

Mr. Andrew	Noes—22.	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bickerton		Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady		Mr. Mohr
Mr. Curran		Mr. Norton
Mr. Evans		Mr. Nilsen
Mr. Fletcher		Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Hall		Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke		Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Heal		Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney		Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney		Mr. May

(Teller.)

Majority for—2.

Question put and passed.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 3.40 a.m. (Friday).

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 25th October, 1960

CONTENTS

ASSENT TO BILLS	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	2071
Superannuation : Review of pensions	2071
University of Western Australia : Government grants	2072
BILLS—	
Architects Act Amendment Bill : Assent	2071
Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	2089
Com. ; report	2089
Criminal Code Amendment Bill : Assent	2071
Dairy Cattle Industry Compensation Bill—	
2r.	2072
Com.	2075
Firearms and Guns Act Amendment Bill : Assent	2071
Interstate Maintenance Recovery Act Amendment Bill : Assent	2071
Licensing Act Amendment Bill (No. 3) : 2r.	2089
Local Authorities, British Empire and Commonwealth Games Contributions Authorisation Bill : Assent	2071
Local Government Bill—	
Suspension of Standing Order No. 206	2072
3r.	2072
Metropolitan Region Improvement Tax Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	2082
Defeated	2082
Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill—	
Com.	2079
Report	2082

CONTENTS—continued

BILLS—continued

Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill : Assent	2071
Noxious Weeds Act Amendment Bill : Assent	2071
Stamp Act Amendment Bill (No. 2)—	
2r.	2079
Com.	2079
Report	2079
State Concerns (Prevention of Disposal) Bill : 2r.	2091
Stock Diseases Act Amendment Bill : Assent	2071
Traffic Act Amendment Bill : Report	2072
ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE :	
SPECIAL	2094

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

BILLS (8)—ASSENT

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

1. Interstate Maintenance Recovery Act Amendment Bill.
2. Criminal Code Amendment Bill.
3. Stock Diseases Act Amendment Bill.
4. Local Authorities, British Empire and Commonwealth Games Contributions Authorisation Bill.
5. Firearms and Guns Act Amendment Bill.
6. Architects Act Amendment Bill.
7. Noxious Weeds Act Amendment Bill.
8. Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

SUPERANNUATION

Review of Pensions

1. The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY asked the Minister for Mines:

Arising from my question on the 4th August, 1960, relating to the recipients of pensions payable under the Superannuation Act, 1871—

- (1) has Cabinet reached a determination in respect of the report received relating to pensions payable?
- (2) If so, what alterations, if any, have been made to pensions payable to the low income group?
- (3) When will details of the report be made available to the public?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) Details of the Government's proposals in respect of pension and superannuation payments will be given by the Premier when he moves the second reading of the Bill now before the Legislative Assembly to amend the Superannuation and Family Benefits Act, 1938-1958, and the Superannuation Act, 1871-1958.

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Government Grants

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

What was the Government grant to the University of Western Australia for the financial years—

- (a) 1956;
- (b) 1959;
- (c) 1960?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

Grants for—

- (a) Operating expenses:

1955-56	1958-59	1959-60
£429,251	£675,317	£697,411

- (b) Capital purposes:

1955-56	1958-59	1959-60
£8,923	£102,976	£204,446

Totals:

1955-56	1958-59	1959-60
£438,174	£778,293	£901,857

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL

Suspension of Standing Order No. 206

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [4.40]: I move—

That Standing Order No. 206 (Chairman of Committees to certify Bill) be suspended in order to facilitate the third reading of the Local Government Bill and thus enable the subsequent proceedings on the Bill to be implemented without delay.

The reason for requesting the suspension of the Standing Order is to allow the third reading of the Bill to be agreed to without the necessity of sending it back to the printer to have all amendments included in the Bill. This action would be fairly expensive, and the suspension of this Standing Order will enable the third reading to be passed without the necessity of reprinting the Bill.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: What Standing Order did you say?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Standing Order No. 206.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [4.41]: I suppose the suspension of this Standing Order will not have any effect on the passage of the Bill, or on the consideration of the amendments in the Legislative Assembly.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government—in reply) [4.42]: There is a precedent for this procedure. This advice has been given me by the clerk in charge of Parliament. I think his advice would be fairly sound.

Motion put and passed.

Third Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government) [4.43]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Before the third reading is passed, I would like to thank members for their assistance, co-operation, and tolerance during the passage of the Bill. I think it might be interesting to members if I give some statistics in regard to the passage of the Bill on this occasion as compared with when a similar measure passed through this Chamber in 1957.

On this occasion we went into Committee five times; and in 1957 the Bill was in Committee on 16 occasions. The time spent in Committee on the present Bill was 10½ hours, while the 1957 Bill took 48 hours. On this occasion 48 amendments were moved, while in 1957 there were 250. In connection with this Bill, 27 amendments were agreed to, compared with 184 in 1957. This year, six amendments were withdrawn—I have not the figures for the 1957 Bill—and 15 were defeated. We had three divisions in Committee on the 694 clauses, while in 1957 there were 42 divisions.

I think members will appreciate that I, as Minister for Local Government, had an easy time compared with that which the late Gilbert Fraser had in 1957. I express my appreciation for the co-operation I received during the passage of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time, and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

DAIRY CATTLE INDUSTRY COMPENSATION BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 18th October.

THE HON. F. D. WILLMOTT (South-West) [4.46]: Although I have no intention of not supporting this Bill, nevertheless I cannot help but say I am not completely happy about the provisions it contains.

The Hon. G. E. Jeffery: It is a cow of a Bill!

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: It has something to do with cows—that's for sure. In the first place, we must not lose sight of the object behind the Bill which is, as I see it, to safeguard the community in the matter of tuberculosis, so that that disease is not spread to the population per medium of wholemilk. I think I would be right in saying that the disease cannot be transmitted through butter. I am not sure on that point; Dr. Hislop could correct me if I am wrong. Therefore, the Bill is really aimed at preventing diseased dairy cattle being milked in the dairy areas for butterfat purposes; the cattle then being sold to the wholemilk areas; and then the milk from those cattle going into the wholemilk industry. The more I examine the Bill and think about it, the more unhappy I become about it in some respects.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: You will have us in tears in a minute.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I do not think I will do that. If we look at the definition of "dairy cattle" we will see it is pretty wide. It includes any bull, cow, ox, steer, heifer, or calf kept for dairying purposes. I do not think that, as a rule, a steer or an ox is kept for dairying purposes. I can see the arguments that will be advanced: that these particular animals should be left within the scope of the Bill because on a dairy farm steers and bullocks are running with the herds and they will be in contact with the cows that are being milked.

That might be fair enough. However, what eludes me is how we are going to define what is a "dairy farm." As Mr. Loton pointed out earlier, any farmer who milks one or two cows and who supplies butterfat to any factory will come under the scope of the Stamp Act, as it is to be amended; and he will be taxed accordingly. I think this creates a very peculiar position. In some cases people have what we might call mixed herds. That is, they run some dairy cattle and, in some cases, great numbers of beef cattle; and at some time or other all these cattle run together and are in contact with each other. Therefore, these herds would all have to come under the scope of this Bill. So we could quite easily have the absurd position—and this is not drawing the long bow—of a man with, perhaps, 100 or 200 head of cattle making a contribution of 1s., and his whole herd coming within the scope of the Bill.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It says "for dairying purposes."

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: That is correct. What are dairying purposes? If a man is called upon to pay the levy—it does not matter how small the levy—surely he must come within the scope of the Bill. From my interpretation of the Bill, if I am a farmer milking a few cattle and I supply a few cans of cream to the butter factory,

all other cattle I have on the place, even though I bought North-West bullocks, would come within the scope of this Bill, provided I had them on the farm for longer than nine months.

I have already heard some criticism of the proposed payments—of the fact that the highest payment allowable under this legislation will be £35 per head.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That is not right.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: The Minister says that is not right. But there is provision in the Bill for the Minister to set annually a maximum amount which will be paid with respect to any one beast. I am afraid I can see a situation arising where it will have to be a very small amount to ensure that sufficient money is in the fund to meet the payments, because great numbers of cattle are to come within the scope of the Bill.

The part of the Bill I do not like is that which provides that the very cattle owners who can least afford to pay will be those who will be called upon to pay; namely, the butterfat producers. They are going to be the main contributors, because the tax—2d. in the pound—is to be levied on butterfat.

I have had a look at the amendments that Mr. Loton has put on the notice paper. In fact, I discussed them with him beforehand. Although I am not particularly happy that any of the cattle should be excluded from the provisions of the Bill, the proposed amendments are the only reasonable way, so far as I can see, towards putting some sort of limit on the expense that will be imposed on the fund.

I would like to say straight-out that I am not necessarily wedded to these amendments. Quite frankly, I think they are, like the Bill, pretty hastily conceived. If we are going to levy this tax on a butterfat basis only, I cannot for the life of me see why we should not limit in some way the payments that are to come out of the fund. Personally, I think it would be much better if all cattle were included in the Bill. If they were, we would need to consider the method under which the tax would be levied.

There is provision in the Bill for the Treasurer to finance the fund if, during the early stages, there is a shortage of money to meet all claims for compensation. That would still remain a charge against the fund and would have to be met at some time or other. In order to pay reasonable compensation, there is quite a danger that the contribution will have to be considerably increased. Under this legislation, the increase would be imposed on those who can least afford to pay.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: What about wholemilk?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: This is a compulsory levy; there is no compulsory levy on wholemilk.

The Hon. C. R. Abbey: Doesn't the fund cover this in the case of wholemilk?

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I think a good deal of extra expense was encountered in the early stages of the wholemilk scheme. But we are in a much more limited area when dealing with wholemilk than with butterfat.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member will please address his remarks to the Chair.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I realise that I cannot talk out of the back of my head.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: The honourable member is talking through the back of his neck!

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: Perhaps I might be. I repeat that I am not wedded to the amendments as they appear. Better suggestions may come forward. If so, I am perfectly prepared to listen to them and to be convinced. I do not think the Bill, as it is framed, is an adequate piece of legislation.

I am, however, certainly going to support the second reading, as I agree that it is most necessary legislation. But I cannot agree that the method of levying the tax is the correct one if the provision is going to cover such a wide range of stock. I will have something further to say when the Bill reaches the Committee stage.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government—in reply) [4.57]: The Minister controlling the Department of Agriculture has considered these amendments. I would agree that the suggestion put forward by Mr. Loton, and to a certain extent agreed to by Mr. Willmott, has some merit. However, we have to remember that other attempts have been made to introduce a Bill to cover exactly what Mr. Willmott wants; but up to date nobody has been able to work one out.

This attempt was made to limit the provisions to dairy cattle in order to give owners of dairy cattle the opportunity of insurance. As with all insurance, somebody reaps a benefit—if one likes to call it that—whilst others do not make a claim. A person may pay continually. If everybody claimed, we would never have an insurance scheme. But the amount that dairymen, who do not claim, pay by way of tax will assist the other dairymen who are not so fortunate.

It may appear that immediately a dairyman, having three, four, or half a dozen cows, starts sending cream to a factory, he starts paying his tax. I agree that he could have a good herd of cows or steers—

The Hon. A. L. Loton: Do steers come within the scope of the Bill?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I agree that they could. This Act is intended to eradicate disease in cattle. If we are not going to include the ox and the bullock we are not going to get rid of disease, because if a farmer is not going to receive compensation, he will keep his diseased cattle out of the way. If he is to receive compensation, he will ensure that they are tested.

I do not think we need worry that the fund will be inadequate to meet all claims. When cattle were first tested in Brunswick and Pinjarra, experience showed that the number of reactors amounted to 5 per cent.

It is intended to test about 20,000 head per annum. I do not know whether it is possible for the department to test any more than that, but that is the programme. Worked out on an average of 5 per cent. reactors, and a compensation payment of £35, it means a payment of £35,000 from the fund for the year. For the first year's operations it is anticipated that £60,000 will be paid into the fund, so there will be a surplus of at least £20,000 in that year. At an average of £35 a head compensation, with a fund of £60,000, it would be possible to pay out for 1,700 reactors, if it were so desired.

If Mr. Loton's amendment is agreed to, and the words "ox, steer" are deleted, it will mean that a dairyman with 20 or 30 head of oxen or steers on his property will be denied the right of compensation if any of them are found to be reactors, despite the fact that he is paying into the fund. We could have the set of circumstances where one fellow does not pay in very much, but all his cattle would be covered; and, on the other hand, we could have the position where a dairyman is paying in more than the other fellow but, because he has 20 or 30 head of oxen or steers on his property, they would not, if they were found to be suffering from T.B. and had to be destroyed, be covered. I do not think Mr. Loton wants that.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: What does the Milk Act say regarding the same diseases?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not know. However, I do know that as regards the second amendment which the honourable member has on the notice paper, the diseases mentioned are listed in the Milk Act and in the Pig Industry Compensation Fund Act. I believe it is essential to cover these other diseases by this legislation so that if any disease suddenly breaks out among dairy cattle, and Parliament is not sitting, and nobody has the power to declare those diseases to be compensable diseases under the Act, they will be covered by this clause. All the clause does is to make provision for them.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: Retrospective legislation has been introduced before today.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I know, but it is difficult with this type of legislation. It would be better to leave power in the Act to declare certain diseases compensable if Western Australia were unfortunate enough to have an outbreak of some disease which was not actually mentioned in the legislation. Mr. Baxter spoke about the maximum of £35. That is not the maximum at all.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: What is the maximum?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Bill says—

The value of any dairy cattle so destroyed shall be determined by agreement between the owner of the cattle and the chief inspector.

It goes on—

In default of agreement some competent and impartial person nominated for the purpose by the Minister shall determine the value.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: It is determined by the amount of money in the fund.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Bill goes on—

No amount of compensation in excess of an amount recommended at least once annually by the Minister and approved by the Governor shall be payable in respect of the destruction of any animal.

That is the only reference to maximum, but the amount in the fund is anticipated to be £60,000 for the first year; and, working on a figure of 5 per cent. for reactors, there will be plenty of money to cover the payments by way of compensation. If we reach the stage where we think there might be trouble, we can limit the number of inspections made in any one year. That is the only way to work it.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: The position still is that the beef man is cashing in at the expense of the butterfat man.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It says "for dairy purposes."

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: How do you define that?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is specific in the definitions.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I use those arguments only to show the House that the dairyman with just a few head of cattle has probably more to gain than the other man; and in that respect the other fellow is being penalised because if the amendment is agreed to it will deny him the right to the payment of compensation for any oxen and steers which are found to be reactors on his property.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We can argue it in Committee.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes; if members like. I think the best thing to do is to pass the second reading, and any further debate can take place in Committee.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 put and passed.

Clause 4—Construction:

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: I do not want the Minister or anyone else to think I am trying to stop some one from being paid compensation for diseased beasts. When I spoke on the second reading I said that I wanted to try to bring as many animals within the scope of the Bill as possible; because over the years those members representing country districts have tried to get the provisions set out in this Bill enacted, but we have always been told that it could not be done. Officers were not available to do the testing, and even if they were, no fund could meet such a financial call upon it.

I have compared the provisions in this Bill with the provisions in the Milk Act. One provision in the Milk Act states—

This Act shall apply and have effect in all parts of the State, except those parts which the Governor by proclamation from time to time declares shall be excluded from the operations of this Act.

When this Bill becomes law, the whole of the State will be covered in respect of those supplying milk to the factories; and after a deduction has been made, all the cattle on the property of the person concerned will be covered. The Minister admitted that.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I did not.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: Yes; the Minister did. I asked the Minister whether, if a person made a contribution, all his cattle came within the scope of the Bill. The Minister said, "Yes."

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You have misunderstood me.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: I do not think at this stage we have enough veterinary officers to do the testing in the outlying districts; and surely the people there are just as much entitled to have their cattle inspected as the people in the areas closer to the metropolitan area. That is why I was hoping the scope of this Bill would be the same as that of the Milk Act, and that certain areas would be proclaimed for a start; and that after they had been cleaned up, areas further out would be proclaimed. That would have

made the scheme far more practicable and easier to work. The department would have been able to concentrate on areas which, under the Milk Act, were found to be more badly affected than others with tuberculosis and lumpy jaw.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5—Interpretation:

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: I move an amendment—

Page 2, line 27—Delete the words "ox, steer".

I covered this amendment on the previous clause. In the Milk Act the definition of "dairy cattle" is as follows:—

"dairy cattle" means any bull over the age of nine months, and any cow or heifer over the age of twelve months kept in a dairy for dairying purposes.

In the Bill dairy cattle are defined as follows:—

"dairy cattle" means any bull, cow, ox, steer, heifer or calf kept for dairying purposes.

Why a calf, an ox, or a steer are listed, I do not know; particularly a male calf. I ask the Committee to support my amendment.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Mr. Loton misunderstood me. If a person brought 500 head of bullocks from the North-West and put them on a property in the South-West, they would not be compensable under the Bill.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: Why not?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Because they would not be kept for dairying purposes, as is required in the legislation.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: You would have a job to tell that if there were other steers on the property.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It would be difficult to say, if a person had 500 bullocks on his property which had been brought down from the North-West, that they were part of his dairy herd.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: What would a dairy farmer keep a steer for?

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: Milking!

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Don't cows steer with their rudders!

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: On a dairy farm today the steer and the ox are part and parcel of the means of obtaining revenue. A steer or an ox has to be the progeny of a dairy cow which is producing butterfat in respect of which the producer is paying a levy. The animal is regarded as part and parcel of the dairy farm. Dairy producers, under the butterfat section, are the worst hit of any portion of the community in the State. They are on the lowest margin of return received by any section. I have every sympathy

for the man and wife attempting to run a dairy farm for the production of butterfat.

Yet, they are the ones who are prepared to make this contribution, and it is at their request that the words "ox, steer" are included in the definition.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: What would happen if a dairy farmer bought a number of steers at the Waroona Show?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: They would not be regarded as part and parcel of his dairy herd.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: They are the progeny of some dairy herd.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: They are not the progeny of that producer's dairy herd. Under the definition of "dairy cattle," all classes of animals included therein must be kept for dairying purposes, and the ox or steer has to be the progeny of dairy cattle. If steers or oxen were suffering from tuberculosis, under certain circumstances the producers would be entitled to compensation.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: If the contention of Mr. Logan and Mr. Willmott is correct, namely, that oxen and steers cannot be regarded as being part of the dairy herd kept for dairying purposes, then there is no point in deleting the words proposed in the amendment. This definition could be expressed in a negative manner by including the term "which are not kept primarily for fat stock," and that would overcome the objection raised by Mr. Loton.

If a producer has a steer running with his herd, it is reasonable that that animal should be covered by compensation. There seems to be a misunderstanding that the purpose of this Bill is to protect wholemilk farmers when they buy replacement stock. The Bill has been introduced at the specific request of the dairying section. These producers are feeding the skim milk to their pigs, and the pigs are liable to be infected with tuberculosis. When a herd is suspected of being infected with tuberculosis all the animals, including even one or two steers running with the herd, should be tested.

I know of one dairy farmer who lost 90 per cent. of his stock when his herd was tested. It will be disastrous if the producer does not receive compensation for the few steers which are infected. If, as suggested by Mr. Strickland, a producer bought half a dozen steers at an agricultural show, they would have been purchased for fattening purposes. They cannot be regarded as part of the dairy herd.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: What is the reason for keeping a steer in a dairy herd?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: In one dairy farm a steer was kept with the herd because the producer found it excellent for leading his herd. That steer was therefore

kept for dairying purposes. I cannot understand the objection to the wording of this definition. We should remember that this legislation is administered by intelligent officers of the department. If a producer keeps fat stock as well as dairy cattle—as is done in the Coolup area—they will not all be classed as dairy cattle. The fat stock will not be considered as part and parcel of the dairy herd.

I have spoken to one or two producers about this definition, and they are satisfied with it. I reiterate that this Bill has been brought down at the specific request of the dairy section of the industry because of the trouble which has arisen over T.B.-infected pigs. This definition should be left as it is. If after a trial of 12 months, difficulty is experienced, then the Act can be amended.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: Let me take a hypothetical case of a big dairy farm in the South-West which produces, and supplies cream to the factory. If there is more pasture available than is required to feed the dairy herd, the producer may decide to purchase ten steers from his neighbour to utilise the surplus feed. He may then decide to run them on his property. In that event I do not think the Minister can deny that this additional stock is covered by the provisions of this Bill.

To overcome the objection of the Minister to my amendment, it has been suggested that the following words "the progeny of dairy cows" should be added to the definition. If my amendment, together with this proposed amendment, is agreed to, the definition of "dairy cattle" will be as follows:—

means any bull, cow, the progeny of dairy cows, and heifer or calf kept for dairying purposes.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: Who is to decide which are the progeny of dairy cows? That is the difficulty.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: The Minister stated that steers running on a dairy property—irrespective of the number of cows in the herd—would not be covered by the definition. I do not agree with him.

The Hon. S. T. J. THOMPSON: There is a reason for the inclusion of the words "ox, steer." Producers who are running Jersey cattle primarily find it almost impossible to get rid of all their steers, and from year to year there is a carry-over of these animals. We should leave it to the discretion of the inspector to determine which cattle on a dairy property are kept for dairying purposes.

It has been stated that a farmer who runs two or three dairy cows very often produces cream. Throughout the wheat-belt there are many such farmers who, in some parts of the year, supply cream to the factories. It will be a long while before any attempt is made, on the inspection of such a small herd, to include the rest of the cattle on the property as part of the dairy

herd. It would not make much difference to the provision if the words proposed by Mr. Loton were agreed to, because it would still be left to the inspector to decide which animals were the progeny of dairy cattle.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: If one were to test one half of the cattle in a herd and remove the T.B.-infected animals, and leave the other half untested, one would be wasting one's time in making the test, because within a short time the whole herd would become infected if there were animals infected with T.B. If we are to achieve any success, we must test all the cattle in a herd, and dispose of all the animals infected with tuberculosis.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: I am amazed that a move should be made to exclude some animals in a herd from being tested. Several speakers have stated that this definition has been included in the Bill at the request of the dairy industry. We know that dairy farmers are not so prosperous today that they can afford to bear any loss as a result of their cattle being infected with T.B. If we were to remove from the definition the words "ox, steer," the farmer would have to bear the loss if such animals should be infected with tuberculosis. I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I agree with the opinion of Dr. Hislop that all cattle in a herd should be covered by this definition; and I said that during the second reading of this Bill. But when they are all brought under the provisions of this Bill, it is unjust to expect the dairy producer in the butterfat section to contribute the whole amount of the compensation fund. That was the point I raised.

The mixed herds in this State are growing bigger and bigger; and the biggest herds are those which are run mainly for beef production, with a few dairy cattle included. The difficulty is to decide where the definition of dairy cattle ends, and where the definition of beef cattle begins. It is anybody's guess. As long as a producer is producing some cream from his herd and selling the cream, all the cattle which have been bred on his property are part of the one herd. They cannot be separated. It is quite probable that the farmers running the biggest herds are supplying the least butterfat. In my view the basis for imposing the levy is wrong.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: I do not want to deprive any farmer from getting compensation. If the Minister gives an assurance that all cattle on a dairy property are to come under the scheme I shall be quite happy; but I thought I made it clear that the scheme was not evolved to compel one section of the industry to contribute for the benefit of another section. If all cattle on a dairy property are to come under the scheme, I will not even be opposed to the inclusion of bulls.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: These are the notes supplied by the department:—

Clause 5 on page 2, line 27.

Any ox or steer in contact with a dairy herd must be tested and—if diseased—must be destroyed in order to prevent re-infection of the herd.

If these are removed from the definition of "dairy cattle" in the Bill, no compensation would be payable. The proposed amendment could therefore penalise the producers. If the definition is permitted to stand it is anticipated that the measure can be intelligently administered.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: What is meant by "contact"?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If any ox or steer comes in contact, it must be tested. Compensation will only be paid in accordance with the definition in the Act; that is, if the cattle are used for dairy purposes. It does not matter to me what happens in this regard; all I know is that the people who are going to pay this are happy to pay it.

The Hon. R. Thompson: If a dairy farmer also has some beef cattle, they would all have to be tested, but he would be compensated only for the dairy cattle which were diseased.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I do not know, but that is my interpretation. It may be that they would be prepared to pay for all stock on the property; but I do not know.

The Hon. R. Thompson: Who will have the say?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I imagine the inspector in the area would have some idea of the use for which the cattle are kept. I am only giving my interpretation of the meaning of "dairying purposes." As I said earlier, if those who are to pay for the compensation are prepared to pay for all and sundry, I do not consider we have the right to deny them the opportunity.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 and 7 put and passed.

Clause 8—Dairy cattle to be inspected and tested for disease:

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

Page 3, line 31—Insert after the word "applied" the words "such tests, bacteriological and biochemical investigations or examinations including."

I have moved this amendment because if it is passed I feel it will give the inspector a much freer hand in examining the animals. He will be able to carry out any examination he may consider necessary, and so control the disease. Actinomycosis is a shocking disease in human beings.

Fortunately I have seen only one case; I would not like to see another. This poor human being must have had incisions of a deep and penetrating character in probably 20 or more parts of the body in an effort to control the abscesses caused by the actinomycosis. Therefore any effort made to prevent the spread of this disease is worth while. However, I feel that we should give the inspector the opportunity of carrying out any form of examination he might think necessary to control tuberculosis, actinomycosis, or any other disease which later may be declared by proclamation.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: There is no real objection to this amendment, but I do think we may be going too far by including all the suggested words. If passed, this amendment would compel the chief inspector to make the suggested examinations, because the subclause reads, "The Chief Inspector shall apply or cause to be applied." All these tests may not be necessary.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: My own interpretation of my amendment is that the chief inspector will be permitted to carry out such investigations or tests as he may consider necessary. He will not have to carry out all the tests and examinations on an animal, but only those necessary to obtain a correct diagnosis. But as the Bill reads, the inspector can carry out only one test—a tuberculin test.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: As the Bill stands, the Minister can proclaim other diseases at any time, and therefore this amendment is necessary. At the moment the Bill requires only a tuberculin test, but we do not know what disease might at any time be proclaimed under this legislation.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 9—Diseased cattle or suspected cattle to be marked:

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move that the clause be amended as follows:—

Page 4:

Line 5—Insert after the word "test" the words "investigation and or examination as referred to in subsection (2) of section eight of this Act."

Line 9—Insert after the word "test" the words "investigation or examination."

Line 11—Insert after the word "test" the words "investigation or examination."

Line 13—Insert after the word "test" the words "investigation or examination."

Amendments put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 10 put and passed.

Clause 11—Application for compensation:

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

Page 6, line 30—Insert after the word "of" the word "diseased."

At the moment the clause could mean that if an animal were slaughtered for any disease other than tuberculosis, compensation could be claimed without having the slaughter of the animal approved by an inspector because the clause refers only to the tuberculous cow. If we are going to include the words "actinomycosis and other diseases" we should limit this provision to those animals classed as diseased within the meaning of the definition.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move—

That the clause be further amended as follows:—

Page 6:

Line 31—Delete the words "positive reaction to the tuberculin."

Line 31—Insert after the word "test" the words "investigation or examination."

Line 32—Insert after the word "test" the words "investigation or examination."

Amendments put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 12 to 25 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

STAMP ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 18th October.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government—in reply) [5.51]: This is a complementary measure—it is a taxing Bill—to the one we have just dealt with, and there is no need for me to say any more about it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title and citation:

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The other evening Mr. Watson gave us an interesting speech on the difficulties of financing such matters as the one with which we

are dealing. As this Bill is, in effect, an insurance measure, it could conceivably be possible to overcome the difficulty arising from section 90 of the Commonwealth Constitution by establishing a trust into which funds were paid, and which would be operated as an insurance scheme in somewhat the same way as the third party insurance scheme is operated today.

In the hope that such an arrangement might overcome some of the difficulties, I suggest that the Minister might convey my remarks to the appropriate departments.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The suggestion put up by Mr. Watson the other night was considered by the Under Treasurer who reported that he was perfectly satisfied that the present provision would stand up to section 90 of the Constitution. However, there is no reason why Mr. MacKinnon's suggestion should not be passed on to the appropriate officials.

I must apologise for the fact that when I replied to the second reading debate of the previous Bill—the Dairy Cattle Industry Compensation Bill—I did not reply to a request made by Mr. MacKinnon. I inform him now that when I move the third reading of the Bill, I shall give him the appropriate reply.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

METROPOLITAN REGION TOWN PLANNING SCHEME ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; The Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Town Planning) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title and citation:

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: This clause refers to the principal Act—the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act—which was the one covered in the general debate on the subject; and provided I am within the scope of this clause, I intend to make some comments.

The other evening the Minister used as his reply to several speeches—and almost completely as his reply—statements of two senior officers whom he named. One such statement I would say could be regarded as a reasonable and fair analysis of what was said by members; the other one could be regarded as criticism of speeches; and, indeed, it used interperate words in criticism of members themselves.

I think it was unfortunate that the Minister named the officers when making his reply to the second reading debate. After all, the matter submitted by the Minister in the introduction of a Bill—the matter submitted in support of the Bill; in explanation of it; and in justification of it as a matter of policy—is the responsibility of the Minister and his Government. No matter how Ministers are advised by officers, and no matter whether they take that advice—because the officers are not responsible for policy, or the framing of policy or the delivery of it to this Parliament—theirs is the final responsibility.

It would be very unfair if senior officers—whether they were inclined naturally to be for or against any particular members, or whether they were incited to be for or against some members, or whether they were asked for a particular type of comment—were to be placed in the unfortunate position, after having expressed themselves in a manner which would render them open to very serious criticism, of being named in this Chamber.

No member of this Committee that I know of would wish to tear such statements to shreds—and one could tear one of those statements to shreds—and attribute them to the officer who would not have the opportunity to defend himself in this Chamber. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, all such matters must be the responsibility of the Minister. In my view, it was an extremely unfortunate happening, and quite unfair to the public servants themselves.

There is not any doubt that the guidance of Ministers by senior officers is something which members of all Governments look for and appreciate; but the policy, the discrimination, and the use of such advice is the responsibility of the Government. In addition, I repeat that it is not a very good thing—whether wilfully or not—to set up any enmity between civil servants and Parliament, or parliamentarians, either.

One other thought on the matter would be that while permanent heads are permanent heads, Ministers are not in that category. I wish to state emphatically that not at any stage in my speech on the second reading of this Bill did I use the words—

The authority has been unwise in spending its revenue as far as it has without using that revenue to fund loans.

Those words were quoted by the Minister as having been uttered by me. What I did say in that regard was a very clear statement of my view on the point which affects this clause. It was an extremely clear statement on my stand in this matter and the relevant matter associated with it. What I did say was this—

While I would not for a moment either doubt the right of the authority to do what it intends to do, or its right

to get the best deal possible for the State by spending the money now, I point out that if it could avoid using capital on capital expenditure, both it—that is, the authority—and the State would be much better off.

I admit it may have been seen that by buying a property now it could avoid greater expenditure later. The schedule is here. The authority is composed of very responsible men actuated by the highest motives. There is no doubt about that. But my point is that it would be far better to plan now, immediately, for loan funds to be made available to the authority, and to preserve the capital as such in order to service the loan.

I went on to say—and this is very important in the light of the reply given by the Minister on this very important and pertinent angle—

It is important that this authority should have the ability to plan and look ahead and anticipate necessary resummptions; to arrange, particularly in the outer areas where values are soaring, for resummptions as speedily as possible; to arrange all of the mechanics within its administration necessary to provide for the arterial roads for the open spaces.

That is very clear. In short, my support of this Bill was unqualified, and the only proviso I made was that the Minister had not furnished the Chamber with the information it was entitled to have.

I have here copies of the Minister's speech, in which almost no figures were quoted; and I made a plea that he supply us with those figures. Many of the figures which the Minister gave us the other evening in his reply to the debate had no relevancy whatsoever to the points that I and others had raised in regard to the quantum of money required and, therefore, the volume of tax necessary to be imposed. Those figures also had no relevancy to the question of money to be raised under the tax Bill; and, in referring to the tax Bill, I said this—

The Government should have made a complete review of the needs of the authority and given clearly an indication of the amount of money required under the different categories.

That is where I still stand.

It was no use the Minister objecting when he was dealing with the financial aspect and quoting the figures during last week's debate. He objected to my interjection when I asked for the figures; and they had not been given to us. When the Minister said they were not ready, I said they should have been ready; and, of course, they should have been ready. How can a complete assessment be made of this

very vital matter, which the Government is now asking to be placed in perpetuity, without all the relevant detail being afforded the members of this Chamber and and those of another place?

That is the situation today. The conflict of the remarks the Minister made last week with those he made when he introduced the Bill is extremely interesting. When the Minister introduced the Bill, his remarks were as follows:—

It is quite unfair on the present generation that it should be called upon to meet out of revenue such substantial expenditure.

He said further—

The costs of such improvements and facilities should logically be spread over the extended period of realisation of the plan and it is neither feasible nor desirable to attempt to meet the whole cost at the outset and wholly at the expense of the present taxpayers.

I think all members of the Committee are in agreement with the Minister on that point; but he took us to task for expressing our opinions, and quoted, at very great length—spread over several pages—opinions to prove that Victoria had done nothing of the sort. The Minister kindly made available to me, over the week end the statements that he read to the Chamber; but because it would mean trenchant criticism of a public service officer, I feel I cannot attack the statements from that angle. However, I intend to refer to certain aspects which the Minister sponsored, or he would not have expressed them. Dealing with the Victorian case, the Minister said—

The authority in Victoria is not prepared to borrow moneys for the purpose of implementing its town planning improvement scheme.

The assets being acquired in Victoria are non-revenue producing, as they will be here in Western Australia, and for this reason, together with the fact that the authority has no desire to see its income from rates completely absorbed by unproductive debt charges, the authority in Victoria is not prepared to borrow moneys for the purposes of implementing its town planning improvement scheme.

He went on to say—

I do not say that we would go so far as this in Western Australia, but it is apparent from the practice in Victoria that as expenditure of tax proceeds on capital works the town planning scheme is not an original thought on the part of our own planning authority, and, in fact, it has much to commend it under existing circumstances.

Just where does the Minister stand? Does he stand on the last statement, or on the first? Or does he stand on this statement that he made—

"In the early stages of the scheme it would be prudent to acquire properties from the proceeds of the tax rather than pay interest on moneys not immediately required"?

The Minister, in sponsoring and presenting to the Chamber such arguments, believed them. However, it is all very confusing to know which statement he stands by, because there are many members in this Chamber who firmly hold the opinion that there is no doubt of the permanency of the legislation being granted once all the justifiable needs are shown. That has been said by more than one responsible person; persons who do not take their responsibilities lightly.

This clause—which is the Bill—coupled with the repeal of the section in the Act which will give this legislation permanency of life, will, I am sure, be supported by every member, because this Chamber will not have changed its mind; and I feel sure that the authority not only deserves a permanency of life, but it needs it, just as it requires—and just as it will get—all the moneys associated with its needs to implement the plan when the Chamber receives the full explanation of such needs.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If one wished to bandy words one could do so without limit. The words I used the other night, and to which Mr. Wise took exception, adding that he had not said them, are—

The authority has been unwise in spending this revenue as far as it has, without using that revenue to fund loans.

I will be fair and say that the word "unwise" was not used by him, but there is no doubt that the inference was there to be drawn. Mr. Wise continued—

Surely it would be an indefensible attitude to think that expenditure of a capital kind should be made from taxation of this nature collected for this purpose, and that this generation should be expected to meet £6,000,000 or £7,000,000 for a plan which is projected 50 years hence.

He said this was an indefensible act, and went on to say—

To get back to the point I was mentioning just now in regard to the use of the £93,000: I am not questioning the board's judgment at all or the need to interfere as much as possible now, but I am deploring the fact that instead of £93,000 serving approximately £1,500,000 worth of debt and giving the authority £1,300,000 or

£1,400,000 to spend—the £93,000 would service and redeem such an amount—we are spending the capital. If we are going to spend the capital, Lord knows what the tax will have to be, because the greater the amount of capital, that is spent, as such, the greater will be the burden, in the form of tax, on the people.

He says it is deplorable to think that the tax is to be used for this purpose. He then deplores the fact that instead of £93,000 being used to refund the loan it is going to be used from capital. If that does not imply it is unwise to spend the regional tax from capital, I do not know what does. I think mine was fair comment.

Mr. Wise also took me to task for not supplying the Chamber with figures of the regional tax that the authorities would be expected to pay. Members will recall that in the course of my speech I gave figures showing it was estimated that £6,650,000 would be required in the space of 10 years. I do not know what more I could have done. I do not know whether the honourable member thinks the authority is a team of supermen. The Act setting up the authority was not passed till last session, and it was only proclaimed in the new year; and before the authority could be established, local authorities in the metropolitan area had to elect their district planning committees, and then make representations to me to be appointed to the authority. The date today is the 25th October. It is impossible to expect all the information from this authority after only six meetings.

I went to the trouble the other night to give members figures of what is expected to come from Consolidated Revenue, and from loan for a period of 15 years. I was not asked for those figures at all; I was asked for the other figures. Mr. Watson asked me for figures dealing with the Main Roads Department, which I supplied. The comment I made was fair, and I have no hesitation in saying so. To revert to Mr. Wise's speech, he said—

The Bill to which I am now speaking—the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act Amendment Bill—which was passed last year, is one which simply seeks to remove the section that limits the life of the authority. As *Hansard* of last year will show, in the very keen debates that took place on these measures, this one was supported by me. It will be found on page 2668 of *Hansard* that, without qualification, this Bill was supported by me.

When we look up the debate we find Mr. Wise moved an amendment to take out of the Bill the subclause dealing with the regional tax. Surely, having done that, he cannot say he supported the Bill without qualification. I desire to make

that explanation, because the word "unwise" though not actually said, was definitely implied.

The Hon. F. J. S WISE: I cannot let the Minister get away with that. Not any statement of mine in regard to the authority or the board has been other than laudatory. The Minister asked whether I thought the authority was composed of supermen. I made an unqualified statement as to the type of men I thought they were, and the type of job they have done. The fault is not with the officers in not supplying the Minister with information because of the immaturity of time: the point is that the time is not opportune for this legislation to be with us. On the question of opposing the tax last year: Of course I opposed it, but never at any stage have I opposed this Bill which will make permanent the life of the regional planning authority.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Report

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

METROPOLITAN REGION IMPROVEMENT TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading: Defeated

Debate resumed from the 4th October.

THE HON. R. C. MATTISKE (Metropolitan) [7.41]: Last year, when the Minister first introduced his legislation to provide for a metropolitan region authority, and for the finance to enable that authority to act, he made abundantly clear—or at least he emphasised very strongly to this House—the urgent necessity that existed to pass both the legislation providing for the authority, and that providing for the necessary finance.

At one stage during the debates I aligned myself with others in an attempt to refer to another place certain aspects of the financial side of the scheme, so that they might have another look at the maximum amount of the tax, and the life of the taxing measure. Subsequently, when restrictions were placed on these, I supported the Bill, because the Minister emphasised so strongly that if he did not have the money necessary to finance the scheme, then it could not proceed.

Along with others, I was urgently aware of the necessity for that scheme to proceed. I still agree with those who have expressed themselves similarly, that we must have this authority; that it is just starting to get into gear; that it has a tremendous task ahead of it. But so far as the financial aspect is concerned, I think we have a totally different proposition. Last year, when we were all in doubt

as to the requirements—and the Minister himself said he had no sure knowledge as to what the scheme would cost—the Minister did say he would review the matter in two years' time.

I feel that a review in one year's time is not fair to those who are responsible for the administration of the authority; it is not fair to the members of this Parliament; and it is not fair to those who have to meet the burden. During the debate on both these measures in the last week or two, there has been much confusion. The Minister has said that certain moneys would be required, and that these must be obtained by taxing measures. He has given us financial information from the authority which shows how it has expended money during the past year; but when we have looked at the report of the financial committee we have found that there are many weaknesses; and I think they were brought to light very neatly by Mr. Wise who, as a past Treasurer of this State, is, I feel, fully competent to make the observations he did.

I think also that Mr. Watson covered the financial aspects very thoroughly indeed; and if we are to take notice of those two speeches—and we surely must because they came from persons well qualified to speak on these financial matters—then it is very obvious that there is need to make haste slowly. There is confusion in regard to the amount of money required. That is obvious because already the Minister has on the notice paper an amendment to reduce the amount of tax. In fairness to the Minister, I appreciate that when he introduced the measure last year it was then anticipated it would produce £140,000 per annum; and I can see in his present move a desire to keep the total income from this tax down to approximately £150,000 per annum.

But, surely that point must have been obvious when the Bill was being drafted a couple of months ago. Surely the officers responsible for advising the Minister on the financial aspects must have been fully aware of it. If they were not, then it adds to our confusion here to know that we are not fully aware of what money would be available and what money would be required to finance the scheme.

Again, I feel there is considerable confusion regarding the money required to be spent in developmental works throughout the metropolitan region during the next decade or so. The Minister quoted certain figures reaching rather astronomical proportions for the State—and I call £10,000,000 or £15,000,000 astronomical—but I feel that in those figures there is a lot of expenditure or proposed expenditure which will, during that period, be normal loan expenditure on departmental work.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That is where it is going to come from.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: Well, we must not confuse the pure operations of this authority with the ordinary loan programme of the State. That is something which requires a very clear line of demarcation and absolute clarity in our thinking so that we can really be assured that what we are doing is the right thing for the authority and for those who have to pay. There is no need for me to labour a lot of the matters referred to by Mr. Wise and Mr. Watson, but I feel I must make reference to the necessity for financing the scheme out of loan expenditure and for covering that loan expenditure, by funding it, from the tax.

In principle, I think the idea of paying compensation from taxation for properties that are acquired is an entirely wrong one. I feel also that there are so many facets to this matter that it requires very much more consideration over a very much longer period than will be permitted in the present session of Parliament. In the past the Minister has, in his short time of office, appointed committees on many subjects to inquire into certain matters, and to advise him in order that he may have all the facts of those particular matters before him to enable him to make a decision regarding policy. I earnestly suggest to the Minister that here is another matter in which he would do well to seek advice of people qualified to give that advice.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: What do you think the authority was set up for?

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: In the short time it has been going, and from the information we have had up to the present, I feel that the whole of the financial structure is in confusion—and it is no good saying one thing and meaning another. I have gone into it as thoroughly as I can, and I am sure in my own mind that that is the case. Before we ask the taxpayers of the metropolitan area to bear a tax in perpetuity, the whole case must be clarified. For that reason I could not support any measure to make this tax perpetual without being absolutely sure in my own mind that it is necessary.

By delaying for 12 months, we will not affect the operation of the authority one iota. That authority still has finances ahead of it for two more years; and during the next session of Parliament, there would be quite time enough for us then to consider some measure concerning the future financial requirements of this authority. If the matter is further considered with a view to submitting legislation to Parliament during the next session, I would also urge that the Minister give very careful consideration to the provision in the existing Act which gives exemption from the tax to certain classes of ratepayers.

The persons listed under the Land Tax Act as being exempted from the metropolitan region improvement tax have a very

unfair advantage over the other residents of the metropolitan area; and I cannot see why they should be singled out for that preferential treatment. So in all earnestness I hope that something can be done with a view to deleting these exemptions. I do not say they should all be deleted, but certain of them should be. I refer to people engaged in business or commercial enterprises.

As I said just now, I cannot support this measure in its present form, even with the decision to reduce the tax from 1d. to 3d. Before this measure is made perpetual, we must have much more information to enable us to vote as we should on behalf of the interests of all concerned. Therefore, I do hope that the Minister will look at this legislation with a view to delaying it until next year so that we may have the full facts to enable us to act properly.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North) [7.55]: I am in complete agreement with the previous speaker in regard to this measure. I feel that following the information which the Minister gave us concerning the expenditure for the next 15 or 16 financial years—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Don't mix that up with the regional tax.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: —much more consideration should be given to the effect and to the implication of this tax, as it now applies, before it should be made permanent. The Minister asked me not to mix up my views with the information which he gave us the other night.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Do not mix your taxes.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: If the expenditure proposed in the metropolitan area by various sources and various departments was not intended to be taken into consideration with a continuance of this tax, surely it is rather confusing. Why did the Minister go to the trouble to collate the figures and inform this House of the expenditure? When one looks at the figures on paper, they look very big; but when one reduces them to annual expenditure, they are not beyond the resources of normal loan fund expenditure.

The Minister quoted the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department expenditure in connection with new works at Kewdale, to where the new railway marshalling yards are to be moved. I take it that if a new suburb sprang up anywhere, the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department would look after the people in that suburb without any special tax being applied. Water was taken to Kwinana; and it was taken to Callista and Medina; and it would be taken to any other suburb that was created. This

would be done by the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department.

The amount quoted by the Minister to be expended over the next six financial years totals £225,000. So, when spread over the six years, it is not a great deal. Then the Minister passed on to railways expenditure. Railways expenditure in the next six years in connection with the goods terminal will amount to something like £3,333,000. The normal annual allocation of loan funds for the W.A.G.R. is round about the £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 mark; and that should cover new works and improvement works.

There is another aspect in connection with the proposed expenditure by the railways that is most important in my view. When the railways eventually vacates its present marshalling yards—the goods yards, as we call them—at West Perth; and when it vacates the Beam Service Station at the southern end of Stirling Street; and when it vacates the Perth central area itself, there is going to be an enormous amount of very valuable land available to somebody. Surely to goodness some capital will be secured from the sale of that land; or because of the value of that land.

The position in regard to the Main Roads Department is most interesting. Something like £2,500,000 is to be spent on the western switch road and the construction of roads at Kewdale. Heavens above—£2,500,000 in 15 years! The financial years quoted by the Minister were those ending in 1961 to 1975—15 financial years, with a total expenditure of £2,500,000.

I worked out what the population of the metropolitan area brought by way of petrol funds to Western Australia under the old allocation of funds—namely, three-fifths of the population to two-fifths area. Assuming that the metropolitan area contained half the population of the State, then the metropolitan area was responsible for bringing in nearly £2,500,000 of the total allocation of £8,000,000. In actual fact the figure was £2,400,000. This will be apparent to any member who cares to go to the trouble to work it out. Therefore, spread over 15 years, if the petrol funds do not increase beyond £8,000,000, it could be said that at least £37,500,000 would be brought to the State under the old formula of three-fifths population and two-fifths area.

When the Minister gave us these figures, they looked like being required for a lot of big works. But those works are already provided for. The money is already there; it comes in through normal channels; namely, petrol tax, which can be applied to roads; and loan funds, which can be applied to water supplies and railways. The market buildings are estimated to cost, in 1975—15 years hence—£729,000; although construction will not begin—the

starting date is not given—for about 10 years. The financial situation is going to be quite different then. If this tax is made permanent there will be an enormous amount of money.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: This tax has nothing to do with that. You should know that. Why don't you listen to what you are told?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I did listen; but I am not going to be blinded by that. What is the tax money to be spent on?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You have already been told.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: If the tax money is going to be used for these purposes, it will be improperly used.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I have already told you it is not to be used for that purpose.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: If the money is to be used for the widening of Charles Street or George Street, it will be used improperly, because the petrol money provides for those works. That money can be spent on roads, or on anything in connection with the construction of roads, or the provision of transport. It could be spent on providing moles for harbours. I can tell the Minister that the Narrows Bridge was erected out of petrol funds.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I informed you of that the other night.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: And the Freeway.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I informed you of that, also.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: And the South of Perth Yacht Club was provided with a new site and club premises across the river out of petrol funds. That is quite different altogether. When the Minister was replying in connection with this tax, I interjected and asked him whether it was fair that owners of properties which are to be bulldozed and demolished to make way for this scheme should have to pay improvement tax. The Minister replied, "Yes; why shouldn't they?" I say, "Why should they?"

Mr. Mattiske raised an important point when he said there were too many properties that were exempt. Property-owners who are exempt from paying this tax are the very people who are going to benefit from the improvement and expansion of the city. The city will improve and expand into their areas and push the values of their properties up. I could instance the Federal Hotel. That property is to be bulldozed out of the road and the livelihood will then go. Anybody who owns a business anywhere along George Street or Charles Street will be pushed out of business; yet they are to pay this tax. I am asking whether this is fair.

Persons who are to be evicted from their homes and have their land confiscated—and this question of resumptions is something which this Government used to make quite a fuss about when in Opposition—will get no sympathy whatever. They will, however, be paid the value of their properties when they are resumed. That is elementary. Surely the Government would not want to beat them down or acquire their properties at less than valuation! But that does not explain the fact that these people are being displaced.

Somebody has to be displaced when expansion occurs. But I object to the fact that these people will be taxed until the Government acquires their land. It is a different proposition with the Chevron-Hilton hotel. When I asked the question from which date that property would be taxed, the Minister said that it would be from the 1st July, 1961.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That statement was corrected. You asked that question on a point of order.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The Chevron-Hilton hotel will pay as from the 1st July, 1961. Why is it not paying now if it owns the property? Why not pay as from July, 1960? Why the exemption? I think it would be a dreadful thing if a tax of this nature were to be a perpetual one, when it is obviously now being paid by people who should not be called upon to pay it, because their properties are to be confiscated anyway. It is not being paid by people who will, in the long run, benefit from these improvements.

THE HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [8.6]: I do not propose to speak at length on this measure. It dovetails somewhat into the previous measure. I feel that the Government has been unduly hasty in introducing this taxing Bill. There is time yet before it will be necessary for the Act to be reviewed. I think it would have been far better if the Government had waited another 12 months at least before endeavouring to introduce this measure to make the existing halfpenny in the pound regional tax a permanent tax.

Some people in the metropolitan region are called upon to pay the existing tax, and others are exempt. Those people who are exempt will benefit from the improvements that will take place, and I feel that further consideration should have been given to this aspect. The question has been raised whether it is necessary to continue this tax beyond the statutory limitation placed on it, bearing in mind that it has raised considerably more money than was originally anticipated.

Section 42 of the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Act makes provision for the Government, as the authority under the Act, to borrow money. I am one of those who believe that progress, extending as it does over the years, should not be a charge entirely upon the people of today; but that

those who will, in the future, enjoy the results of any improvements commenced today should be entitled to contribute something towards them. The method of raising loans spreads the payment over a number of years, and people in the affected areas will, in years to come, be contributing their share to the progress.

When I was speaking on a previous measure the Minister pointed out, if I heard him correctly, that a request had been received from Fremantle for action to be taken to repossess land for the purpose of widening certain regional roads. Under the provisions of Act No. 19 of 1925, as soon as a local authority makes a declaration, owners of the property concerned may claim compensation. Although the Minister said that no decision had been reached, I venture to say that the reason for this is that the group committee has not yet agreed to the proposition put forward by the regional committee. I venture to say—and I did express this opinion—that those people who live within the boundaries of the City of Fremantle will be called upon to pay through their rates, for the acquiring of land for the widening of regional roads; and they are, at the same time, liable for the halfpenny regional town planning tax.

I do not consider this fair. I believe the Government has been hasty in bringing down this legislation, bearing in mind that there is no reason why it could not be introduced in twelve months' time. By then the Government would be in full possession of the facts which members have said they possess, and the Government could then place those facts before members of this House.

In view of this, I feel it is not necessary for us, at this juncture, to deal with this taxing measure; although the Minister has apparently decided that in view of certain speeches made in the House the tax should be reduced from $\frac{1}{2}$ d. to $\frac{1}{4}$ d. The Government must have a reason for that decision. I believe it has come to the conclusion that it was hasty in bringing down this measure, and desires that it should receive further consideration. While I support the previous measure dealing with town planning which, I feel, is necessary, I do not propose to support this Bill now before us.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Local Government—in reply) [8.14]: It seems very strange to me that both Mr. Strickland and Mr. Davies should say that in October, 1960, they have not sufficient information to enable them to make up their minds to vote for the continuation of this legislation, when they supported the very same measure in 1957. Apparently, they had all the information they required at that time. Mr. Strickland, who was a member of Cabinet, agreed that the Bill should be introduced.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: How do you know what happened in Cabinet?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It was a Cabinet decision; and Cabinet decisions are unanimous. A half-penny in the pound was agreed to three years ago. There was no limitation. There were exactly the same exemptions then as there are today. The honourable member is merely shedding crocodile tears, because it is exactly the same Bill.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: When did it come here?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: In 1957.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: What did you do about it?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I supported it. Had the Government of the day come back the following week, that legislation would have been law three years ago, and we would not have had all this worry and trouble that we are having today. I know that this Bill is going to be thrown out—

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I supported it last year.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I told Mr. Strickland he was confusing his figures. When I introduced the measure I gave a figure of what I expected the authority would receive, and what the money would be used for. The honourable member can look back and see what I said in *Hansard*. It was an estimate of £6,500,000; that was the immediate target. The authority could see that it would require that much money in the next few years to purchase land for the widening of roads and the establishment of public open spaces. The regional authority intended to apply the tax to that purpose, which was fair enough.

The other evening, in an endeavour to show the amount of money which would be used from the over-all loan and Consolidated Revenue funds I gave the figures of what could be expected to be expended in the next few years as the result of the metropolitan regional plan—that was purely from the Consolidated Revenue and loan funds. The building of the switch road had nothing to do with the regional tax. The tax money would be used only to purchase the land; and that was included in the £6,500,000.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It should come out of the petrol tax.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: We cannot use the petrol tax for everything.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: That is what it is for.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Not for all these purposes.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It is for roads.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Ever since this authority has been in existence, it has been working on the problems confronting it.

Yet now Mr. Mattiske wants a special committee set up for the purpose of considering the financial angle. I already have a committee of the 11 best brains in the city.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Not on financial matters.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: They must be all poultry farmers.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The honourable member talked about the poultry farmers at Melville. There are seven poultry farms in Melville; three are in the zoned rural area and four in the zoned residential area.

The Hon. R. Thompson: What did the Campbell estate realise when it was sold?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Regional tax was being paid on it. Mr. Strickland wanted to know about race horse breeders. They are not exempt.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: What about the stud farm at Serpentine?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I said race horses. The people who breed those horses are not exempt, and that is the question the honourable member asked.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Aren't they breeding race horses?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The honourable member is exaggerating the position; and he is exaggerating the number of people who are exempt through being in the agricultural areas. The other night I emphasised the need for an exemption on agricultural land; it is set out in the original Stephenson report. Obviously the honourable member does not appreciate the Stephenson Plan, except those bits and pieces of it he thinks might be all right. The reasons given—and these were the reasons given by Mr. Tonkin in another place—are all set out. I gave the same reasons as Mr. Tonkin gave; but now members want to shed crocodile tears over those whom they were prepared to exempt when the Bill was before this Chamber in 1957.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I am objecting to the perpetual side of it.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Much has been said about the taxing angle. I gave the reasons why it was necessary for the tax to be continued without any limitation on the life of the Act. Whether I did the wrong thing or not by quoting the Under Treasurer the other evening, I do not know; but if I was wrong I take the blame for it. However, I gave the reasons why it was necessary for the tax to be continued without a limitation on its life. If the tax is not continued for the next two years, the authority will have to use the money it obtains from the tax as its capital—a principle to which two or three members in this House have objected.

The authority has no other way out of its difficulties; and I have already stated what the Grants Commission is likely to do

if the money is taken from Consolidated Revenue. Every £100,000 taken out of Consolidated Revenue means a further £100,000 which the Grants Commission will not refund; and the money has to be taken out of our loan allocation to fund any debts. That is the position in a nutshell. Mr. Strickland will want something built in the North, and other members will want other buildings erected elsewhere. But because that £200,000 has been taken out of Consolidated Revenue some buildings will not be erected. The Grants Commission will not allow us to take money out of Consolidated Revenue in that way.

Surely to set up another committee, as Mr. Mattiske suggested, when we already have an authority of 11 members—and they have their own finance committee to deal with these matters—is to put it bluntly, just too crazy!

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Do you consider them the highest authority on financial matters?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: A man like Mr. Eilbeck, who is probably one of the most successful businessmen in Perth, must have some financial ability to have got to his present position. The Under Treasurer is brought into all the finance committee meetings. There are men like Mr. Lloyd, the Town Planning Commissioner, and Councillor Alf Spencer, one of the most prosperous men in the city. They are members of the finance committee; and do not let any member tell me that they have no brains in regard to financial matters.

This authority came to me as Minister and asked for the limitation on the life of the Act to be removed. They asked for it because they realised that they were stymied in their approach to this problem, unless that limitation could be removed. The Treasury is not in a position to fund any loans, because of what I have already said. If the tax is not made permanent, it will be essential for the authority to use its capital for the work it has to do.

If members toss the Bill out, instead of paying three-eighths of a penny in the pound next year, those affected will be paying a halfpenny in the pound. If the authority is to continue after 1962, without recourse to the Consolidated Revenue Fund, a tax will have to be applied; and if that is done those people for whom some members seem to be most concerned will have paid one-eighth of a penny in the pound more than they should have done during the next 12 months.

I broached the question of reducing the tax from a halfpenny to three-eighths of a penny in the pound with the authority. Its members said that they did not want to reduce the tax, because they could do with all the finance they could get. But I make the policy in these matters, and because of the figure which was given in

this House last year—£140,000—I contended that a tax of three-eighths of a penny in the pound would have meant a figure of £158,000. I thought the reduction was worthy of some consideration and that is why I mentioned it.

To say the time is not ripe, when it was ripe in 1957 to introduce legislation such as we introduced, is just too silly. In the minds of some people the time will never be ripe.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: That is quite so to a lot of those who are paying the tax.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The honourable member supported the same measure in 1957.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: I know.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The honourable member was quite happy with it then.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: All I am saying is that you have brought this in too soon.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Too soon! Yet the honourable member supported the same sort of thing in 1957. Mr. Strickland talked about spending General Loan Funds. I mentioned the other night the amount required over the next 15 years for roads. But what the honourable member forgot to say when he spoke was that the main part of the money will be spent in the first six years. Parliament set up an authority to do a certain job, and I am hopeful that next year the members of that authority will be able to present their version of the Stephenson Plan for public inspection. I hope that by the following year, after getting the public reaction to the plan, we will be in a position to present it to Parliament for ratification.

However, I am afraid that unless we have some continuity in regard to the tax, the authority will not be able to raise the necessary loans, and will have to use its capital. I do not think that is altogether advisable.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: The matter will drag on for years like it has done in the past.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It could do that. But to say the legislation was introduced too early is just too silly. Day after day I get requests from people who have been trying to get some finalisation over the last four or five years. They want to develop their properties, but because they have been covered by the interim development order they do not know where they are. For the last 18 months we have been trying to give relief to some of these people. We cannot give relief to all of them because there is not sufficient money to pay them; but we do what we can.

As regards the Federal Hotel, the proprietors are getting their revenue all the time; they are making a good living and I see no reason why they cannot continue

to pay the tax. They will get the full valuation of the place when it is taken over. All I can do is leave it to the House to decide on this measure. If members are prepared to allow the present position to remain, and not to remove the limitation from the life of the Act, people in the metropolitan region will be called upon to pay a halfpenny in the pound. If members want the authority to continue to function as it should, and this Act is allowed to go out of existence, another tax will have to be applied. If the tax is reduced from a halfpenny in the pound to three-eighths of a penny in the pound; if the limitation on the life of the Act is removed; and if the tax realises £175,000 instead of £158,000, we can reduce the rate still further to bring in about £150,000. The incidence of the tax is not that great.

My tax last year was 19s. 2d.; and if I, as a resident of this city, am not prepared to pay 19s. 2d. for the benefit of the region and to improve the city as it ought to be improved, I do not deserve to be a citizen of it. Out of that 19s. 2d., I would have been able to claim one-third as a taxation deduction, so it actually cost me about 12s. 6d. Most members would be in a similar position.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The ordinary householder cannot do that.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Is that too big a price for anyone to pay to develop the region as it ought to be developed? I do not think so.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Your principal property holding is not taxed.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Which one is that?

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Have you properties in the country?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: No; I have not.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Then I am sorry.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I believe in the Labor Party principle of one man one job. I have applied that ever since I have been in Parliament.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: You obviously don't live in North Fremantle where the railway bridge is to be built.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Those people will be paid compensation for whatever land is taken over.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: But they are paying the tax as well.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: That has nothing to do with this. I leave it at that. I hope the House will give a little more thought to the action it takes, if it decides not to take off the time limit to the legislation.

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

Ayes—14.

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. J. Murray

(Teller.)

Noes—15.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. G. E. Jeffery	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	Hon. W. R. Hall
Hon. R. C. Mattiske	

(Teller.)

Majority against—1.

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

COAL MINE WORKERS (PENSIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from the 13th October.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 20th October.

THE HON. A. L. LOTON (South) [8.37]: As on a previous occasion, I am of the opinion that this Bill should be opposed. The sponsor desires to bring within the scope of the Licensing Act the Mundaring, Mundaring Weir, Parkerville, Rottnest, and Naval Base hotels. I want to point out that these hotels are not very far from the city. People who consider it essential to patronise a hotel on Sunday to partake of liquor should obtain before Sunday the few bottles which are required. They could place these in their refrigerators and consume the liquor at home. By doing that, they would not have to travel a long way on the road on Sundays to partake of liquor, and subsequently become a menace to other motorists. I oppose the Bill.

THE HON. H. K. WATSON (Metropolitan) [8.38]: This Bill will not really solve the problem regarding *bona fide* travellers on Sundays. There are only two possible alternatives to deal with this matter logically and efficiently; firstly, permit all hotels in the metropolitan area to remain open on Sundays, or secondly, extend the existing limit to 100 miles from Perth.

The 20-mile radius provision had its genesis in the horse-and-buggy days, when that distance was the equivalent to 100 miles today. I do not think it was ever intended that the provision should be an excuse for or a convenience to city dwellers—who are too forgetful or too lazy to obtain their liquor supplies before Sunday—to go on a brief motor journey of 20 miles for the purpose of satisfying their desire for liquor; and by so doing create a real traffic hazard, as was outlined by Mr. R. Thompson when he dealt with a similar measure earlier this session.

If a person were to forget to obtain his bread or meat supplies for the weekend on Saturday morning, he would have to wait until Monday before he could obtain them. The same principle ought to apply to liquor. For my part I would be more inclined to support an amendment to the Act to increase the limit to 100 miles from Perth, rather than have the existing 20 miles. I oppose the Bill.

THE HON. C. H. SIMPSON (Midland) [8.40]: I support the Bill. I think it is a step in the right direction. As the sponsor of the Bill pointed out, there is a drive going on in this State at present to increase the tourist trade. For that one reason we should give some consideration to providing the extra amenities sought by the Bill, as part of the way towards meeting the needs of visitors to the State.

The peoples of Europe take a very different attitude to drinking habits, as compared with the Australian attitude. For instance, in France one can observe cafes and similar establishments where light liquor may be procured on any day of the week; and, as far as I am aware, these operate under a very generous schedule of hours. It is quite common to see patrons being served on the footpath, seated at tables under umbrellas. They consume the liquor in a social atmosphere in full view of the passers-by, who are able to see what they are doing.

In the old pre-war days of Germany the beer gardens were a source of entertainment to whole families. Certainly the patrons were expected to buy a drink, and perhaps two or three in the course of the evening. They were provided with band music, and the very best of music. Those were places where men could take their families for their evening's entertainment. To a large extent that practice obtained over most of the western countries in Europe.

In America there was a time when there was a prohibition on liquor, but that was a period when everyone was supposed to have still a little, or a "little still." When the prohibition Act was repealed, generally speaking the conditions of drinking in that country were brought up to date to a great extent. I understand that instead of having their doors screened off so that the passing public

were not able to see what was taking place inside the bars, the hotels built window openings in their establishments, and patrons were served with liquor at tables by the windows, in full view of passers-by.

In this State the drinking habits conform to the convenience of the hotel management, but reflect a rather casual attitude to the customer who has to line up at the counter to obtain his liquor. In some places, particularly where trading hours are restricted, the customer will drink as much as he can within the restricted time, and perhaps leave the bar very much under the influence. It is a curious thing that the more drinking hours are curtailed, the more drunkenness appears to exist.

I can remember a visit I made on one occasion to Italy around Christmas time; and on Christmas Eve a party of soldiers, including myself, went around the city to see what occurred at that period. We wondered whether celebrations were the same as those in an English or an Australian town. We thought that there would probably be some church services and we went along to a magnificent cathedral in Milan called the Duomo; but to our surprise we found that it was one of the few occasions when the cathedral doors were locked.

On the other hand, it was possible to walk down the streets at 3 o'clock in the morning and find plenty of people around. Also there were little shops where people could obtain coffee and wine. We remarked, however, that we did not see a single drunken person on the streets—and that was 3 a.m. on Christmas day.

Although this Bill is only a small one, it does achieve several things. For instance, it removes the anomaly which at present exists whereby some hotels on the borderline are permitted to stay open and serve drinks; while others, because of a curious quirk in connection with the reckoning of distances, are just outside the borderline, as the crow flies, but within the borderline by road or sea.

In my opinion, if these hotels were allowed to stay open, we would spread the trade and perhaps, to some extent, reduce the road risks which are involved because men will drink a lot of liquor in a limited time. At the same time, I think the demand is prevalent and that by spreading the number of vehicles over a larger number of places, the road hazard will be reduced.

Incidentally, the passing of the Bill would bring the practice into line with that existing on the goldfields. Although I admit that the metropolitan area has always had hotels closed on Sundays, I frankly cannot see the logic of allowing some hotels in the country to provide drink within certain hours, and prohibiting others because they happen to be in the city area.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: The people there have no silicosis dust to wash down; but they have in Kalgoorlie.

The Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: That may be the reason. But the point is that there would be an adverse reaction to any attempt made to introduce Sunday trading in the metropolitan area. Frankly I cannot see why certain hotels, such as the Sawyers Valley Hotel and the Rockingham Hotel, should be open, and the others, mentioned in Mr. Baxter's Bill, should be closed. If this Bill were passed, it would be a move in the right direction, and would tend to bring our customs more into line with those in other countries.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [8.50]: There are one or two other aspects of this measure which I would like to bring to the attention of the House. Mr. Simpson said he could see no reason why the Sawyers Valley Hotel and the Rockingham Hotel, with others, should have a monopoly of this type of trade for people travelling out of the city. But I think it is our duty to give some thought to the economics of this matter.

I take it for granted that when a person buys or leases a particular hotel, the weekly profit made by the premises would naturally affect the price paid. I have no doubt that this was so in the case of the hotels mentioned in Mr. Baxter's Bill, the purpose of which is to spread the Sunday trade over a larger number of hotels.

I do not think there will be any great increase in the quantity of drink consumed. It has long been my belief that there is a certain amount of money to be spent on beer; and if hotels are open from 9 a.m. till 6 p.m., there will be much the same amount of money spent as if they are open from 9 a.m. till midnight. After all, the big trade in beer is not in the saloon bar or in the lounge, but in the front, or public bar.

As I have said, the main purpose of this Bill is to distribute the Sunday trading among those who enjoy it now and the five hotels enumerated. I do not know how long the present proprietors have been in the hotels mentioned in the Bill. It could well be that one or two have moved in only within the last six months; but if this Bill were passed, there would be a pretty marked jump in the amount to be paid for ingoing.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: I don't think so.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I think some cognisance should be given to that fact. I would be happier, if this Bill were passed, if a period were allowed to elapse to permit of some sort of adjustment.

I cannot remember whether I have ever been in the Rockingham Hotel on a Sunday; but I have seen it comparatively recently, and I know there has been a lot

of money spent there, a great proportion of which must have been spent because the hotel enjoys Sunday trading.

I cannot, for the life of me, follow the argument about tourists. I think we mix up our terms a little. We mention tourists generally, when actually we mean Sunday trippers or holiday-makers. It is time someone in authority defined the term. But to me a tourist has always been an interstate visitor. Such a person usually stays at a hotel, anyway, and can obtain a drink when he requires it. He would probably spend a fair amount of his time in the city, and therefore the Bill would not affect him. The Sunday tripper goes out for a drive with Mum and the children.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Not so much with Mum.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The majority of them do. I cannot see any great advantage in giving another three or four hotels permission to open on a Sunday. The Sunday tripper has any amount of opportunities to obtain lemonade; or he can stop and boil the billy and enjoy a picnic with the kiddies.

The only towns in which the opening of hotels on Sundays is warranted are those without any clubs or other such amenities. For instance, a town like Kirup enjoys Sunday sport; and it is an occasion for the towns-people to have a drink or two, and then go to their sport. But I cannot see any great virtue in having a ring of hotels around the metropolitan area to which people can drive on a Sunday afternoon, when all sorts of other people are out on the roads, because the roads are fairly busy these days.

The Hon. N. E. Baxter: What about the situation now?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Anyone who has read the reports on the tests made in connection with alcohol content in the blood are fully aware of the effect of even a couple of schooners. To satisfy those people who need a drink on Sunday, it would be much better to forget the ring of hotels and open those in the city, because the people could walk to them or take a taxi. That would be infinitely preferable; because, as we all know, the number of road deaths is becoming absolutely frightful. Road accidents are killing more people than were killed in the last war.

Therefore I think the more sensible idea would be to open hotels in the city. If anyone drove 20 miles to obtain a drink, he should be sent back home. I know it is a difficult problem; and I know that there are some arguments in favour of this Bill, such as those expressed by Mr. Heenan. However, balancing them all up, I am afraid I cannot support the measure.

THE HON. C. R. ABBEY (Central) [8.58]: I support the Bill, although I have one small complaint: It does not go

far enough. In the measure is mentioned a distance of 20 miles from the Town Hall in Perth, when measured by the shortest road or sea route. We have many hotels in a comparable situation which should be included. I say this because I have experienced driving against the stream of traffic which comes from Rockingham and Mandurah following the closure of the Sunday session. Most of the cars have their lights on, and it is very unpleasant driving against them—at times it is almost impossible. Some people are even tempted to pull up to allow the traffic to pass.

If this Bill were passed, that problem would be overcome to a certain extent, because the traffic would be spread over other areas. It would also assist those who are not making a financial success of the hotels. I agree with Mr. MacKinnon that the wisest plan to follow would be to allow metropolitan hotels to open; and I intend to move an amendment to shorten the distance applying under this legislation. I support the Bill.

On motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee, debate adjourned until Tuesday, the 1st November.

STATE CONCERNS (PREVENTION OF DISPOSAL) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 4th October.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North—in reply) [9.0]: It is some time since the Bill was last debated; and the discussion has not been a long one. In fact the Bill itself, which has as its purpose the protection of the public's or the State's assets, is not a long one.

To refresh members' memories I shall refer briefly to the contents of the Bill, which attempts to do what the Minister explained to us on the 28th September; namely, to seek the approval of Parliament before any State trading concern or any other State concern may be disposed of.

When referring to the Bill, the Minister had very little to say in defence of his opposition to the measure—that is, in regard to up-to-date events. The Minister went back some 30 years and referred to a speech made by Mr. Baxter, the father of the Mr. Baxter who now sits in this Chamber. When Mr. Baxter spoke 30 years ago, he was speaking on the deletion from the State Trading Concerns Act of the very provision which I am endeavouring to re-insert in the Act.

My Bill does go a little further than the provision being dealt with at that time, because I seek to cover concerns that are not enumerated in the State Trading Concerns Act. Those concerns are such enterprises as the Rural and Industries Bank,

Chamberlain Industries, Wundowie Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry, the W.A. Meat Export Works, the State Electricity Commission, the State Government Insurance Office, and one or two others which are not quite so large. Tied up in the State Government Insurance Office, the R. & I. Bank, the Wundowie Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry, and the S.E.C. are some tremendous capital investments running into many millions of pounds. Because of that, my party thinks it is desirable that these assets should have the protection of parliamentary approval in regard to the sale of any of them.

The Minister, when speaking to the Bill, allowed himself to be carried away into fantastic fields of imagination. He suggested that we could possibly have a private member introducing a Bill to sell State trading concerns. Well, I suppose we could; but it certainly would be fantastic. I think the Minister used that argument hypothetically. I suggest it would be ridiculous to assume that any private member would introduce a Bill to sell a Government concern, whether it be large or small, without first consulting the Government; because the Government of the day always has a majority in the Legislative Assembly. So it would be impossible for anyone to dispose, by means of a private member's Bill, of any Government concern.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Not impossible.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It would be impossible if the Government did not agree; and it is quite certain that the Government of the day would not allow a private member to tell it what to do with its concerns; whether the Government be the present Government or any other Government.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It might be improbable, but it is not impossible.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I would say it would be highly improbable, if not impossible.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: That would be selling the Crown.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Of course we could not introduce a Bill in this Chamber to do anything like that, because it would be subject to the question of placing a burden on the people by way of disposing of their assets; and we cannot attempt to do anything like that.

When I introduced the Bill, I said that the Premier had made a public statement to the effect that he would sell the railways. The Minister, when he spoke to the Bill, said that, in accordance with the Railways Act, it was highly improbable that the Premier could sell the railways. It might be highly improbable, but again it would not be impossible, because the Railways Act contains sections providing that we cannot sell or lease a railway without the approval of Parliament. That does not

mean that we must bring a Bill along in order to dispose of a railway, but that we must put before Parliament the reasons why we wish to dispose of a railway; and, in the case of a lease of a railway, the reasons must be laid on the Table of the House; and if objection is taken, of course the lease does not proceed.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What the Premier said was that he would sell the railways if he could.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: If he could find a buyer.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is right. That is totally different from what you are saying.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The Railways Act does contain the very provisions I am endeavouring to have the House agree to.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is what I explained to you.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: We are not much worried about the railways. As the Minister said, the railways would not be easy to dispose of. We are, however, somewhat worried about such concerns as I have already mentioned—the R. & I. Bank, the Wundowie Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry, the State Building Supplies, the State Shipping Service, the Wyndham Meatworks, the export works, the Midland Junction Abattoir, and the Midland Junction saleyards. The saleyards, abattoir, and the State Shipping Service are part and parcel of our organised marketing and transport systems.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: The State Batteries.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Yes; as the honourable member says, the State Batteries could also be disposed of. But that would be highly unlikely with the present Minister.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It would be highly unlikely with any Minister. It would be highly improbable with even you as the Minister.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: But the Minister will not deny that it is the policy of his party to dispose of all State trading concerns.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Would you seriously suggest—

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The Minister will not deny that.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Would you seriously suggest that anybody could sell the State Batteries?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: One never knows what might be sold by the existing Government; because, as the Minister has told us, its policy is free enterprise. But in practice we know its policy is a different proposition altogether—it is private enterprise.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: We said we would dispose of State enterprises provided a reasonable price could be obtained. A

reasonable price could not be obtained for the State Batteries. You have only to spend 10 minutes in the Mines Department to find that out.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I am pleased to hear the Minister say that; but it all depends on what one terms a reasonable price. It is hard to say what would be a reasonable price for the R. & I. Bank, the State Government Insurance Office, or the State Building Supplies. The capital value of any of these institutions is tremendous—it runs into millions. It is most unlikely that a buyer could be found to take over these concerns. But there is nothing to stop a combination of organisations from absorbing them. But again the question of reasonable price would be involved. My Bill intends to safeguard the State's or the public's assets to the extent that Parliament, at least, will have knowledge of what is termed a reasonable price before any sale can be finalised.

I was very pleased with the speech made by Mr. Baxter. He was not led astray by the Minister's remarks when he referred to the speech made by Mr. Baxter's father some 30 years ago. The Minister made great play on the fact that Governments are responsible to the people. The argument by the late Mr. Baxter 30 years ago was that, because of that fact, there was no danger of the State's assets being disposed of at an unreasonable price, or unreasonably.

That is a fact with a democratic Government; but I interjected and said, "Providing the electoral boundaries are not gerrymandered." I have, from time to time, been given to understand by the Press that the electoral boundaries in Queensland and South Australia were gerrymandered for years. Of course I would not say that the boundaries are gerrymandered here; there is a law in Western Australia which prevents any gerrymandering.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Introduced by a Liberal Government.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It was introduced by a Liberal-Country Party Government, but not put into practice by any Liberal-Country Party Government. It was put into practice once by a Labor Government. The law, as it exists, deals with the question of gerrymandering; and it should be put into practice again if gerrymandering is to be prevented. So the argument that Governments are answerable to the people is quite sound and valid provided the people have a democratic vote and democratic representation. Nobody can argue against that point of view.

I am not going to labour the whys and wherefores of this matter. Members are well aware of exactly what the Bill means; and they know their responsibilities in connection with public moneys and public trusts; and public moneys and public trusts are tied up in State-owned assets.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Before you sit down, will you tell us what you think of Mr. Baxter's proposed amendment?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The Minister, Mr. President, would like to know my views on Mr. Baxter's amendment.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: The House might like to know.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I consider that Mr. Baxter's amendment is quite a good one. I agree with what the Minister said during his speech: that this Bill is a very broad and wide one. I admit it is. It covers every State-owned concern. Nevertheless, there are some concerns, such as the State hotels, regarding which I agree with the Minister that, to dispose of them, there would be no need to bring a Bill before Parliament. The reason for that is that in the days when State hotels were required, private enterprise did not have sufficient inducement to provide the service that was given by them in the back country. However, those days have passed.

I would have liked to see Mr. Baxter's amendment include the State Shipping Service. Now that the north-west has started to go ahead, even this Government has realised that the State Shipping Service is just as important to the north-west as rail and road transport services are to the south. I sincerely hope and believe that the Government will not dispose of the State Shipping Service as it exists at present, and provide a substitute.

Therefore I am sorry that Mr. Baxter did not see fit to include the State Shipping Service among those concerns which he feels should be the subject of a Bill brought to Parliament before they are sold or disposed of. The concerns he named were the State Engineering Works, the State Building Supplies, the Wyndham Meat Works, and the Wundowie Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry. I support that amendment wholly and solely.

However, there are other concerns—such as the R. & I. Bank, and the State Government Insurance Office—which I would also like to see included in that amendment. That would be a matter for the House to decide if it feels it should give consideration to the Bill in Committee. I sincerely hope the House will give consideration to this measure in Committee and debate that item or any other item.

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

Ayes—16.

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. A. R. Jones
Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. G. E. Jeffery	Hon. W. F. Willesee

(Teller.)

Noes—13.

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. S. T. J. Thompson
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. R. C. Mattiske	(Teller.)

Majority for—3.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

*As to Committee Stage***THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North)**

[9.22]: I move—

That the Committee stage of the Bill be taken on Tuesday, the 1st November 1960.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 7.30 p.m. tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.24 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 25th October, 1960

CONTENTS

ASSENT TO BILLS	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	2095
Agriculture Protection Board : Expenditure in Pilbara area	2097
Albany Harbour : Construction of third berth	2095
Bogie Castings—	
Ban by railway unions on imports	2096
Suitability of Bradford Kendall Ltd. as contractors to W.A.G.R.	2096
Effects of Bradford Kendall Ltd. contract	2096
Position of employees of Hadfields Ltd.	2096
Building Industry : Apprentices	2098
Carnarvon Junior High School : Accommodation for additional pupils	2095
Carnarvon Primary School : Completion and future requirements	2095
Collie Infectious Diseases Hospital : Capital cost of alterations	2099
Collie Maternity Hospital : Capital cost	2099

CONTENTS—continued

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—continued	Page
Collie Railway Institute : Capital cost	2099
Collie Schools : Capital cost	2099
Electricity Supplies : Cost of erection of street poles	2100
Hospital Benefits : Liberalising existing policy	2095
Local Government Bill : Proclamation and effect on municipalities	2098
Perth-Kalgoorlie Railway : Freights on sugar, fruit essences, and aerated waters	2097
Quarrying for Minerals : Regulations	2098
Silicosis—	
Scope of committee's inquiry	2097
Tabling of report	2097
State Hotels : Disbursement of money from sales	2100
Virgin Land : Area classified, blocks surveyed, and land open for selection	2099
Water Meters : New installations—Effect on departmental finances	2097
West Collie Railway Yards : Capital cost	2099
Wittenoom Water Supply : Restrictions	2097
QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE—	
Wellington Dam Opening : Presence of police	2101
BILLS—	
Acts Amendment (Superannuation and Pensions) Bill—	
2r.	2101
Message : Appropriation	2104
Architects Act Amendment Bill : Assent	2095
Betting Control Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	2114
Com. ; report	2118
Betting Investment Tax Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	2119
Com. ; report	2119
Companies Bill : 1r.	2101
Country Areas Water Supply Act Amendment Bill : 2r.	2126
Criminal Code Amendment Bill : Assent	2095
Firearms and Guns Act Amendment Bill : Assent	2095
Fisheries Act Amendment Bill : 1r.	2101
Government Railways Act Amendment Bill : 1r.	2101
Interstate Maintenance Recovery Act Amendment Bill : Assent	2095
Local Authorities, British Empire and Commonwealth Games Contributions Authorisation Bill : Assent	2095
Local Government Bill : Returned	2101
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment Bill : 1r.	2101
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment Bill : Assent	2095
Noxious Weeds Act Amendment Bill : Assent	2095
Optometrists Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	2104
Com.	2108
Paper Mill Agreement Bill : Report	2101
Simultaneous Deaths Bill : 1r.	2101
Stock Diseases Act Amendment Bill : Assent	2095
Totalisator Agency Board Betting Bill : Report	2101