construction of a new building at the corner of Beaufort-st. and Brisbane-st. The building at present occupied by the committee is leased by the City Council or the Railway Department. It is a poor sort of building and most inadequate.

The committee has been anxious to have a building of its own which would meet the needs of the society. It had a fair sum of money, which it had gathered from various sources, when it approached me, and the Government agreed to advance £5,000 towards the cost of a new building which is just about completed. It is a fine looking edifice and I understand from members of the committee that it will be suitable and adequate for the committee's needs. As a result, I should say that the work of this society will be better in the future. It has done very valuable work for the community in the past.

Item, Historical Society, £50.

Mr. COURT: This seems a very small amount and I wonder if we could have some information as to its object. The society could not do very much to promote interest in historical records, etc., with £50. The Treasurer will recall that I raised the question of the Dampier home, for instance. I suggest that the Government should not stand the entire cost of shifting this building because the people have an intimate interest in it and would no doubt help provide part of the necessary finance. The Historical Society would be intensely interested in the proposal.

The **TREASURER**: The payment made each year to the Historical Society is one without any strings attached and is used by the society on its own judgment. The amount is very small. If at any time the society has any project it wishes to take up, it would be at liberty to approach the Government and present its case for greater financial assistance. If the case was worth while, I feel sure the Government of the day would be sympathetically disposed towards it.

**Hon. SIR ROSS McLARTY**: I remember making an amount of £50 available to this society when I was at the Treasury. It is certainly a small sum but up to the time that it was made available, no grant was made at all. The Historical Society does valuable work and the historical records of the State should be maintained. Not only do they mark places of historical importance but they also produce a journal and generally try to preserve historical interest in the State. I would hope that the grant could be increased. The Treasurer has said that sympathetic consideration would be given if the society made a special plea for a particular purpose; and I hope the amount can be increased.

Item, Kindergarten Union, £23,500.

**Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT**: I am pleased that the grant to the Kindergarten Union has been increased. Not only do the members of that organisation help to educate pre-school children but they provide valuable assistance to mothers by relieving them of the responsibility of their children for a short time. I know the cost of education is tremendous. The Kindergarten Union is doing an excellent job and those associated with it are making as great an effort as any other section of the community. It is a pity that more cannot be granted. I do not think the teachers receive the basic wage and that would not be permitted in any industry. The teachers must have three years' training and a fair education. I admit most of them do the work as a vocation rather than an occupation, and if the Treasurer could squeeze out a few extra pounds to help them, it would receive my full support.

The **TREASURER**: The member for Mt. Lawley and other members may be interested to know the basis on which this grant is built up. The amount provided for student training is £6,400 to which is added a subsidy at the rate of £8 per child making a total of £9,100. To meet administrative costs an amount of £2,500 is provided. A living allowance of £4,500 is provided for trainees at the Kindergarten College and there is a special subsidy of £1,000 given to those kindergartens which have more than usual difficulty in meeting their expenditure. I imagine that those would be the kindergartens located in the poorer districts of the metropolitan area. A deputation from the Kindergarten

Union has arranged to wait on the Minister for Education to put up a case to him which the union hopes will justify the Government making some additional grant.

Item, Country Free Lending Library, £1,500:

**Mr. JOHNSON**: I would like to refer not only to Item 29 but also to Items 31 and 38. It appears to me that those items should come together as one. I wonder if the Treasurer could explain the difference between the three items. Are not they all covered by the Bill we had before us to amend the library Act?

The **TREASURER**: This scheme is to subsidise country local governing authorities on a £ for £ basis up to a maximum of £50 per annum, the money to be used for the purchase of books of a broadly educational value. The scheme has been administered by the Perth Public Library to which body the grant is paid. That procedure will doubtless be altered under the new set-up, and the Government will probably find it necessary to make a greater contribution to the library movement.

Item, Public Library, Museum and Art Gallery of Western Australia, £54,000.

**Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON**: What is going to happen to this sum as a whole now that new legislation has been passed regarding the library services. Will some of the money be taken and used for Library Board activities?

The **TREASURER**: There will have to be some adjustment. The whole position of the Public Library, Museum and Art Gallery is under review. I have had the papers on my table for quite a time and had hoped to finalise the matter before now, but the pressure of the political situation, especially at Parliament House, has considerably delayed a decision.

When Parliament goes into recess, which I hope will happen in the next few hours or days, this matter will receive my personal consideration, and I hope that within the next two weeks a final decision will be made. I express the hope that this will be of some reasonable, if not considerable advantage to the library movement and also to the Art Gallery. So far I have not been able to get very enthusiastic about the museum side.

**Mr. Ross Hutchinson**: I was asking about the possible reapportionment of the money.

The **TREASURER**: As I have said, there will have to be some readjustment, but I am not in a position at present to say what form it will take.

Item, Royal Mint, additional grant, £75,000:

**Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY**: An increase of £9,500 is shown for this year, but on the figures I think it ought to be £10,000. What does the increase mean?

The **TREASURER**: The estimated increase for the year is £9,500, which is mainly due to marginal increases in salaries and wages. Under the Royal Mint Act, the State finds £25,000 to meet the expenditure of the mint, and the excess expenditure above the £25,000 is provided under this item. Receipts, which are taken into revenue, are estimated this year at £90,000.

Item, Swimming Pool, assistance for, £15,000.

Mr. **YATES**: This is a new item on the Estimates. Is this amount for one or more swimming pools and where are they situated?

The **TREASURER**: I have three of these swimming pools in mind that have received some financial help. The pool at Merredin is just about completed and will be officially opened next month. Another is at Cunderdin and the third at Kelm-scott. I think some small assistance was also given to the Katanning pool.

Item, Electricity undertaking losses, Geraldton municipality, £6,000.

Hon. **D. BRAND**: This undertaking showed a heavy loss over a number of years and reached a stage where it was difficult to carry on. Last year the vote was £1,500. Can the Treasurer explain the financial position and how it comes about that £6,000 is estimated for this year?

The **TREASURER**: This is a contribution provided as a result of representations made by the member for Geraldton, towards the cost of conversion of the Geraldton electricity supply from direct to alternating current.

Item, Rent reductions, prefabricated houses, reimbursement to State Housing Commission, £23,234.

Mr. **WILD**: This item shows an increase of £3,645. Why is that?

The **TREASURER**: The item covers the reductions in rentals for certain prefabricated houses. The Government decided that there should be a reduction of 10s. a week in the rentals being charged for Australian pre-cut houses and 5s. a week on the Sims-Cooke houses. The rentals on these pre-cut houses were considered to be beyond what was reasonable for those types, and the Government made the reductions in the rentals. I think members would consider that those rentals are still fairly high.

Item, Purchase of land for police stations, £300.

Hon. **Sir ROSS McLARTY**: A number of members are interested in the provision of police stations in their districts, but

the amount provided does not give very much hope of additional stations. What is intended by this small amount?

The **TREASURER**: The land to be purchased under this item is not necessarily a true measure of the number of new police station buildings that might be constructed during the financial year. The land for the buildings to be erected this year, I think, would have been bought last year or the year before, and the land to be purchased this year would most likely not be built upon until next financial year. I believe that the Police Department buys land 12 months or so in advance.

Item, Zoological Gardens Board, £21,000.

Hon. **A. V. R. ABBOTT**: For the Kindergarten Union, £23,500 was provided, and yet the Treasurer is able to find such a large sum as £21,000 for the Zoo.

Mr. **McCulloch**: Too much.

Hon. **A. V. R. ABBOTT**: It is too much. If the Treasurer occupies that position next year, I should like him to give serious consideration to this item, because we are not justified in having kindergarten teachers who look after the kiddies receiving less than the basic wage. Many of the women who send their children to the kindergartens cannot afford the small fees, and others pay them with an effort. Yet the Treasurer can provide £21,000 to feed the lions!

The **TREASURER**: Without knowing for sure, I think the hon. member's views and mine in regard to the zoo might coincide. The zoo is there, and I did not establish it. When a Minister of the Crown, the member for Mt. Lawley helped to keep the zoo going, and that is what this Government has done. Many people look on the zoo as a necessary and desirable activity and derive a great deal of entertainment from it. I never go there from choice and, if I do go, I remain no longer than is necessary. I agree that the kindergartens would have a prior claim on my sympathy and support as against the Zoological Gardens Board.

I understand, from the zoo authorities, that tens of thousands of children go there during the year and get a great deal of entertainment and joy from their visits and, as the member for Cottesloe suggested, they get some good education from it.

Hon. **A. V. R. ABBOTT**: And some that might not be so good for children.

The **TREASURER**: Oh, well.

Hon. **A. F. WATTS**: Do not be so fussy!

The **TREASURER**: The member for Mt. Lawley reminds me of the story of the spinster who went to the zoo a few weeks ago.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Is this relevant to the vote?

The TREASURER: Yes, as part of the vote is to be used for the purpose of looking after the two bears, male and female. This elderly spinster visited the zoo and, having been told about them, wanted to look at the bears. When she got there they were nowhere to be seen so the good lady found an attendant and asked where the bears were. He said, "They are mating." So she asked, "Do you think they would come out for some bread?" and he replied, "Well, would you, madam?"

Mr. YATES: I think the member for Mt. Lawley is nothing but a broken down rhinoceros, to speak of the Zoological Gardens of being of no value.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: I did not say that. I said that the kindergartens were of greater value.

Mr. YATES: One cannot compare the kindergartens with the Zoological Gardens. There has been too much criticism of our Zoological Gardens in this Parliament in the past. Very few members of this House visit the zoo and so they would not know what is going on over there. The Treasurer admitted that he was not game to go there—probably because of the wild hawks. Nevertheless, the amount of money shown on these Estimates is not a true indication of the worth of the work being done in the Zoological Gardens, and no mention is made of the income.

The Treasurer: This is additional to their income.

Mr. YATES: The income derived is considerable. A number of men are employed there and the educational value of the zoo far exceeds the amount the Government spends there. The member for Cottesloe said by interjection that thousands of school children visit the zoo from time to time and they are taken there mainly because of its educational value. They are taught in school about the animals and are taken to the zoo to see them in surroundings as natural as they can be made.

Mr. McCulloch: That applies only to metropolitan children.

Mr. YATES: No. Country children often visit Perth and recently a group from Narrogin visited the Zoological Gardens, although that is not usual. People on holiday from the Goldfields and many country centres seldom leave Perth without taking their children to the zoo. They make a point of taking them to South Perth at least once during the visit, not only to show them the zoo but also to enjoy the nice surroundings.

The Zoological Gardens are so important that large sums of money are spent, not only in the other capital cities of Australia but also throughout the world in this way, and when one travels overseas it is quite a feature to visit the various zoological gardens in the major cities and see the

advances that have been made in the care of animals and the educational standards that are set. In the last seven or eight years tremendous improvements have been made in our zoo and excellent surroundings have been built up out of practically nothing.

Hon. D. Brand: What about the tennis courts?

Mr. YATES: They have been removed. The only paying railway line in Australia is to be found in the zoo and it is well patronised by thousands of children. Many adults go there also to see it, and so its value cannot be estimated in pounds, shillings and pence. The zoo also assists our ferries, as without it they would have to close down and many men and women would be placed on the labour market. We must not forget that although it was established in the dim past, it is still here and will remain for many years to come.

The South Perth Road Board would be happy to see the zoo placed at Point Walter, where land was set aside for future expansion of the zoo, because it is a non-rateable area and takes up a fair bit of South Perth. However, they have no complaint about it because of the good it has done and will do in the future to the people of Western Australia. This is the first time I have protested against the many derogatory things said about the Zoological Gardens. Now the Treasurer may be able to go there at any time and be welcomed by the animals.

Item, Exchange on overseas interest payments, £324,000.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I would like the Treasurer to tell us how these amounts are made up and on what sums these exchange payments are being made.

The TREASURER: The note I have from the Treasury in this regard reads—

This item provides sterling exchange at 25½ per cent. required for the payment of interest on the State debt in London. It also provides dollar exchange above par rates for the payment of interest in New York. The reduction this year is due to redemptions by the National Debt Commission reducing the overseas debt.

Item, Loan management expenses, £22,000.

Mr. COURT: Could the Treasurer tell me the nature of this expenditure and why it should be included? Is it a form of brokerage or some State expenditure?

The TREASURER: According to the information supplied to me, it is the State's proportion of conducting inscribed stock registries by the Commonwealth Bank in

Australia and in London and a proportion of the expenditure in connection with New York loans and commission on interest paid by the Westminster Bank in London.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Child Welfare, £329,100:

Mr. WILD: I want to hear from the Treasurer, in his capacity as Minister for Child Welfare, something about the decision to take from the Seaforth Boys' Home the right to look after delinquent children. The children were taken from the home in a strange and secretive way and it was done in a dirty and underhand manner.

The Treasurer: That is an absolute lie.

Mr. WILD: It is not, and I challenge the Treasurer to tell us what he did.

The Treasurer: This is just your usual filth.

Mr. WILD: The Treasurer did not look the commissioner in the eye when he was here and say that he was dissatisfied with the work of the Salvation Army.

The Treasurer: The member for Dale is nothing but a political bushranger.

Mr. WILD: The Treasurer gradually allowed the number of children to go down until there were only two left and then, on the 12th August last, the home received a letter indicating that no more children would be sent there. As the Treasurer must agree, the Salvation Army is very fine organisation and did not deserve such treatment. I know he was negotiating to purchase the property but London did not agree to the price he offered.

That was purely a business transaction, but it is sufficient to say that this organisation, members of which do not demand the basic wage or any set conditions, but who are prepared to give the whole of their lives to this work, had been looking after children in this institution for 30 years until the number was reduced to two and in August last they received the letter saying that no more would be sent there. To add insult to injury, a few weeks later a man was sent there and said he wanted the film projector.

Whoever sent him lost sight of the fact that, like most parents and citizens' associations, that organisation had got the projector through the Education Department, which provided a certain amount of the money. In answer to a question asked in this House, the Treasurer told me that the instruction had been withdrawn and that the projector was still there. I take strong exception to the way in which this matter was handled in view of the work these people have done. There was a rather adverse report by Mr. Hicks of New South Wales in regard to this home but the Treasurer said he did not agree with it. When I wanted the report laid on the Table of the House he said he would prefer

not to do that but agreed to show it to the member for Stirling and said that he did not agree with the report in regard to the Seaforth Boys' Home.

The Treasurer: Who did not?

Mr. WILD: The Minister did not. He told me that himself from the very place he is now sitting in.

Mr. Yates: What did the Salvation Army think about it?

Mr. WILD: It took an extremely poor view of it. Some of its representatives went with me to inspect the Seaforth property. I have been there on many occasions and I have visited there many times since. The officer from the Eastern States made his report, but the Treasurer, or Minister for Child Welfare, did not act upon it until months after it had been submitted. This home was established and it has been operating for 30 years and has done an excellent job. However, the number of children was gradually decreased until it reached only two.

Mr. Heal: While they were slowly dribbling away, did you make any inquiries in regard to the position?

Mr. WILD: I was not informed that the numbers were decreasing. Obviously the number of children varies from time to time. Sometimes it is six, but at other times the home has a full complement. If the step taken was because of finance, why was not the Salvation Army informed? The Treasurer admitted, in answer to questions asked in the House, that a certain amount of finance had been made available to the Stoneville home. I have no objection to Stoneville, where the children have been sent, but I do object to the principle that was followed in this matter.

The TREASURER: I know of no one who spends half as much time in the political gutter as does the member for Dale.

Mr. Wild: Apparently my remarks have hit home.

The TREASURER: The member for Dale not only tells lies, but he tells deliberate lies.

The Minister for Housing: Hear hear!

The TREASURER: That is the sort of individual the member for Dale is and it is about time he took stock of himself.

Mr. Wild: It is about time you said something about Seaforth.

The TREASURER: I will say something about Seaforth in a few moments, but at the moment I am saying something about the member for Dale. If he does not attempt to pull himself out of the political gutter, he should get someone else to pull him out. The position in regard to Seaforth is that the Government at one stage, did consider purchasing the property to

operate it entirely as a Government home for delinquent youths, and negotiations were set in train for the purpose of seeing whether agreement could be reached on the basis of purchase.

In order that the Government might be absolutely sure of the wisdom of such a move, the assistance of the appropriate expert officers in the Department of Agriculture was enlisted. Following reports from those expert officers covering the property the Government had no option but to decide that the property was not suitable for the purpose the Government had in mind, and so it decided, there and then, not to proceed any further with the negotiations for the purchase of the property on the ground that it would not be suitable.

Mr. Yates: Is that the land or just the buildings on the land?

The TREASURER: The land. As for the buildings—I do not want to say this publicly, but the member for Dale is so unscrupulous about this sort of thing that he would almost compel one to make a statement that one did not wish to make—I would say that many of the buildings would not be suitable, and leave it at that. However, much more could be said.

Mr. Wild: You say that they were not suitable for youths in a delinquent home?

The TREASURER: No, they were not suitable. Anyone who cares to go out and look around can judge for himself.

Mr. Wild: Could you not have spent money to improve them?

The TREASURER: I have already said that the property itself was found not to be suitable for the requirements of the Government and for the objective the Government had in mind. Communications passed between the Government and the officer concerned—who was located in Adelaide or Melbourne, if I remember rightly—and as a result of these communications the obligation of the Child Welfare Department to continue sending boys to Seaforth came to an end. There was nothing underhand about it. When we found the Seaforth property was not suitable for the Government's objective, we searched for a property that would be suitable and were fortunate enough to find one, and that property is at Stoneville.

Mr. Wild: You purchased it, did you?

The TREASURER: I have not said that we purchased it. Is the member for Dale assuming that we purchased it?

Mr. Wild: You said you could not purchase Seaforth, so I presume that you purchased the Stoneville property.

The TREASURER: The member for Dale is jumping to the wrong conclusion. As a matter of fact, the Government

has made arrangements with the authorities at Stoneville to develop the property upon a basis that is mutually satisfactory to everyone concerned and the property is being developed on that basis and it will meet the objective which we have in mind. I say to members—and I am not talking to the member for Dale because I realise that that would be a waste of time—that the Government has only one concern in this matter and that is the welfare of the children.

We do not mind whether it is the Salvation Army, the Church of England, the Presbyterian Church or the Roman Catholics who do this job, or who co-operate with the Government to do it, as long as it is well and faithfully done. We believe that the present set-up and the present property is one that will enable us to achieve a great deal of success in re-training delinquent boys who are a problem in every community.

Mr. Wild: Do not you think the Salvation Army at Seaforth could do that?

The TREASURER: I am not going into that, except to say, as I have already said, the the Government thinks, after a close examination, that the Seaforth property would not be suitable for the objective we had in mind and, as it was not suitable, there was nothing to be gained by trying to go any further in the matter. We looked around and sought to find a property that would be suitable, and we found it. It was already partly developed for the purpose we had in mind. We were able to make satisfactory arrangements with the authority that owns the property and those arrangements were made. This project is now being developed along very suitable and successful lines, and it will, I am positive, when it is fully developed, make a major contribution towards solving the problem of delinquency among youths and boys in this State.

The member for Dale can tell as many lies as he likes about it; he can say as much as he likes to put us in the blue with the Salvation Army, but that does not worry me because, if the member for Dale is not telling lies about this matter he will be telling lies about something else. I am not concerned about the member for Dale. I regard him as being utterly unscrupulous in this matter and in other matters. I repeat that the absolute concern of myself in my capacity as Minister for Child Welfare, and the absolute concern of other members of the Government is the welfare of the youths and boys, and that will continue to be our concern in the future.

Vote put and passed.

Progress reported.

**BILL—SUPPLY (No. 2), £16,000,000.**

Returned from the Council without amendment.

*House adjourned at 12.12 a.m.*