

# Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 15th September, 1959

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :</b>	
Goldfields high schools, effects of merger	1581
Rural electricity supplies, conversion of current	1582
Train crew staff, reduction at Geraldton	1582
Rottnest Island, leasing of land	1582
Fruit fly, destruction of infested fruit and cases	1582
Court fees, payments to jurors and witnesses	1583
Entertainment tax, reduction	1583
Settlers' timber reserves, Harvey Road Board district	1583
Midland Junction Abattoir, sale of hocks and sheep's skulls	1584
Gascoyne River water conservation, election campaign statement, and steps taken	1584
<b>QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE :</b>	
Delay in asking	1584
<b>BILLS :</b>	
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, 3r.	1584
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act and Traffic Act Amendments, 3r.	1584
State Electricity Commission Act Amendment (No. 2)—	
2r.	1584
Com., report	1585
Industrial Development (Kwinana Area) Act Amendment—	
2r.	1585
Com., report	1586
State Hotels (Disposal), Com.	1586
Filled Milk, returned	1606
Fire Brigades Act Amendment, returned	1606
Railways Classification Board Act Amendment, returned	1606
Noxious Weeds Act Amendment—	
2r.	1606
Com., report	1606
Interstate Maintenance Recovery—	
2r.	1606
Com., report	1607
National Fitness Act Amendment—	
Message appropriation	1607
2r.	1607
Art Gallery, Council's amendments	1608

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

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### GOLDFIELDS HIGH SCHOOLS

#### *Effects of Merger*

1. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) With the proposed merger of the two Goldfields High Schools and the Boulder High School becoming an annexe of the Eastern

Goldfields High School, will all first-year students be directed to Boulder? If not, what grade, or grades, will attend at Boulder?

- (2) When the merger takes place, will the home science centre at Kalgoorlie still be used?
- (3) How many units of responsibility will the combined high school carry?
- (4) When the proposed merger operates, will five avenues of promotion for teachers—namely, the positions now held at Boulder High School of principal, deputy principal, senior mistress, and senior masters—disappear?
- (5) Exactly where on the Eastern Goldfields High School site will the proposed 10 new classrooms be built?
- (6) When the new classrooms are completed, what will become of the existing accommodation at the Boulder High School?
- (7) What were the improvements made and the amount of money spent on same at the Boulder High School this year?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) It has not yet been decided. The Superintendent of Secondary Education will report on the implementation of the merging of the two high schools in the near future.
- (2) Yes—temporarily.
- (3) Four.
- (4) The positions of principal and deputy principal at Boulder High School will disappear. The number of senior assistants at Eastern Goldfields High School will be increased from five to eight when the merger is effected.
- (5) Plans have not yet been prepared.
- (6) This matter will be given consideration when the additions are completed.
- (7) (a) Repairs and renovations to main building.
- (b) Additions to manual training room and alterations to provide science room.
- (c) New ablutions.
- (d) The cost of the foregoing is £5,845 16s. spent as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
1958	1,500	0	0
1959	4,205	16	0
Still to be paid on completion of maintenance	140	0	0
Total	£5,845	16	0

**RURAL ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES***Conversion of Current*

2. Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Electricity:

- (1) Has any money been set aside for the purpose of providing assistance towards the cost of converting rural electricity undertakings from direct to alternating current?
- (2) If so—

- (a) what amount has been allocated for this purpose during the current financial year;
- (b) is this financial assistance available to both private concessionaires and local authorities;
- (c) how many applications for financial assistance towards this conversion cost have been received to date and what is the total amount of the assistance applied for?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) (a) £89,000.
- (b) Consideration would be given to applications for assistance from both private concessionaires and local authorities.
- (c) Four applications have been dealt with which involve financial assistance to the extent of £68,250. A further two applications have been received for assistance totalling £37,500 and are now under consideration.

**TRAIN CREW STAFF***Reduction at Geraldton*

3. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Railways:

Is it the intention of the Railway Department to cut down the running train crew staff at the Geraldton depot by four sets (four engine drivers, four firemen and four guards) thus making Mullewa the home station for the Northern area, with Narngulu as the return point for Mullewa based crews?

Mr. COURT replied:

There is no intention at present of altering existing arrangements at Geraldton, although they are still under consideration.

**ROTTNEST ISLAND***Leasing of Land*

4. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Lands:

- (1) Has any representation been made to him or the Rottnest Board of Control by private individuals

or companies for the leasing of land at Rottnest for the purposes of—

- (a) erection of cottages for private use;
  - (b) erection of cottages or chalets for letting?
- (2) Will he give an undertaking that no land will be leased for the purposes referred to?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) (a) Yes.
- (b) Yes.
- (2) Although no leases have been approved, no such undertaking will be given, as future development of Rottnest Island must be considered in the light of circumstances which may exist at the time.

**FRUIT FLY***Destruction of Infested Fruit and Cases*

5. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What was the number of fruit fly condemnations (all fruits) at the Metropolitan Markets last season?
- (2) Are cases known to have carried fruit fly infested fruit destroyed, and who is the responsible authority to supervise the destruction of such cases?
- (3) What was the number of fruit fly condemnations in exportable fruit for the years 1956-57 and 1957-58; and from which districts did the condemned fruit come?
- (4) Is export fruit, when found to be infested with fruit fly, destroyed with cases, and who is responsible for the destruction of infested fruit and cases?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) 678 cases.
- (2) Condemned fruit is incinerated in the cases, and this is supervised by the Department of Agriculture.
- (3)—

Year	Apples	Pears	Plums	Grapes
1956-57 ..	81	53	nil	90
1957-58 ..	723	47	31	275

Detailed records are not available but it is known that rejected fruit was mainly from commercial orchards adjacent to the metropolitan area.

- (4) Fruit found to be infested with fruit fly is destroyed. However, much of the fruit rejected is in an unripe condition and showing fruit fly stings only. The Department of Agriculture is responsible.

**COURT FEES***Payments to Jurors and Witnesses*

6. Mr. HALL asked the Attorney-General:

- (1) What are the fees paid to jurors per day?
- (2) What are the fees paid to persons called as witnesses at Courts of Sessions and Local Courts?
- (3) Has he given consideration to increasing jurors' and witnesses fees in all courts?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) Jurors attending courts in the Perth and agricultural jury districts, £2 per day.  
In the Goldfields jury district, £2 7s. per day.  
In the North-West jury district, £2 12s. per day.  
In extraordinary circumstances such remuneration may be allowed as shall be decided by the Attorney-General.
- (2) (a) Courts of sessions, criminal session of the Supreme Court, before justices in petty sessions and other summary jurisdiction or on any inquest—

- (i) Professional men—£3 3s. per day.
- (ii) All other male persons of or above the age of 21 years—£1 10s. per day.
- (iii) Male persons between the ages of 18 and 21 years—£1 per day.
- (iv) Adult female witnesses engaged in remunerative employment—£1 per day.
- (v) Other adult female witnesses and female witnesses between the ages of 18 and 21 years—15s. per day.

Where a witness receiving salary or wages as an employee proves to the satisfaction of the Under Secretary for Law that the amount of the allowance is less than the salary or wages lost in attending court the Under Secretary for Law may direct payment of the difference.

In extraordinary circumstances, or in case of dispute, such remuneration shall be allowed as shall be determined by the Attorney-General.

(b) Local Courts:

- (i) Professional persons—£1 1s. to £3 3s. per day.
- (ii) All other witnesses over the age of 17 years ordinarily in receipt of salary or wages or who carry on business as principals — 10s. to £1 10s. per day.
- (iii) Expert and scientific witnesses attending to give evidence strictly as experts—£1 1s. to £3 3s. per day.  
Plus a qualifying allowance maximum—£3 3s.
- (iv) Persons not coming within any of the above descriptions—5s. to 15s. per day.
- (3) No. Fees for jurors were reviewed and increased in February 1954. Fees payable to witnesses were reviewed and increased in May, 1952. The provision that increased payments may be approved enables any case of hardship to be dealt with sympathetically.

**ENTERTAINMENT TAX***Reduction*

7. Mr. HEAL asked the Premier:  
When will the entertainment tax be reduced, as promised in his policy speech?

Mr. BRAND replied:

This matter is still under consideration.

**SETTLERS' TIMBER RESERVES***Harvey Road Board District*

8. Mr. I. W. MANNING asked the Minister for Forests:
- (1) What area of land has been set aside as settlers' timber reserves in the Harvey Road Board district?
  - (2) Where is each of these reserves situated, and what is the approximate acreage?
  - (3) What is the condition of the jarrah timber on each of these reserves?
  - (4) What conditions are settlers, taking timber from these reserves, expected to comply with?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) and (2) Three reserves, namely—  
Reserve 17805 of about 345 acres, plan 383 D/40 C.4., situated one mile south-east of Harvey railway station.

Reserve 14564 of about 150 acres, plan 383 C/40 D.4., situated seven miles east of Harvey.

Reserve 3672 of about 21 acres, plan 383 A/40 C.2., which adjoins the south-east boundary of Wagerup townsite.

- (3) Reserve 17805. Has been cut over by settlers for fence post requirements but timber suitable for milling and some rough pole timber remains.

Reserve 14564. Carries some timber suitable for farmers' requirements, situated on the western scarp. Jarrah mixed with marri.

Reserve 3672. Small area in sandy country. Small quantity of timber which is considered more suitable for milling.

- (4) Settlers would be required to take out a forest produce license, pay the ruling royalty rate, and confine their operations to trees that would be marked by a forest officer.

#### MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR

##### *Sale of Hocks and Sheep's Skulls*

9. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) With reference to question No. 8 on the notice paper of Thursday, the 10th September, relative to the sale of hocks and sheep's skulls by the Midland Junction Abattoir why were all tenders rejected?
- (2) Who succeeded in obtaining the contract?
- (3) Was the person who obtained the contract amongst the tenderers whose tenders were rejected?
- (4) Is the contract price above or below the highest price which was submitted amongst the tenders which were rejected?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) The board was not satisfied with any tender received, and decided on the 10th September, 1959, to recall tenders.
- (2) No-one.
- (3) Answered by No. (1).
- (4) Answered by No. (1).

#### GASCOYNE RIVER WATER CONSERVATION

##### *Election Campaign Statement, and Steps Taken*

10. Mr. NORTON asked the Premier:

- (1) Is it a fact that, during the general election campaign in March last, he publicly stated at Carnarvon that if his Party were returned to the Treasury benches

he would obtain the best technical advice possible in respect to water conservation in the Gascoyne River, even if it meant obtaining this from overseas?

- (2) If so, what steps has he taken?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) and (2) The matter is now being examined by local engineers and further consideration will be given when the report is prepared.

#### MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

##### *Third Reading*

Read a third time and passed.

#### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

##### *Delay in Asking*

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had risen in time to ask a question without notice.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member was too late. I gave him plenty of time and made a distinct pause. If members have questions without notice they must be ready to ask them.

#### MOTOR VEHICLE (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) ACT AND TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENTS BILL

##### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

##### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 10th September.

MR. WATTS (Stirling—Minister for Electricity—in reply) [4.45]: I do not know that there is much to reply to in regard to the debate on this Bill. Unfortunately I was not present at the time, but I believe the Leader of the Opposition expressed the view that the proposal was unnecessary. As long as he did not say it was undesirable, I do not think his opposition amounts to very much.

It is true that in the course of the remarks I made, I said that at first sight I doubted the necessity for it; but on examination of the situation as it existed in regard to the extensions of electric power into various parts of Western Australia, I had come to the conclusion that the requests made by responsible bodies, including the Road Board Association of Western Australia, were reasonable, and hence the presentation of this Bill to Parliament.

As I pointed out, the Bill is not to come into operation until a date to be fixed by proclamation. That may be in the near

future or a little later on, but it will certainly be brought into operation only when a suitable individual of whom the Government approves has been found to be appointed to the commission's board. There is no doubt whatever in my mind that no harm can be done; and much good may accrue from the addition to this body of another representative of the country districts, provided that representative is properly selected and is a person who could compare with the one we already had on the commission for a number of years.

As I indicated, the development, in the early days, of the State Electricity Commission was almost entirely in the south-western districts proper, and the gentleman who was appointed to represent the country consumers came from that area only. Now the State Electricity Commission's ramifications have extended far to the east of that, and are extending still further day by day; and, without any question, the reasonableness of the approach of the Road Board Association and of the other bodies I have mentioned, I think, becomes more apparent. So I have every confidence that the House will agree to the Bill, and that in the net result good will accrue to the commission and to its operations in Western Australia.

**Question put and passed.**

**Bill read a second time.**

*In Committee*

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

## **INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (KWINANA AREA) ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 10th September.

**MR. HAWKE** (Northam) [4.52]: I support this Bill. Its main purpose is to bring under the provisions of the parent Act an area of land which the State of Western Australia purchased from the Commonwealth Government in the year 1954. Normally, it would be desirable that this land be brought under the provisions of the Act in order that it might be made available for industrial development in the Kwinana area when a reasonable opportunity presents itself to dispose of the land to good advantage.

I raise the point as to the advisability of the committee which operates under the parent Act having power greater than the power which is in the hands of the Government under the provisions of the same Act. The Minister or the Government cannot act in regard to the making available

of land under this Act unless the committee first makes a favourable recommendation to the Minister. Members of the committee are the Town Planning Commissioner; a representative of the Chamber of Manufactures; and, at this moment, the Director of Industrial Development, although no such position exists. When this Bill becomes law, the Director of Industrial Development, as such, will cease to have a position on the committee, and his place will be taken by the then executive officer of that department.

The question then arises—although we cannot decide it in connection with this Bill—as to whether a committee of that kind should have the final say; or as to whether the Government, through the Minister, should have the final say when any difference of opinion develops. However, I raise that matter only for the purpose of suggesting to the Minister that he might possibly give some thought to it before Parliament meets next year. Then, if he considers the Government should have the final authority when a difference of opinion does develop between the Minister and the committee, he could introduce a further amending Bill next year.

In his second reading speech the Minister stressed the importance of providing as much employment locally in the Kwinana district as possible. He talked about the people there at present being in a position where not all of them who were seeking employment could obtain it on the spot. This is no new problem. It is a problem which exists in every country town of any consequence. Every young person in Albany, for instance, cannot get employment in Albany. The same applies at Geraldton, Northam—

**Mr. Evans:** Kalgoorlie.

**Mr. HAWKE:** — Kalgoorlie, Beverley, and all the rest of the places. So I would suggest to the Minister that there are more places than Kwinana and more places than the metropolitan area, or some parts of it, where employment is not always readily available at the back door of every person who is seeking it. I suppose it might be a good thing, although it could perhaps be doubtful, if employment were available on a plate at everybody's back door, irrespective of where he or she lived.

That might, from the employment point of view, be the millennium; but whether it would be good for everybody concerned is, I think, a bit doubtful. If every young person could get a job on a plate just where he or she is living, I suppose that might have some merit; but whether, in the long run, it would be to the good of the State, and to the good of the standard of persons who would then live in the State, is probably open to a considerable amount of argument.

However, I only raise that question because the Minister did emphasise very strongly in support of this Bill the argument that some people in the Kwinana district were not able to obtain employment at their back doors at the present time. I said at the beginning that I support the second reading of this Bill.

**MR. COURT** (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development—in reply) [4.58]: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his support of this Bill. He raised two cogent points, one being the power of the committee under section 6 of the principal Act. I must confess that when I was examining the proposed Bill in relation to the parent Act I received something of a shock when I read paragraph (c) of section 6, which provides that unless the committee approves the proposed exercise of the power, the Minister shall not exercise it.

It could be that a very desirable project was contemplated by the Government and it could not be proceeded with because the committee said "No"; and there is no right of appeal, as it were, so far as the Government is concerned. The only other action would be for the Government to come to Parliament and have the transaction approved or obtain a general amendment.

Mr. Hawke: I think that part of the Act was insisted upon originally by the Legislative Council.

Mr. COURT: There is one redeeming feature about it. While the provision is in the Act, it will make the Minister very cautious about the proposition he puts forward to the committee.

So far as the second point is concerned—namely, the emphasis placed by me on the need for an ever-increasing amount of employment and diversity of employment in the Kwinana area—I am conscious of the fact that we have this problem in many parts of the State. The Kalgoorlie-Boulder problem comes to mind. We have heard of the problem at Collie, as well; and, in fact, in any of the provincial towns, once the population gets to a certain point, we have an insoluble problem unless we can arrange for the establishment of some large industry to absorb a high proportion of the junior male and female labour in the town.

The matter is well in the mind of the Government, and I did not want to emphasise it as a problem peculiar to the Kwinana area. The problem, which is common in many provincial centres, is receiving attention from the Government.

Mr. Nulsen: It is a real problem even in Norseman, now, for the young people leaving school to obtain suitable employment.

Mr. COURT: That is true; and in the main it becomes a problem of transportation. Most of these districts have a fairly

stable labour force if we could induce industry to go there, and if we could get the products out on a basis to make the industry economic. Ways and means to overcome the problem are being examined; but it is not easy of solution, as the previous Government found. I thank the honourable member for his support of the Bill.

**Question put and passed.**

**Bill read a second time.**

### *In Committee*

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

## **STATE HOTELS (DISPOSAL) BILL**

### *In Committee*

Resumed from the 10th September. The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Roberts) in the Chair; Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Chief Secretary) in charge of the Bill.

**Clause 2—Cancellation of reserves (partly considered):**

**Clause put and passed.**

**Clause 3—Power to sell or lease State Hotels mentioned in Schedule:**

Mr. MOIR: My amendment is to permit the people in the area where the hotels are situated to have the first opportunity, or option, of purchasing the hotels. It was difficult to word the amendment, because most of the provisions deal with bodies which are not in existence at the present time. Also, it was not easy to frame an amendment that would do all the things that are necessary. The most important part of the amendment is that portion which states that any profits accruing shall be used to provide or maintain amenities within the district.

At Cunderdin we have a good example of a private hotel having been purchased by a community centre. I do not think anyone with knowledge of the position at Cunderdin would dispute the fact that the performance of the people there has been meritorious, both in the manner in which they conduct the hotel and in the way in which they use the proceeds.

The people at Wongan Hills—no doubt after closely examining the position at Cunderdin—decided that they, too, would like to conduct a hotel on the same basis; and overtures were made to the previous Government, which agreed to dispose of the hotel to them. I feel sure those people are conducting the hotel successfully.

No quarrel can be found with this proposal; and it must have an appeal to those who espouse the cause of the co-operative system, because the proposal is truly a co-operative one—more so than most projects. No shareholder will obtain personal gain. The only gain that anyone will get will be the feeling that comes from having

played a part in a community effort. The proceeds, instead of being available to shareholders, will be used for projects and amenities within the district.

I am disappointed that the Minister for Transport is not present, as no doubt I would get some support from him. On the 14th August, 1946, the Minister—he was then a private member—moved the following motion:—

That where a local community desires to take over a State hotel to be run by it as a "community hotel," on a co-operative basis, giving good service and using profits for financing local amenities, this House considers that the Government should adopt a policy designed to make possible and further this objective.

From that motion, members can see that what I am putting forward is not a new idea. Quite a number of members, who are now sitting on the Government side of the Chamber, were in support of the motion.

It is with confidence that I put my amendment forward. We must remember that a large proportion of the amounts that have been earned by the hotels—we know those amounts are considerable from the figures given last week—have been provided by the people who live in the districts concerned. If the amendment is agreed to, it will enable residents of the districts concerned to purchase State hotels, if they wish to do so and can raise the finance.

Mr. EVANS: I support the amendment, as it will give residents of districts where State hotels are situated an opportunity of forming community companies for the purpose of taking over those establishments, if they are offered for sale or lease by the Government, and running them for the benefit of the district. I oppose, on principle, the sale of State hotels; and I can speak with feeling on this subject in regard to the State hotel at Gwalia, where I lived for a number of years.

That hotel was built in 1903 to meet the needs of the community; because private enterprise was reluctant at that time to risk investment in the town, in view of the fact that the Sons of Gwalia mine was the main source of employment there; and it had many ups and downs. The member for Murchison knows the conditions that exist in that area; and it is difficult to imagine what would be the circumstances of people there, were it not for the existence of the State hotel. The figures indicate that that hotel owes the taxpayers of Western Australia nothing; instead, it has contributed a great deal to the revenue of this State.

If the people of any centre where there is a State hotel indicate their desire to form a community company and purchase it, they should be given preference over private enterprise. I do not know

how many members of this Chamber have visited Nuriootpa, in South Australia; but that is a town built on a community basis. It opens one's eyes to see the amenities provided there for the people by the people; and it is an ideal example of the working of a true co-operative. It is an example of what could be done by communities in this State, if they were enabled to purchase the State hotels.

I have read the speech made by the Minister for Police in 1946, when he expressed the same views on this question as are embodied in this amendment. He believed then that the people of a district should be enabled to take over and run the local State hotel on a co-operative basis; and so I hope that, if he is present when the question is put, he will support the amendment.

I wonder how the member for Moore feels in this regard, seeing that the people of Wongan Hills last year—with the support of a sympathetic Government—formed a community company and took over the running of the State hotel there. I am sure the honourable member is proud of his constituents and what they are doing in that district; and so I feel confident that he will not be a party to refusing people elsewhere an opportunity to do likewise.

Mr. J. Hegney: What are they running that hotel for?

Mr. EVANS: For the benefit of the people of the district. Clause 3 states, "Notwithstanding the provisions of any Act", and so on. The other night the Minister for Police refused to accept an amendment proposed by the member for Guildford-Midland, because he thought it might clutter up the legislation, and he believed legislation should be precise. I cannot understand the Government including this clause; because, if it wants to be precise and maintain the niceties of its legislation, it should amend any other Act which may be involved. I support the amendment.

Mr. MOIR: I regret that when speaking earlier I omitted formally to move the amendment. I therefore move as follows:—

Page 2—Add after subclause (1) the following proviso:—

Provided the Governor shall sell or lease any of the hotels only to a community company until the expiration of eighteen months from the coming into operation of this Act and if within that period a community company makes an offer to purchase or lease an hotel at a satisfactory price, or on satisfactory terms, the Governor shall accept that offer.

A community company means a company formed by residents within the district and registered

under the Companies Act, 1943-1954, whose aims and objects shall be to purchase or lease, operate and maintain an hotel within the district for the benefit of that district. Any profits accruing from such undertaking shall be used to provide and/or maintain any public amenities within that district.

Mr. NORTON: I am surprised that the provision contained in the amendment is not embodied in the Bill, particularly in view of the motion moved in this House by the Minister for Police in 1946, involving the self-same principle. Referring members to South Australia for an illustration, as the member for Kalgoorlie did, I would remind this Chamber of Renmark, for instance, which was practically built on the proceeds of the community hotel there. In this State a prime example of what can be done is to be found at Cunderdin, where the people had the foresight, a few years ago, to purchase the local State hotel.

In last week's edition of the *Weekend Mail*, under the heading of "How to get sports fields, pool and trotting track free," we read the following:—

Cunderdin has done it, Wongan Hills is doing it. Why can't other communities do it too?

Why can't they take over and run their town hotels?

Ten years ago running their own hotel was a novelty for the people of Cunderdin, and an experiment in community effort.

Take a quick look at Cunderdin to-day and not even the abstainers would deny it: the experiment has been a whacking success.

In its Greater Sports Ground the town has football and cricket fields, a trotting track, swimming pool, tennis club and bowling green.

Other improvements are a new road board office, a memorial avenue, and finally an attractive beer garden.

The pride of the townsfolk in these achievements, and the fact that they stem from running their own hotel and their own affairs, must be causing a good deal of soul-searching elsewhere.

That is a good example of what can be done by a community running its own hotel; and we find the Minister for Police trying to secure the Bruce Rock Hotel for the same purpose. The people of Wongan Hills purchased their hotel from the State, and are running it now for the benefit of their own district. If any State hotel is to be disposed of by the Government, it should definitely be offered first to the people of the area concerned, so that, if they wish to, they may take it over and run it for the benefit of their district.

In the taking over of State hotels by local communities, price should be no object; because, as the member for Boulder pointed out during the debate on the second reading, they have paid for themselves over the years and have, in fact, shown a net profit to the Treasury of £285,000, after taking into consideration depreciation, interest, and sinking fund, as well as the administrative costs attached to running a Government department. I repeat that, if these hotels are sold to co-operatives in the districts concerned, price should not be taken into consideration.

If a State hotel is sold to a private company, very little of the profit derived from it is spent in the district, and most of it goes to shareholders who are non-residents of the district concerned. I will be greatly surprised if members on the Government side, who represent country districts, do not support the amendment. Throughout the State, in farming communities, one sees co-operative movements in operation almost everywhere.

The people have supported co-operative movements because they themselves are deriving a profit from them. They enjoy a benefit which otherwise would not have been available to them. The handing over of the State hotels, even without any charge to the people in the districts concerned, would mean that they would be an asset to the State. I am satisfied that any co-operative effort in any district is well worth while. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I am surprised to see a Bill of this nature before the Chamber; and, in my opinion, the amendment should be supported by all members. The State Hotels belong to the people. I might remind the Minister that he is a member of at least one club which, in effect, is a communal organisation; and, therefore, if the Minister wishes to continue this practice of selling State hotels, he will soon be attempting to introduce legislation to effect the sale of clubs such as Tattersall's. If he attempts this, I presume that the Fremantle Workers' Club would be one of the first to be affected.

Mr. Bovell: How can he sell something which does not belong to him?

Mr. LAWRENCE: Is not that what he is doing now? Is it not a fact that the State hotels belong to the people? Probably a very tiny part of them belongs to the Minister.

Mr. Hawke: Yes, the key-hole.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I hope he does not put his eye to it or he will probably get a cold. The State Hotels definitely belong to the people, and any person who tries to sell them is prostituting the people's own assets. In my opinion, the administrators can be blamed for the losses that have been incurred by the State hotels; and, in turn, the responsibility must be laid at the feet of the Minister.



Since this Tory Government has taken the reins of office it has continued its practice of toadying to the powers that be. I refer to the tycoons of the State who represent private enterprise. If the State hotels had been properly administered by the present and past Ministers, in all probability the hotels would not be in their present condition. However, that cannot be used as an excuse for their sale.

I suggest to the Minister that if he is desirous of selling something that belongs to the people, he should hold a referendum on the question. The provision contained in the amendment would not come into operation until 18 months hence; and following the expiration of that period, if any local community had not shown its willingness to buy a State hotel, the Government could proceed to sell it to private interests. That is only fair and just. I understand that there are some State hotels which have been run very successfully on a community basis. If one hotel has proved to be successful, surely all of them can be managed successfully.

In any event, this proviso contained in the amendment will give the people an opportunity to purchase the State hotels in their districts if they so desire. If they are not sold to communal interests, they will only be sold to the Swan Brewery, which already owns 50 per cent. of the hotels in the State. It is evident that there is quite a large monopoly by the brewery of the liquor trade in the Eastern States, and we do not desire to see such a situation developing in this State.

**Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON:** On the face of it, it would appear that the member for Boulder has presented a sound case in support of his amendment. However, whilst his arguments seem reasonable and his story plausible, when one gives closer consideration to the amendment, it will be realised that there is no necessity for it. If the amendment is passed it will delay the sale of State hotels for at least 18 months; and, if any negotiations are entered into between the Government and any local community, it may be difficult to break such negotiations at a later stage, and the period of negotiation could prove to be indeterminate.

As the Bill is printed, there is nothing in it to prevent any local community from applying to purchase a State hotel. As every member knows, the Wongan Hills Hotel was bought by the local residents.

**Mr. Lawrence:** Do you think they could outbid the brewery?

**Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON:** I think that every application from a local community should be considered with applications from every quarter. Further, the acceptance of this restrictive amendment would mean that the State would not be recompensed to the full for the true value of a State hotel. For many years various local

communities have had the opportunity to purchase their local State hotel. There are many members of this Chamber who know that. A great deal of publicity was given in the Press to the negotiations that were entered into, over a period of years, between the local community and the Government over the purchase of the Wongan Hills Hotel. It must have been apparent to any community in the State that it could approach the Government to buy a State hotel. In fact, the Leader of the State made it known that he was prepared to sell the State hotels to local communities.

At the time, the Chief Secretary and the Under Treasurer both disapproved of the sale of the Wongan Hills Hotel, because they considered that unless it was decided to sell all the State hotels, the sale of one would undermine the whole structure of the State hotels administration. Despite their disapproval, the Government of the day went ahead and sold the Wongan Hills Hotel. Therefore, since then—and even before that time—local communities have had every opportunity to purchase State hotels; but they have always failed to take advantage of such opportunity.

**Mr. Norton:** Which communities?

**Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON:** The Bruce Rock and Corrigin communities each entertained the idea of purchasing the hotel in their respective districts, and considered such a proposition when the Wongan Hills Hotel was sold. Local communities, therefore, have had ample time to make application to purchase State hotels. I spoke to the Minister for Police on this matter, and he told me that the Bruce Rock and Corrigin communities had rejected the offer to purchase the State hotels in their respective districts. I oppose the amendment.

**Mr. FLETCHER:** I support the amendment because I agree that local communities should be given the opportunity to take over any State hotel in their districts. The amendment will enable the locals to do that. That is the only condition under which I would agree to the disposal of the property of the State to private interests. These hotels have been built with the taxpayers' money, and their sale should be considered in that light.

I disagree with the contention of the Minister that State hotels should be disposed of because they are run by the Government. The other evening he said the State hotels were a form of socialistic enterprise which can never be successfully run by the Government. That is a lame excuse to offer for the disposal of a public asset. It has been demonstrated that collectively the State hotels are an asset to the people. The member for Boulder proved that in the figures he submitted, which showed that the hotels

were a payable proposition. The Minister is impelling his Government to dispose of a payable asset run by the State.

The label of socialism was attached to State hotels by members opposite to imply that they were to be deplored because they were a form of socialistic enterprise. I might remind members that some forms of services provided to the public—electricity, water, the telegraph—are socialistic within limits, in that they are provided at charges below those which would be fixed by private enterprise if private enterprise ran those services.

I wonder what lobbying is going on in regard to the sale of State hotels? It is quite possible that brewery interests are behind the move to dispose of them. The Chief Secretary told us that the sale of one State hotel was being considered, but there is more than one State hotel here. In my view the local communities concerned should be given the first opportunity to take over any State hotel, no matter what other parties are interested.

The member for Kalgoorlie pointed out that in South Australia one local community running an hotel was conferring great benefits on the people of the district. I remember seeing pictures in the magazine "Pix" showing what can be achieved by this sort of project. The pictures showed swimming pools, kindergartens, creches, and other amenities provided for the community from the profits derived from the hotel taken over by the local community.

Mr. MAY: The Minister has not convinced me that the local communities concerned were not interested in taking over the State hotels. He was very hazy as to the information he had been able to obtain. The local communities should be given the first opportunity of taking over the State hotels in their districts. It is obvious to everyone that the successful tenderer under the proposal in the Bill will be the breweries. The breweries have a big enough monopoly now, without the opportunity being given to them to extent it. The Minister should consider the remarks made by members on this side of the House who contend that local communities should be given the opportunity to take over the State hotels. I am against the State hotels being handed over to the breweries.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What about the profits from wheat farms being taken over by the local communities?

Mr. MAY: That has nothing to do with the Bill before us. The State hotels have proved to be a great asset to the State; and if they are taken over by local communities, they will prove to be most beneficial to the people. I support the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS: I propose to support the amendment. During the second reading debate and the Committee stage, we heard

the merits of State ownership expounded as against the merits of private ownership, but I believe there is a happy compromise between the two, and that is co-operative ownership. I have been a supporter of the co-operative movement for many years, and I was the foundation chairman of my own local co-operative.

The amendment is designed to give community companies the first opportunity to purchase the State hotels. We know that they have done so on two previous occasions—in Cunderdin and in Wongan Hills. The Minister said that it was open to local communities for many years to take over the State hotels. The co-operative movement in the State, since 1912, has not been concerned with the running of hotels generally. One can, then, well appreciate the reluctance of some local communities to enter into ownership of hotels. From the teething troubles experienced, no doubt a great deal has been learned. I understand that the Cunderdin Hotel is now run on very prosperous and stable lines.

The Wongan Hills community, when faced with the question of taking over the State hotel, turned to the experience of the Cunderdin community. The advent of the newly-formed community company which had taken over the State hotel at Wongan Hills is being watched very closely by communities elsewhere who are interested in taking over State hotels.

Had there been an Act in force two years ago, containing provisions similar to those in the Bill before us, it would have been a foregone conclusion that the Wongan Hills community would not have been able to take over the hotel. The Act would have offered the State hotels to private interests. Within a few days of such an Act being passed the Government would have been approached by private individuals or companies to take over that State hotel.

Every community company must take a considerable time in deciding to take over a State hotel; because, firstly, the local people will have to demonstrate their interest. Then share capital or promises of share capital will have to be gathered, and that takes time, particularly when the people are watching the results of their wool clip or harvest before committing themselves financially. Other negotiations will have to be conducted before finality can be reached.

As we have had hotels in Western Australia under State ownership for a long term of years, I submit that a further period of 12 months would not unduly delay the principle contained in the Bill, which is to dispose of State hotels. On this question the Government should consider what is best from the local community's point of view, not from that of the Government. It is from the patronage of local communities that these hotels have prospered, and those people should be given the first opportunity to take them over.

I can conceive of no better body of people more interested in the well-being and management of hotels within the locality concerned, than a community company, which invariably comprises a widely representative body of local citizens. A community company will provide the best amenities possible in the hotel. They will have the interests of the citizens at heart.

No matter how well private interests may manage an hotel taken over from the State, very often they remain in a district for some years before selling out. Not all private owners are concerned with running hotels for the good of the community. In the main, they are conducted for the good of themselves. Such a community company will go on and on. Directors and shareholders may pass on over the years, but successors will take their place; and there is something more permanent about a co-operative community company than about private enterprise. I submit, therefore, that the Minister might have another look at this amendment, because I think it is the best compromise between the present State ownership and the private enterprise ownership envisaged in the Bill.

Mr. HAWKE: Naturally, I was very interested to hear the remarks of the Country Party member for Moore. I always understood that co-operation and co-operative effort had a very permanent place in the policy of the political Country Party. Therefore, it was encouraging to find one of the members of that Party expressing his support of the move by the member for Boulder to give to local communities organised on a co-operative basis, an opportunity, within a set period, to take over the hotels which are covered by this Bill.

The Minister submitted as his main argument against the amendment the proposition that local communities had had the opportunity through the years to display initiative and to organise themselves to take over these hotels if they wanted to do so. He went on to say they had not done so, and therefore they did not want to have them, and that it would be a waste of time putting the amendment in the Bill.

I suggest that the situation facing the local communities today is considerably different from what it has ever been before. Previously, the communities concerned had the choice of the hotels in question being taken over by themselves on a co-operative basis or of being run by the State. That was the choice. That will not be the choice when this Bill becomes law. They will be faced with an entirely different situation, because the choice will then be between the local community organising on a co-operative basis to take over the hotels, or private enterprise taking them over.

So the situation today, or in the near future, which will face the local communities will be vastly different from what it has been in the past. Therefore, a community at Corrigin, Bruce Rock, Gwalia, or somewhere else, which might not have wanted to take over the hotels because it knew the State would continue to run them, might easily now want to take them over because the alternative will be that private enterprise will run them.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is an airy-fairy one.

Mr. HAWKE: We shall see. The other night, strangely enough, when replying to the second reading debate, the Minister submitted an entirely different reason for expressing opposition to the foreshadowed amendment by the member for Boulder. His opposition was not then based on the ground that the local communities had the opportunity of taking the hotels over and had not exercised that opportunity. His opposition then was that private enterprise would pay more money to the Government for the hotels than the local community would pay for them.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: That is another reason. I stated it tonight.

Mr. HAWKE: And that was a most miserable reason.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I cannot agree with you.

Mr. HAWKE: I say that the Government would be thoroughly well justified in making the State-owned hotels available to local communities at half the price it might get for them from private enterprise. The member for South Fremantle emphasised the truth that these State hotels are the property of the people. They are the assets of the people as a whole. I quite agree with him that the people as a whole in this State would much prefer the local communities concerned to take over these hotels as against private enterprise taking them over.

Reference has been made to the fact that the community hotel idea is not a new one. It is something which has been tried out and, in practice, has succeeded remarkably well. Reference was made to a town named Nuriootpa in the Barossa Valley in South Australia. Community hotels have also existed for years at Renmark and Berri on the River Murray. Renmark is famous throughout Australia for its community hotel.

Mr. Lewis: The Barmera is another one.

Mr. HAWKE: Yes. Barmera is another one on the River Murray. Renmark is famous not only in Australia for its community hotel, but also in other countries of the world. Not only have Renmark, Cunderdin, Nuriootpa, and Barmera—and probably some other places—been able to

develop remarkably good amenities within their townships for the people of the towns and districts concerned; but they have, I am positive, developed a much better community and citizenship spirit within each of the localities.

I know that that is positively so in Cunderdin, which is in my own electorate. Twelve years or so ago, Cunderdin was just an ordinary wheatbelt town—no better and no worse than any other country town of its size. The owner of the local hotel was old and sick; and as a gesture of gratitude to the people of the district for the custom they had given his hotel over many years, he offered it to the local community at a very reasonable price.

Some leading spirits in the community called a public meeting and they argued and debated for some time. One can imagine how some of the people there were horrified at the thought that a community should take over the hotel and run it. However, the majority opinion favoured the idea. They set to work, established a committee, and in due course took over the hotel. The improvement in the community amenities and facilities at Cunderdin since that time has really been remarkable. I have an idea that the Minister for Health has been there in recent weeks.

Mr. W. Hegney: He would not know!

Mr. HAWKE: I would be very disappointed to know that during the time he was there he did not take the opportunity of inspecting these facilities and amenities.

Mr. Graham: He saw those in the saloon bar.

Mr. HAWKE: I am sure there are members on both sides of the House who have seen those amenities and facilities, and they are indeed a tremendous asset to all the people of the surrounding district. Therefore, I submit as my most important point in supporting this amendment, the great value in promoting citizenship and community welfare which results from community ownership of hotels.

I think all members know that I am not over-enthusiastic about hotels, and not enthusiastic about some of the products they sell. However, I am tremendously enthusiastic about the possibility of obtaining from the trade which a hotel does in a district, financial strength with which to establish community facilities and amenities and further money from year to year with which to extend those facilities and amenities. I say that the Government has a wonderful opportunity at hand in this matter.

This Bill, and the decision of the Government to dispose of the State hotels, gives the members of the Government a marvellous opportunity to promote community welfare and to promote the greater establishment of community facilities and amenities in all the towns and districts in which the State hotels are located. The

Government would be missing a great opportunity and failing in its duty to the people as a whole were it not to accept this amendment. Therefore, I most heartily support the appeal made by the member for Moore to the Minister to give second thought to the amendment; and I am hopeful that if he can bring himself to give the matter second, and serious, and logical thought, he and his colleagues in the Ministry will agree to accept the amendment.

Mr. BRAND: The position is that if there are any conditions imposed upon the Government for the sale of the hotels, it really means—particularly if 18 months is included—that nothing can be done about the sale of the hotels for at least 18 months.

Mr. Graham: No. You may be able to sell them to local communities in that time.

Mr. BRAND: We could do nothing about it until 18 months had elapsed, because we would have to give an option for at least 18 months to each community in which a State hotel is situated. There has been so much talk about the sale of hotels and why we should sell the hotels. It has been the policy of our own Parties that we should get rid of them. We have moved motions in this House; and when there is a Bill brought before the House, there is an attempt to at least cut it right in half.

I think it has been indicated that we are willing to negotiate with communities for the sale of the hotels; but we are very much opposed—at least I am—to having an 18 months' provision included in this Bill. However, in order that we might satisfy the principles which have been outlined by the member for Moore, I would be prepared to accept, on behalf of the Government, a six months' provision. If a community cannot indicate its desire one way or the other or come to some definite arrangement within six months, then I do not think we should be expected to wait any further.

It was made quite clear during the election campaign that we would sell these hotels; and therefore I believe we are going a long way towards meeting the points of those who support the amendment, by saying that we should include six months instead of 18 months. So, I hope the Minister will give some consideration during the tea suspension to an amendment to the amendment along the lines of an option of six months, after which the Government would proceed with the implementation of the policy which it announced during its election campaign.

Mr. MOIR: I am grateful to the member for Moore for supporting the amendment; but, at the same time, I am rather disappointed in the Premier's approach to this matter. It indicates that he has not the requisite knowledge of local affairs, and the way local communities work.

Mr. Brand: Having lived there all my life!

Mr. MOIR: Sometimes it is a very slow process to get people moving. There are a few live wires in a district who do most of the work, and it is difficult to get the others to do anything until the necessary arrangements have been made.

I would like to quote the case of Gwalia. The community consists mostly of working people, and I imagine it would take them quite a while to raise the money necessary to take over a hotel for community purposes. They would have to overcome more difficulties than the people at Cunderdin or Wongan Hills; because, as I said, they are in the main working people, and they would find it difficult to get the necessary money.

I think the period of six months mentioned by the Premier is far too short. When I decided on the time of 18 months it was not with the idea of using it as a bargaining point, but because I felt that that was a reasonable time to give the people of a district to make up their minds; and, at the same time, it would not place any undue strain on the Government in the disposal of these properties.

When replying to what I had to say previously, the Minister said that I had told a plausible story. I was not telling any story. I was merely expounding what I believed to be the truth, and I would like to tell members something about the Gwalia Hotel. I have had a lot of personal contact with the people in that town, and they make the hotel a sort of meeting place or club rather than a hotel as we know it in the ordinary way. At the back of the hotel a large area is protected by canvas; tables are set out, and the people use it as a sort of meeting place.

Many of the people in the district are of Italian extraction—some are Italian-born while many others have been born in this country—and they are as good Australians as one would find anywhere. They sit at the tables and drink their beer; some of them play cards, while others sit and chat, or read the newspaper. While they are doing that, they are not consuming a great quantity of liquor; and I have always been struck by the atmosphere which prevails at that hotel. It would be a good thing if the same sort of atmosphere existed at many other hotels. The hotels at Leonora are not patronised to the same extent as the one at Gwalia, and I often wonder how much the atmosphere that has been created at the Gwalia Hotel has had to do with it.

There are tennis courts in the hotel grounds; and, despite the heat, those courts are well patronised. I would have thought that the member for Murchison would have something to say about this, because he knows the position there. Many years ago the workers on the mines took

a liking to Swan beer; and, although there is a brewery at Kalgoorlie, the Gwalia Hotel has catered for the tastes of the people and has brought Swan beer up from Perth. Although it involves higher freights, they seem to prefer it to the Hannan's beer which is brewed at Kalgoorlie.

Mr. Burt: They pay a higher price for it.

Mr. MOIR: But not a great deal more. The member for Gascoyne quoted an article in a weekend newspaper, and I should like to quote the second part, which he omitted. After mentioning the improvements that are to be seen around Cunderdin, the article goes on to state—

The pride of the townsfolk in these achievements, and the fact that they stem from running their own hotel and their own affairs, must be causing a good deal of soul-searching elsewhere. First to search their souls, and then their pockets maybe, will be the towns where State hotels may be offered for sale.

Although it has been said that the previous Government did not do anything about this matter, I would remind members that the previous Government had no intention of disposing of State hotels, and therefore there was no need to approach the townspeople about it.

Mr. Norton: I do not think the Minister is listening to you.

Mr. MOIR: The townspeople did not expect anyone to take the State hotels away from them. It is only when we get a Bill like this, and the people realise that they are in danger of losing the hotels as State hotels, and that there is a possibility of their becoming privately owned, that they start to think about the matter, because they realise that private people will make as much profit as they possibly can out of these businesses.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. HEAL: It is pleasing to see at least one Country Party member supporting the amendment. I agree with the Chief Secretary and the Premier that they said in their policy speech that if they were returned to power they would sell the State hotels. But I do not recall reading or hearing of the Country Party saying that was part of its policy.

Mr. Watts: It was given express reference in my policy speech, and included the State hotels.

Mr. HEAL: I did not hear it said; nor did I read where the Country Party had stated that. It is amazing that the Premier should get all excited and take the matter out of the hands of the Chief Secretary.

Mr. Court: He was not excited. He was making a forthright statement.

Mr. HEAL: It is the first time I have seen a Premier take a Bill out of a Minister's hands during the Committee stage; and it is a very poor attitude on the part of the Premier. The Premier said that he would agree to a time limit of six months. That would be quite unworkable, as the Premier well knows. Had he made the time limit 12 months, it might have been logical; but I hope members will stick to the amendment and give these community centres 18 months to make up their minds and raise the necessary finance.

Mr. Graham: They have to be formed first.

Mr. HEAL: When replying, the Chief Secretary said this would hold up the sale of the hotels. The State hotels have operated for a number of years, and another 18 months will not make much difference. It has been said that the State hotels require money to be spent on them to bring them to the necessary standard; but that can be said of all the hotels in Western Australia. It is no argument at all.

As the member for Boulder has mentioned, State hotels have shown a profit of £200,000, which money has been used to the benefit of the State. Why should the State hotels lose that money? A fortnight ago I was passing through Cunderdin, and stopped at the State hotel. A farmer who is a well-known public figure there said they were highly satisfied with the hotel conditions at Cunderdin. If a committee were set up to control these hotels, it would be a great help to the districts concerned. I hope the Country Party member who has supported the amendment will continue to do so.

Mr. ANDREW: The amendment is most desirable. The Minister said that the amendment was all right on the face of it, but went on to say it would not be advisable to support it. The reasons he gave were that there is no necessity for the amendment; that it would hold up the disposal of the hotels for 18 months; and that the community could acquire hotels under the present Bill. Those arguments are not valid, because at any time the community could enter into competition on the open market to acquire hotels. If the State hotels are to be sold, the communities concerned should be given the opportunity to take them over. The Minister said that a wait of 18 months would delay the sale of the hotels, but it must be remembered that it would take time for a community to organise such a takeover. It would not be able to do it as quickly as a big company.

The Minister's argument was nullified by the Premier who said he would accept the amendment if the period was six months instead of 18 months. I think a

period of 18 months should stand. Good government is for the benefit of the majority of the people and not of a few individuals. We should give the communities an opportunity to take over these hotels. The Leader of the Opposition spoke of the benefits that had accrued by the taking over of hotels as community centres; he pointed out the great service that was given to the community as a result of such takeovers. If an individual took over a State hotel he would be interested only in profit.

I read in the paper that finance knows no country or loyalty; the same is true of investors. I was a member of the liquor committee which travelled around the country taking evidence. We found that in some cases the licensees were paying too much rent and had to make every post a winner; they had to sell as much liquor as they could to make things pay.

If the State hotels were sold to private individuals, they could ultimately be let to other people. The member for Moore mentioned co-operatives and said he believed in them. The previous member for Moore was proud of the fact that he was a member of Co-operative Bulk Handling. He worked hard to make it the success it is to farmers in the country. The member for Toodyay was managing a co-operative at Herne Hill. I think it was called the Swan Settlers. I do not think the honourable member will deny that it gave better service to the growers than would any privately-owned concern.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the honourable member is going to relate his remarks to the hotels.

Mr. ANDREW: I am suggesting that people should be permitted to obtain these hotels on a co-operative basis. I cannot understand why the Government will not agree to 18 months, because there is no necessity to get rid of the hotels quickly. This period will give the communities concerned an opportunity to acquire something that will be of benefit to them.

Mr. PERKINS: I have followed the debate with a great deal of interest. Unfortunately I missed some of the earlier remarks, but I understand that what I said on a previous occasion was quoted. I only hope members read through the remainder of the debate that took place on that occasion, because some of the remarks of the members of the Labour Party at the moment make very queer reading when related to what some of its more illustrious members had to say on that occasion. Included among those members was Mr. Wise and the present member for East Perth.

Sir Ross McLarty: Oh! Let's hear it!

Mr. PERKINS: It is true that on that occasion I moved a motion asking the House to agree to the proposition of a

local community taking over a State hotel. But the Labour Party mutilated the motion, deleting all the words after the word "that" and inserting other words to the effect that the number of State hotels be extended.

Mr. Evans: Have you changed your opinion?

Mr. PERKINS: Of course not!

Mr. Watts: There is nothing in the Bill to require him to do so.

Mr. PERKINS: The Labour Party has cut a very sorry record when it comes to helping co-operative enterprise. On numerous occasions since then I have approached Labour Governments to reconsider the decision made in 1945 and 1946, and on each occasion obstacles have been placed in the way. As the Leader of the Opposition knows, only a few years ago I discussed with him the question of the local community taking over the Bruce Rock Hotel.

It would have been in the interests of the Labour Party to hand over the hotel then because £23,000 of the loan moneys was to be spent on its renovation. What happened, however, was that the price quoted by the then Labour Government was so high that the local community could not consider the proposition. An amount of £23,000 was spent on the Bruce Rock Hotel; and at present I do not think we would get any more than £40,000 for it, if that. If we subtract £23,000 from £40,000 we get £17,000, approximately half the figure at which the then Labour Government was prepared to offer that hotel to the local community. In those circumstances the present amendment is in very poor taste indeed. I cannot help thinking it is chockfull of politics. I still think, however, that where community hotels can be encouraged, that should be done.

If it is possible for any of the State hotels to be taken over by the local community at the present time, I hope that will be considered, irrespective of whether an amendment such as this is carried. I am certain that this Government would consider any proposition from a local community to take over one of these State hotels as a community hotel. Therefore I do not think the amendment is necessary at all.

A period of 18 months is too long. The Wongan Hills Hotel has been taken over by a local group. There are three other State hotels in areas which I represent, but I am sure the local community would not be interested in the Kwolyin hotel. The people have a very good club at Shackleton, which is four or five miles away, and there would be no possibility of their being interested in the local hotel.

Because of the refusal of a previous Labour Government to consider a proposition from the local community at Bruce

Rock, a very good club has been established, and I think the chances at that town are very remote. Because of the treatment meted out to the people at Bruce Rock, I am very doubtful whether the people at Corrigin would be interested. I am certain that within six months it will be possible to discover whether the local community is interested or not in any of these hotels.

I am not conversant with other areas, but I will be surprised if the position is materially different from the districts which I know so well. I believe it is possible to obtain a decision within six months. I move—

That the amendment be amended by deleting the word "eighteen" in line 6, with a view to substituting the word "six".

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: In order to salvage something from this amendment for the ridiculously long period of 18 months, I feel that, in the interests of all concerned, I should accept the amendment on the amendment to provide for a period of six months. I would point out to the Committee that there is some benefit to be derived from an apparently quick sale of these hotels.

Mr. Graham: Benefit to whom?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: To the people of the State.

Mr. Graham: Which people?

Mr. Watts: The Tourist Bureau, for one.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The money to be derived from the sale of State hotels will be paid into a tourist fund which will be used for the benefit of the whole State. The money will not be sidetracked into any impossible venture; it will be used for the people of the State. If this delaying amendment were agreed to by the Committee, it would strike a special blow against the tourist industry, which it is hoped will make a commencement within a comparatively short space of time.

Mr. Hawke: What awful piffle!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: As the Leader of the Opposition so often indulges in piffle, he might know—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There is no necessity for the amendment moved by the member for Boulder. The local communities have had an opportunity of applying for these hotels; and with the passage of this Bill, they will still have the opportunity of applying.

Mr. Evans: What chance would they have against the brewery interests?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The closest consideration will be given to any offer that is made; and it need not necessarily be that the highest tender will be accepted.

It could be that a fair offer from a community would receive favourable consideration. I agree with the amendment on the amendment.

Mr. MOIR: I do not feel that the Minister is sincere in the arguments he has put forward that the 18 months is asked for to cause delay so that something may turn up to prevent the sale of the hotels. That is attributing a base motive to members on this side of the House.

For the purpose of the records, I want to put the Minister for Transport right, seeing that I quoted him earlier in the evening and he took exception to some of the remarks. I would point out to the Minister for Transport that he did not tell all the story; he told only part of it. The motion he moved was amended, as he stated; but he did not say what the amendment was. There is nothing inconsistent with the amendment before the Committee with regard to the attitude of this department as it was in 1946, when the Minister's motion was debated. The amendment which was moved by the previous member for Warren, reads as follows:—

That all words after "that" in line 1 be struck out with a view to inserting the following words:— "This House is of the opinion that more State Hotels should be established in suitable localities and that controlling legislation should be introduced to safeguard the interests of any community in which the local community organises to take over or has already taken over an hotel with the object of operating it co-operatively for the purpose of running an efficient service and devoting surplus moneys to the expansion and improvement of conditions for the community."

That is what we are trying to do now.

Mr. Hawke: Clean-bowled him with a double stumper.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MOIR: From the remarks of the Minister for Transport, I think he was trying to pull a swifty. He thought there would be only one chance in a thousand that anybody had this volume of *Hansard* in front of him and would bother to read it. I can assure him that it has been read, and quite a lot more of it could be quoted.

Mr. Hawke: Like the Town Planning Bill.

Mr. MOIR: I do not think the Minister for Transport has been fair with his statements, as there is nothing inconsistent in the attitude of the Opposition now compared with its attitude in 1946, when it was in Government. It believed in community hotels then and does so now.

Mr. Perkins: Why did it have to defeat my motion?

Mr. Graham: It improved it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MOIR: The only difference was that we were in favour of more State hotels at that time. I think that would have been a good thing, as there would have been more hotels for the community to take over. I wish we had more State hotels scattered around the country to give the people the opportunity of taking them over. We do not get many philanthropists like the previous private owner of the hotel at Cunderdin, who made his hotel available to the community at a very low price.

In the case of these State hotels, figures have shown that they have returned a tremendous amount of money to the State—well over £250,000 during the time in which they have been in existence. That money has come out of the pockets of the people in the respective communities. The Government says that it does not believe it should run hotels. It says, "We believe they should be run by somebody else." We on this side of the House have no quarrel with that, as it is the policy of the Government.

However, the Government is willing to get the utmost it possibly can for these hotels from somebody who is willing to pay for them and who will endeavour to make as much profit as he can out of the community which has already provided profits for the hotels over the years. The alternative is to allow the community to purchase the hotels so that they can be run better than in the past and be more suitable for the people. The profits would be expended on amenities for the town.

I do not think anybody could seriously argue that a period of six months is long enough. Anybody who has had any experience of trying to get things moving in a community will know perfectly well that six months would be too short, and that 18 months would be a reasonable period in which to get organised, raise the money, and get the movement under way.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Your side gave him plenty of hurry-up.

Mr. MOIR: I know that the Government to which I had the honour to belong gave the people at Wongan Hills every encouragement; they got the hotel at a far cheaper price than that at which they would have bought it from private enterprise. The Minister said that the Under Treasurer was against it. He said it was not an economic proposition from the Government's point of view; that it would be better for the Government to retain the hotel. Had the Government been concerned with screwing the last penny out of



the people, it would not have made the hotel available to them on such reasonable terms.

**Mr. NORTON:** The Premier, in offering to set a limit of six months on the term, and the Minister for Police in moving his amendment on the amendment, are attempting to kill the amendment. Anyone who has had experience in forming public or co-operative bodies knows that their formation is not an easy job, or one than can be done quickly. The people have to be brought together, and they have to reach agreement. In addition, articles have to be approved and registered. It would be hopeless for a community to do anything within six months. The amendment on the amendment will absolutely kill the amendment.

The Government is in a spot. It has agreed to form a tourist authority, and its idea is to get sufficient money from the sale of these hotels, to carry out the objects of the tourist authority, without calling on other Government funds. The Chief Secretary has pointed out that the money from the sale of these hotels will be used for that purpose. He has also clearly indicated that he wants to get as much for them as humanly possible. But I advocate that the Government sell the hotels at a reasonable price to the communities in which they are situated so that those communities can carry on the hotels.

The Premier and Deputy Premier have said that they promised to sell the hotels. Why have they included in the Bill the words "for sale or lease"? It seems as though they are trying to shuffle out of the question in some way. I oppose the amendment.

**Mr. OLDFIELD:** I move—

That the Committee do now divide.

Motion put and passed.

Amendment on the amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—25.

Mr. Boveil	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Mr. Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Craig	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Owen
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Perkins
Dr. Henn	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Lewis	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Mann	(Teller.)

Noes—23.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. May
Mr. Jamieson	(Teller.)

**Mr. LEWIS:** I move—

That the amendment be amended by substituting the word "twelve" for the word deleted.

I do not know how long the Wongan Hills community were in negotiation with the previous Government, but I know the negotiations extended over many months.

**Mr. Hawke:** It was over a year.

**Mr. LEWIS:** The Leader of the Opposition was quite sympathetic to that community.

**Mr. Hawke:** I had a letter of thanks from them, too.

**Mr. LEWIS:** Those negotiations took a considerable time.

**Mr. Hawke:** They took over a year; and with a sympathetic Government.

**Mr. LEWIS:** There is a State hotel at Bolgart, and I can imagine the people there going to Wongan Hills to find out about acquiring a State hotel. It is not easy to get farming communities to come to meetings. Many people in country districts are not prepared to commit themselves financially until they know the result of their harvest. I think 12 months is all too short a period in which to negotiate, but I am prepared to go part of the way to meet the view of the Government in endeavouring to shorten the period. I think that 12 months is a fair compromise.

In addition to raising the capital to buy the hotel, a country community will be faced, in many cases, with the cost of immediate renovations; and it could run into a considerable sum. The Wongan Hills Hotel was opened only two months ago, yet I have been informed that the people there are faced with an expenditure of £1,500 for renovations and alterations.

Earlier, the Premier said that the Government was committed to selling the State hotels. I agree with that; but I say, too, that the Government is committed to the disposing of them to the best advantage; and I maintain that to sell a State hotel to the best advantage does not necessarily mean selling it to the highest bidder. I would be with the Leader of the Opposition that a bias very much in favour of the local community should be given; because that is a prime consideration: to do the best for local communities. If we do that, I think that ultimately we will have done something best for the State and for the other hotels that have to be disposed of.

**Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON:** I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. Earlier, I said I would agree to the deletion of the 18 months' provision, with a view to inserting a six months' provision; but 12 months is too long a period. If any community came forward, within six months, with a reasonable proposition,

Majority for—2.

Amendment on the amendment thus passed.

the Government would consider extending the time in order that that community might be able to complete its deliberations. The amendment, if agreed to, would cover the whole of the six hotels in this extra period of delay; and when the Government is endeavouring to do something to the benefit of the State, I think the Committee should agree.

Mr. HAWKE: The approach of the member for Moore to this question is realistic. Clearly no local community could so organise, in a period of six months, as to be in a position to make a firm offer to the Government; nor would the Government, through the Governor, be able within that time to agree to the sale—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Surely it could be done in six months!

Mr. HAWKE: Many of these communities are far-flung—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: If you were living in the vicinity of one of these hotels, could you make up your mind in six months as to whether you wished to purchase it?

Mr. HAWKE: I would be able to make up my mind; but, in the same circumstances, the Minister would not. He would dither and change his mind according to pressures put on him by different sections of the community. I could make up my mind in six months—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You are no genius.

Mr. HAWKE: Of course not; but I am miles ahead of the Minister, I hope.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HAWKE: Such a decision would have to be a community effort; and if the Minister had more experience, he would know that it is not easy to get a whole community to move—

Mr. Norton: He is used to organising children.

Mr. HAWKE: It is a well-established fact that the conservative element in any community will hold sway early in any progressive move; and it is only with the passing of time and the gaining of knowledge that the progressive element wins through; but it often requires much more than six months. In Gwalla, for example, the community is probably 95 per cent working-class people. Could they be expected to organise in six months and make a firm offer to the Government in this regard?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Of course they could!

Mr. Evans: Have you ever been to Gwalla? Of course not!

Mr. HAWKE: There is no justification for restricting the period to six months, as that would give no community any chance. Even 12 months might not be long enough, but it would give opportunity

for a local community to consider the question and organise. Surely the Minister does not want the people to make a snap decision!

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Six months would not mean a snap decision.

Mr. HAWKE: Such a decision should be made on a solid basis of fact. The Minister's argument as to why these hotels should be disposed of quickly is that the proceeds would go to promote tourist activity; but we cannot swallow that. Surely he does not think that if the period is 12 months, tourist activities would suffer during the second six months! The Treasurer knows that all moneys reasonably required for tourist activities would be available from Treasury resources; so that argument has no force.

The choice before the Committee is between a period of six months, which is impracticable, and a 12 months' period, which would give the community concerned a reasonable chance to arrive at a decision based on a logical assessment of all the factors involved. Most of the communities concerned are small communities, without the financial resources possessed by the people of the Municipality of Cottesloe; and they would require time to reach a decision. Surely these local communities, which provide the sinews of war for whoever runs the hotels concerned, are entitled to every consideration!

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I support the amendment. Mention was made earlier this evening of the principle of co-operation, which is embodied in the platform and constitution of the Country Party and of the Farmers' Union; and I understand there is some reference to co-operative principles in the Liberal platform. The Government has accepted the principle contained in the amendment moved by the member for Boulder; and this Committee must decide whether the time limit should be six months or 12 months. I listened to the Minister, and to the Premier's outburst prior to the tea adjournment; and I think the Premier got the jitters when the member for Moore decided to express his views on this amendment.

I know that during the tea suspension—there is nothing improper in it—efforts were made to get over the amendment moved by the member for Boulder. I differ from the member for Gascoyne, who said that the amendment in regard to the six months' period was moved to defeat the objective of 18 months. Judging by the remarks of the Minister for Health, I suggest that, on behalf of the Government, he is trying to get rid of the State hotels as fast as possible, under any conditions. Earlier during this debate he stated that the return from selling a State hotel to a community would not be nearly

as large as if it were sold to private enterprise; and he also said that he would do all he could to dispose of the State hotels as quickly as possible, no matter what the terms might be.

The Minister said, further, that the highest tender would not necessarily be accepted; and even if the 12 months' grace is given to enable a community organisation to negotiate for a State hotel, there is no guarantee that the Government would accept that tender, even if a private tender were lower. That is how I interpret the Minister's remarks. He said if negotiations were entered into with a private individual or concern, they would be hard to break. That will not hold water, because in such negotiations there is nothing obligatory until a contract is signed; and if a community organisation in touch with the Government decided it could acquire a State hotel, that would not constitute any breach of faith on the part of the Government.

It must be remembered that most, if not all, State hotels were established many years ago. The reason for their establishment was that it was found necessary to provide hotel accommodation in certain isolated localities. It is all very well for members on the other side to instance places such as Bruce Rock and Corrigin, where there is now a strong, healthy environment, and where the communities are firmly established. In years past, however, they were isolated, and the wealth of the community was nowhere near what it is today.

It is incumbent upon Parliament to ensure that local communities are given an opportunity to acquire the assets of the State hotels, because such assets belong to the people themselves. Furthermore, money is not everything. The Government would not be wise to obtain as much as it could for the State hotels regardless of the circumstances. The development of a spirit of community-mindedness and good citizenship cannot be bought with money.

Mr. Perkins: Why would not the Labour Government sell any of the State hotels in 1945?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: This is 1959, and the Minister's statement has already been discounted, inasmuch as he gave only half of the truth to the Committee this evening, but the other half was disclosed by the member for Boulder. The Premier, when he had the jitters just prior to the tea suspension, said that the Government would not be able to do anything for 18 months if the local community organisation was given an option over a State hotel. But what disadvantage would result from that? It has been pointed out that the Gwalla Hotel was established in 1903, and others in 1912. What

difference would it make if the Government had to wait another 12 months to effect the sale of State hotels?

One of the Ministers—I do not know which one—suggested that a period of six months would be a fair compromise. However, 12 months is more reasonable, although I would prefer 18 months. A period of 12 months is not very long for a local community to make inquiries and enter into negotiations to purchase a State hotel. Whenever he is in charge of a Bill, the Minister for Health, in his attitude, seems to follow the lead given by the Minister for Police. The Minister for Police stated that the Labor Party's amendment is chock-full of politics; and just after that, the Minister for Health stated that the members of the Opposition were adopting delaying tactics.

If any honourable member has the political touch, I would say that the Minister for Police would be regarded as being No. 1. Also, nothing is further from the truth than the statement of the Minister for Health that the Labor Party is adopting delaying tactics. This matter involves high principle and thousands of pounds. It is a very important factor that local communities should be given an opportunity to purchase State hotels, and discussion on such a point is well warranted. I hope the amendment moved by the member for Moore will be carried.

Mr. MANN: I cannot help but reply to the member for Mt. Hawthorn. Corrigin used to be in my electorate, and to talk about the generosity of the Government is just a lot of twaddle. The policy that is being followed by the Government today was the policy of the Labor Government in 1940; and where did the Labor Government start? With fish shops, butchers' shops, hotels, and the like. Also, what happened in the first year of office of the Scaddan Government? He had a million pound deficit; and for a long time afterwards he was known as "Gone a Million Jack." In those days Corrigin had its slygrog shops, and they used to sell fairly good whisky; I can assure the Committee on that.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the honourable member will return to the amendment.

Mr. MANN: There were no police stations in Corrigin then, and the police used to chain to a hollow log those under the influence of liquor. This talk of the Government's generosity is all nonsense. The Corrigin Hotel should have been sold years ago. In fact, I blame the McLarty-Watts administration for not selling that for the purpose of developing it as a community hotel. The position today is that the Corrigin Club has outclassed it as a hotel.

Members of the Labor Party have got a shock because the Government is not a half-baked Liberal Government, but a

truly Liberal Government. I hope there is no amendment to the Bill, because the Government has every right to pass any legislation it so desires. How often did the member for Mt. Hawthorn, when he was Minister for Education, refuse to agree to any amendment that we suggested to him? If the arguments put forward by those on the other side of the Chamber were sincere it would be a different matter. Should the State hotels be sold, the proceeds will not be squandered. I am not averse to the hotels being sold to the local communities, but I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Hawke: The Government has agreed to the principle of the amendment.

Mr. MANN: I do not agree with it. My advice to the Opposition is to get on with the business and get the Bill through, because the Premier has made up his mind that it will go through even if he has to sit till midnight.

Mr. BICKERTON: I cannot see why the Minister or the Government has any objection to the amendment moved by the member for Moore; nor could I see why they had any objection to the amendment moved by the member for Boulder. From the Minister's speech, I gathered that the main object of the Bill is to enable the Government to rid itself of the responsibility to manage the State hotels. The original amendment and this further one will allow the Government to do that.

The amendment before the Chair seeks to give to those people in the district where a State hotel is situated the opportunity to at least consider whether it would be a good proposition to form a committee to run that hotel with the object of keeping the profits within the district for their own benefit. That does not seem to be an unreasonable proposition.

In spite of all the arguments submitted by the Opposition in support of the amendment, the Government had no intention of taking any notice of them until the member for Moore lent his support. The Government then condescended to arrive at an agreement so as to avoid a split in the Party. The compromise of 12 months, instead of the 18 months as proposed, will enable the communities in various centres to consider the matter of acquisition and the financial aspect.

I firmly believe they will need at least 12 months. Anyone with experience of organising in country towns will be aware of this. A matter concerning the investment of the people's money cannot be dealt with overnight. If the Government agrees in principle that the communities should be given the opportunity to make up their minds on the acquisition of State hotels within six months, then there is argument that they should be given sufficient and more time to do so.

There is no need for me to say that some communities will not take that period of time to make up their minds. Some will

arrive at a decision within a couple of months and declare that they are not interested. In that event the Minister could proceed with the sale. The 12 months' provision is to ensure that adequate time is given to local communities to decide the question. A dozen meetings may have to be called, and people living in outlying districts may have to be summoned to attend. I do not agree that these matters can be done within a few weeks. That may be possible in some communities, but not in all.

If the Government agrees to the principle of giving local communities time to arrive at a decision, it should provide for a sufficient time, and they should not be limited to a period of six months. The period of six months was mentioned as the minimum to which the Government could agree after the member for Moore supported the amendment. I urge the Government to extend the period to 12 months.

Sir ROSS McLARTY: There is the Dwellingup State Hotel in my electorate. So far, I have not seen any interest evinced by the local community to acquire it on a community basis. I realise that certain communities are desirous of obtaining a community hotel. I am also aware of the benefits derived in certain districts from a community-owned hotel.

For some months the local communities have been aware of the policy of the Government to dispose of the State hotels. That was announced in the policy speeches of the Premier and the Deputy Premier, and the local communities have had an opportunity to plan accordingly.

I disagree with the Leader of the Opposition that a period of six months is far too short to enable the community in a district to organise and determine whether or not to acquire a State hotel on a community basis. If he were living in any of the districts affected, I know that he would gather around him a sufficient number of enthusiasts to determine whether or not the State hotel should be acquired. He would do that in much less than three months. A period of six months is too long.

Mr. Hawke: There is the financial side to be considered.

Sir ROSS McLARTY: It may be necessary for such a community to obtain guarantors for the finance required, but they could approach the bank to borrow the money under the guarantor system. If the people cannot make up their minds in a period of six months, they will not be able to make up their minds at all. Based on ordinary business standards, the six months are sufficient.

If people in a district are opposed to the sale of State hotels, as a principle, they could organise to prevent the sale well within six months. I can appreciate

the attitude of the Government in desiring to reach finality in respect of this matter. The Minister stated that if there were a community interest the Government would be prepared to give it favourable consideration, and that is a pretty fair proposition.

I do not agree with the contention that the period of six months will prevent the acquisition of State hotels by local communities. It is a most reasonable period.

Mr. WATTS: There are one or two aspects which are lost sight of. Nothing in this Bill prevents or hinders the sale by the Government of a State hotel to a community company. In certain cases I can readily visualise a proposition coming forward for the acquisition of a State hotel by such a company. The amendment first moved, or any likely to be moved, is unnecessary to a greater or lesser degree. The principle of giving a reasonable time to a community organisation to submit an offer to the Government has now been accepted.

The opinion seems to be held by some members that within the proposed period of six months the whole contract has to be completed—signed, sealed, delivered, registered, and safely put away. That is not the case at all. All that the amendment proposes is that within six months the community company make an offer of purchase. If the Government thinks it necessary, all the time required to attend to the other matters can be made available.

The reason for the Wongan Hills Hotel transaction taking such a long time to complete was partly due to the fact that the company concerned had to apply to the Licensing Court for a license. The time within which the offer was made and accepted was much less than the period of 12 months which it took to complete the contract, which was occasioned by the application to the Licensing Court and the carrying out of the machinery under that Act, by the tidying up of the title to the land in order that the company could register the transfer of the title. Therefore a much greater time elapsed before final settlement took place.

This Bill makes special provision in regard to licensing. It provides that the Minister may direct the Licensing Court to grant a license, and the Licensing Court shall not refuse to renew a license because of objection in regard to the insufficiency of premises or the like. The court has to give a reasonable time; and it has to renew a license when asked for at the expiration of 12 months, even if the premises are not sufficient.

So within a period of six months ample time is given for offers to be made and accepted. After that, it does not matter if the transaction takes another year to complete. That is all the amendment

provides for, because the community company has only to make an offer to purchase or lease a hotel at a satisfactory price.

I have reviewed the position of the Wongan Hills Hotel in full. The parties were in agreement long before final settlement took place, long before the title could be registered, and long before the Licensing Court granted the license. In regard to those two aspects in particular this Bill seeks to overcome the difficulty by giving certain powers to the Minister in relation to licensing and to the freehold title to the land.

I believe six months is a reasonable time without further delaying the matter, in face of the fact that there is a provision in the Bill that any surplus moneys available are to be given to the tourist authority. The work of the tourist authority will be delayed further by the absence of this money as other additional funds will not be readily available. Therefore, why hold this matter up indefinitely? For that reason, I trust the Committee will stick to the six months.

Mr. HAWKE: I think the Attorney-General has overlooked the important fact that the amendment requires the formation by the local community of a company.

Mr. Watts: That will not take six months.

Mr. HAWKE: The local community cannot just call a public meeting, have a debate, followed by a motion that it make an offer of £15,000 for the hotel, and then make the offer.

Mr. Brand: Surely it could within six months!

Mr. HAWKE: I am saying it cannot just do that, because that would not meet the requirements of the proposed law. Before it can make an offer it has to form a company and have it registered. If the procedure to be followed were half as simple or even as simple as the Attorney-General explained, then the six months would be ample.

Mr. Watts: I assure you it would be ample if you went about it the right way.

Mr. HAWKE: It would be simple because all the community would have to do would be to have a meeting, debate it for a month or so, decide on the amount it would want to offer for the hotel, and then do so. Obviously, if it could be done on that simple basis, six months would be adequate. However, the Attorney-General overlooked the important fact that no offer could be made to the Government on behalf of the local community under the provisions of this proposed law until the local community agreed to establish a company. It would have to make that decision, and could not do so within a week, a fortnight, or even a month.

Mr. Watts: It could make it within six months.

Mr. HAWKE: I suggested to the Attorney-General that there would be a good deal of discussion. There would have to be more than one meeting, and there would be arguments for and against; and I believe it would take a good while.

Mr. Watts: Yes; about four or five months.

Mr. HAWKE: After making that decision and forming a company, it would have to—

Mr. Brand: I would hope it would not take four or five months to form a company. The people of the community are not very enthusiastic if they would take that long.

Mr. HAWKE: It would take a while. They would have to get the company legally, properly, and adequately established, after which they would make an offer to the Government. I am anxious to give the local communities a fair opportunity. That is my only concern, and I hope it is the concern of the majority of the members of this Committee. I have not talked with the members for Boulder and Moore; but could we not agree to nine months?

Mr. W. Hegney: Something ought to happen then.

Mr. HAWKE: If the Minister would be prepared to agree to that, the member for Moore might be; and I think the member for Boulder would be; and I certainly would be.

Mr. Brand: No; six months.

Mr. HAWKE: That seems to indicate that the Government is out to kill this as a practical, workable proposition.

Mr. Brand: Not at all.

Mr. HAWKE: Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I will certainly support the amendment for 12 months.

Mr. MOIR: I listened with interest to what the Attorney-General had to say. He missed another important point apart from that mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, and that was the reason for bringing this amendment forward. It is quite true that when this Bill in its original form became law it would be possible for anyone or any body of persons to make an offer for the hotels. However, the Minister, when moving the second reading—and the Attorney-General can be forgiven for this because he was not in the House then—emphasised that the hotels, when sold, must be sold to private enterprise. There was not one word about any community of the people being allowed to purchase them.

Mr. Brand: It has been made quite clear since.

Mr. Watts: Does not a private company come under that heading?

Mr. MOIR: There is quite a difference.

Mr. Watts: I think you will find they are both included under that heading.

Mr. MOIR: If the Attorney-General will bear with me for a few minutes, I will endeavour to explain that point. However, the whole emphasis made by the Minister when introducing the second reading was that they must be sold to private enterprise. There was not one word that any community would be considered. The Minister said he would not have a bar of the amendment I foreshadowed. He said he would not allow time for the communities to negotiate for the purchase of these hotels. He was adamant that they must be sold to private enterprise. It is quite apparent from the Minister's remarks that if a community made an offer, it would not be given any consideration. He may have changed his mind now, after the prolonged debate that has taken place; but he definitely was not at all sympathetic to local communities.

We must remember, too, it is not as simple as the Attorney-General tried to make out. He said that the people can make an offer. We know it would take quite a time to form these companies. The Attorney-General also stated that this could have been done under the original Bill; but again we can see that some members of the Government are not anxious to allow very much time at all. Six months is far too short a time. While I am disappointed that the Committee did not agree to the 18 months I proposed, I am quite happy about the 12 months, as moved by the member for Moore; although I do not believe it is all the time that could be required under certain circumstances.

In view of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition has made an offer to the Government that he is prepared to consider nine months and the Premier refused the offer, it should only harden the attitude of other members and make them insist on 12 months being given. It is not a simple matter of calling a meeting and deciding to make an offer.

When making an offer, a community has to be satisfied that it will be considered; and at the same time, it must have a pretty fair idea that it is going to be able to raise the amount of money suggested. The raising of that money could be a very difficult matter in some communities, while in others it might be easy. For instance, I think it would be easy in the community represented by the member for Murray. There would be more people there who would have assets they could pledge, and many people could, no doubt advance sums of money; whereas, in a place like Gwalia, the situation would probably be different. Therefore, I do sincerely hope that the Committee will agree to the amendment moved by the member for Moore.

**Amendment on the amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—**

**Ayes—24.**

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Evans	Mr. Molr
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Norton
Mr. Graham	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Heal	Mr. Sewell
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. May

(Teller.)

**Noes—24.**

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Craig	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Owen
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Perkins
Dr. Henn	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller.)

The CHAIRMAN: The voting being equal, I give my vote with the Noes.

**Amendment on the amendment thus negatived.**

Mr. PERKINS: Mr. Chairman,—

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister for Police.

Mr. HAWKE: Mr. Chairman, I understand the Minister for Police wants to move for the word "six" to be inserted. I wish to move that the word "nine" be inserted.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I was on my feet first, and I wish to move that the word "nine" be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member may proceed.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I move—

That the amendment be amended by substituting the word "nine" for the word struck out.

I do so for obvious reasons. The debate has been prolonged far enough, and we all know the reasons why some suitable time should be given to allow communities to carry out all the necessary arrangements for the taking over of State hotels where they desire to do so. I think 18 months is too long, but six months is too short.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I oppose the amendment. I presume that after this has been debated at length, an amendment will be moved for the word "eight" to be inserted; and then the word "seven."

Mr. Hawke: Not if this is agreed to.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It is apparent that members opposite are not taking a realistic view of the proposition. Arguments that have been advanced from this side should be sufficient for any sensible man to arrive at the conclusion that six

months is ample time for these negotiations to have been started and have reached the stage where the Minister, if it is a reasonable proposition, will allow further time. Members opposite just want to haggle and haggle for additional time. I oppose the amendment because I consider six months is ample time to allow in the circumstances.

Mr. LEWIS: While I would have preferred 12 months, the proposed period of nine months is pregnant with possibilities, and I commend the amendment to the Committee.

Mr. May: Anything less than that would be premature.

Mr. LEWIS: I have had something to do with organising co-operatives in the country, and endeavouring to gather in shareholders. I can assure the Minister that it is no easy matter. Before anyone can be induced to part up with cash—and usually it is only a promise for after harvest—balance-sheets, profit and loss accounts, and so on have to be produced. It is not a matter of one or two men having to make up their minds; the whole community has to be satisfied in regard to a community project; and this involves lengthy investigations, and usually a number of meetings. Six months in my opinion is too short to allow for these negotiations, and even nine months is short enough. But if the Government is not going to agree to 12 months, then I think we should allow a period of nine months.

Mr. JAMIESON: It would appear that the member for Mt. Lawley is just humbugging the Committee with this proposal. He puts members on this side in the position where they have no option but to support his move. By being smart, the honourable member has moved an amendment that he knows will be carried because the member for Moore will support it, having had the proposal of 12 months defeated. I do not think it reflects any credit on the member for Mt. Lawley because, if he was truly sincere in the matter, he would have realised that the period suggested is not very long for negotiations of this sort; otherwise the Opposition would not have argued as it did. If his attitude is just one of smartness, it ill becomes him.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I thank the member for Beeloo for his observations. We can always expect something of a statesman-like nature from him nowadays, and I think he has just concluded a statesman-like oration. A period of nine months is fair enough. I thought 18 months was in excess of that required, and six months is not long enough.

I agree with the member for Moore that certain legal difficulties have to be overcome, a company has to be formed, and certain meetings have to be held. However, nine months is sufficient time for

a community, if they are interested in buying a local State hotel, to take the negotiations to a stage where they would be able to give the Minister an assurance that they wanted to take the hotel over as a community hotel. That was my reason for moving the amendment.

**Amendment on amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—**

Ayes—24.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Nuisen
Mr. Graham	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Heal	Mr. Sewell
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Noes—23.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Crommellin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Wild
Dr. Henn	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Hutchinson	

(Teller.)

Pair.

Aye.

No.

Mr. Kelly

Mr. Mann

**Majority for—1.**

**Amendment on the amendment thus passed.**

**Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON:** I move—

That the amendment be amended by adding, after the word "offer" in line 10 of the proviso, the following words:—

unless the local authority within whose district any particular State hotel is situated advises the Minister for State Hotels that the local community is not interested in buying or leasing such State hotel.

It could well be that a local community could quickly arrive at a decision in regard to perhaps four or five of the State hotels, and in that case negotiations could be entered into by the State Government and would-be purchasers. If my amendment is not agreed to, they would have to be treated en bloc and we would have to wait for nine months. This amendment is an endeavour to salvage something from the wreck, so that the Government may be able to make a quick decision in negotiating with would-be purchasers. If the Opposition is sincere, no attempt will be made to dispute the amendment. The local authority would not lightly inform the Minister that the community did not want to buy a hotel.

**Mr. MOIR:** At first glance, this might seem an oriental move on the part of the Minister to save face; but it goes much

deeper than that. The Government was prepared to accept six months; the Committee agreed to a period of nine months; and now the Minister wants to shoot the whole thing down in flames.

The amendment shows the lack of knowledge of the Minister in relation to some of these districts. For instance, if the people of Bruce Rock decided they would like to purchase their hotel and run it on community lines, which road board would they consult? I know he would say the Bruce Rock Road Board; but it must be remembered that a large section of that community lives in Merredin, the boundary of which goes into the Bruce Rock area.

**Mr. Perkins:** You are wrong there.

**Mr. MOIR:** It is a matter of opinion. It is possible that the people just outside the district who wish to form a community company may have no connection with the people of the local authority. If the local authority advised the Minister at the end of two months that nobody desired to set up a community centre, the Minister could, under the amendment, accept offers from other interests, which would mean that the amendment just agreed to would be null and void. There may be people in the local authority who would be opposed to this type of venture and those in favour may not be of the same outlook as those on the local authority. The Committee has made the period nine months, and this amendment will go beyond the time the Government is prepared to accept. The Attorney-General said he was in favour of six months; but under the amendment, he would deprive the people of even six months' grace; he would completely nullify what the Premier was prepared to agree to in the first place. I oppose the amendment.

**Mr. PERKINS:** The member for Boulder is being unrealistic in this matter.

**Mr. Hawke:** Did the Minister for Transport draft the amendment moved by the Chief Secretary?

**Mr. PERKINS:** I do not think that matters.

**Mr. Hawke:** I doubt whether it has the Attorney-General's approval.

**Mr. PERKINS:** I would like to safeguard the position where the Government would have to wait for a statutory period of nine months before it could take action to dispose of the hotel. This provision arises particularly with regard to the Cor-rigin Hotel, which at present is very run-down, as I think the previous Minister for State Hotels will agree. A great many renovations have been asked for over the years but refused by the previous Government on the ground that there was no money available. The Leader of the Opposition knows that when he was pressed on this point he suggested that an offer



should be made to see whether the local community was still interested in taking over that hotel in order to get it off the Government's back. No action was taken to renovate the hotel, and the present Government has been left with a building in a dreadful state of disrepair. The floor coverings are in a shocking state, and are certainly not a credit to the Government.

If the local community desires to take over a hotel, negotiations can be entered into and successfully concluded, and the community would do whatever was necessary to improve the hotel. If, on the other hand, the community is not interested, why wait nine months; and why force the people who desire to use the Corrigin Hotel to put up with substandard conditions?

Even after nine months has elapsed and the hotel is sold to a private person or the local community is not interested, a further period must elapse before improvements could be effected. In those circumstances an escape provision should be included so that necessary action can be taken by the Government if it finds the local community is not interested. In rural communities the local authority is very conversant with local opinion, and it is a very remote possibility that a local community would take over a State hotel without the backing of the local authority.

Mr. Hawke: Is the Minister supporting the amendment?

Mr. PERKINS: Yes; and I think some escape provision is necessary.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The Minister more than once used the phrase that he wanted an escape provision. That is significant. To me it seems that the Minister for Transport and the Minister in charge of the Bill desire to put up something to the Committee to escape what took place a while ago. I think the amendment should be left as it is, and the Committee should not accept this further amendment. I do not know whether the amendment was drafted by the Minister for Police, by the Chief Secretary, or by some other Minister; but members of the Committee have had an opportunity of looking at it only in the last few minutes. I am not complaining about that, because there is only one sentence in it and one can grasp the purport. But if one word is being added by way of amendment, to a Bill of which the Minister for Police has charge, he wants the amendment placed on the notice paper!

The member for Boulder placed his amendment on the notice paper last Thursday with the intention of giving a community organisation a period of 18 months in which to apply to the Government in regard to the sale or lease of a State hotel. When the Chief Secretary

saw the amendment proposed by the member for Boulder, he should have placed his amendment on the amendment on the notice paper.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You cannot visualise what is going to happen.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Had the Chief Secretary done that, the position would have been that the time limit would be 18 months, subject to the proviso which he has now moved. The only difference is that the time limit has been reduced to nine months which, to my mind, is not long enough and is just an afterthought.

Members of local authorities are in touch with their respective communities; but it is quite possible that the bulk of the public-spirited citizens may not see eye to eye with members of the road board, and a vote of five to four, or even voting, would indicate to the Minister concerned that the community was not interested. It has been said that nine months is ample time for arrangements to be made. According to the Chief Secretary, six months is ample time. I do not think it is sufficient, and nine months is the very minimum.

A community organisation must be a registered company, and certain pre-requisites of the Companies Act must be complied with in order that such registration may be effected. The provisional directors would have to give certain notice, and a few months would soon elapse before a company was registered. I hope the Committee will not accept the amendment moved by the Chief Secretary, because I do not think it is justified; it is an attempt on the part of the Chief Secretary to save face.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I feel that my amendment after the word "offer" could lead to a little confusion. I wonder whether you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, to insert the words after the word "Act" in line 5, and add the word "otherwise" to my amendment on the amendment.

Mr. Hawke: Could we report progress and get the Crown Law people to have a look at it?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: While not phrased as the Leader of the Opposition would like it to be phrased, I think it is perhaps better than the amendment is at present.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chief Secretary will have to withdraw his amendment on the amendment which is before the Chair at the present moment. Then he will have the right to move his proposed amendment. He will have to get the leave of the House to withdraw.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I move—

That the amendment be amended by inserting the following words after the word "Act" in line 8:—

Unless the local authority within whose district any particular State hotel is situated advises the Minister for State Hotels that the local community is not interested in buying or leasing such State hotel otherwise.

Mr. HAWKE: I think the Committee is getting into a proper mess in connection with this matter. I am not prepared to accept the amateurish drafting of the Minister for Transport. So that the Crown Law authorities may be consulted, I move—

That progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.

Motion put and passed.

Progress reported.

### **BILLS (3)—RETURNED**

1. Filled Milk.  
With amendments.
2. Fire Brigades Act Amendment.  
With an amendment.
3. Railways Classification Board Act Amendment.  
Without amendment.

### **NOXIOUS WEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 10th September.

MR. BRADY (Guildford - Midland) [10.15]: As the member for Merredin-Yilgarn is indisposed, Mr. Speaker, I have arranged to take over his interest in this measure. The Bill contains an amendment to the Noxious Weeds Act, to allow the Agriculture Protection Board to delegate to a local governing authority its power to insist on private owners of land clearing out noxious weeds in the area of the local governing body concerned.

The Bill also provides that, in the event of an owner of private land not clearing up noxious weeds, the local governing authority can do the work and subsequently claim the cost from the owner or occupier. If noxious weeds in a local governing authority's area are to be effectively dealt with, this measure is necessary. In the event of an owner not desiring to pay any expense incurred by a local governing body in the eradication of noxious weeds, there is provision in the Bill for that local authority to claim, through the court, and obtain, payment. I can see no objection to the amendments contained in this measure and I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee*

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

### **INTERSTATE MAINTENANCE RECOVERY BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 8th September.

MR. NULSEN (Eyre) [10.20]: This is a rather important Bill, as its title would indicate to the House. It seeks to bring to book those people who refuse to make any contribution to the maintenance of their families, whom they are obliged to keep. There have been a number of people in this State who have left their families to be looked after by the Child Welfare Department, without making any effort to support them. Under this measure, reciprocity with the other States of Australia and with the mandated territories of Australia is sought, in order to give better access to such people than has obtained under the Interstate Destitute Persons Relief Act, which has been in operation for the past 47 years, but which is now outmoded and is hereby repealed.

When the Minister introduced the Bill, he explained it clearly to the House. The measure will be administered by the Child Welfare Department; and the court will deal directly with the punishments, and the requirement of payments by persons who have not kept their contracts, or who have defaulted in payments to their families. The penalty or recovery of payment is now to be dealt with under the Justices Act of 1902; and if a defaulter does not pay, he will have to remain in prison for one day for each £1 of the debt.

Many defaulters under this legislation earn good money, but seem to have no sense of responsibility in regard to their families. I am sorry to say that a number of such people have left this State, and have gone overseas to India, Malaya, and elsewhere. I hope that, in time, we will reach reciprocal agreements with those and other countries. However, this Bill will give the Child Welfare Department much greater redress than it had under the old legislation; and especially in regard to the other States, where previously there has been no means of varying orders of the court. Under this measure that position will be remedied.

The Bill will give a better opportunity of ensuring that people who refuse to meet their obligations to their families eventually do so; and it will operate fairly. Defaulters will not be imprisoned indefinitely, but will suffer imprisonment for one day for each £1 in default. I think this legislation will be of general benefit to the community, particularly to those wives who are separated from their husbands, and where the husbands are dodging their obligations. The Bill is quite

acceptable, and is more of a Committee measure than one to be discussed at the second reading stage. It has been clearly explained by the Minister, and when it is passed should be of great assistance to the administration. After giving it due consideration, I give it my support, and hope that it will pass through Committee without amendment.

Mr. Evans drew attention to the state of the House.

**Bells rung and a quorum formed.**

Mr. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [10.26]: I wish to have a few brief words to say on this Bill.

Mr. Bovell: Now that you have an audience.

Mr. EVANS: Like the member for Eyre, I support the second reading. It implies the repeal of an Act of Parliament, and brings into being a more modern form of liaison between the various States of the Commonwealth and New Zealand. It is a Bill to which mature thought has been given and one which deserves the support of the House. I support the second reading.

MR. WATTS (Stirling—Attorney-General—in reply) [10.27]: All I wish to say is thank you to the member for Eyre for his comments on the Bill. I can vouch for the fact that the honourable member went very carefully into the measure, because the circumstances in which we travelled together over the weekend afforded him an opportunity to do so—and I know he did. Therefore it is of the greatest satisfaction to me to know that it has been carefully examined and finds favour with him.

**Question put and passed.**

**Bill read a second time.**

*In Committee*

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

## NATIONAL FITNESS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Message—Appropriation*

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

*Second Reading*

MR. WATTS (Stirling—Minister for Education) [10.40] in moving the second reading said: This is a short Bill to amend the National Fitness Act; and, in all, it seeks to make four alterations to it. The first has relation to the appointment of members to the National Fitness Council. At present there is no period provided for which members of that council are appointed. In consequence it appears that, when once appointed, they remain in office

until they resign or die. It is not desired to remove any of the present members from office; but there are three vacancies and it is thought that it would be better if, after the 1st July, 1959, new appointments were made for five years only—with, of course, the right of renewal—so that there may be some assurance that younger people become members of the council in the future.

I want to make it clear that none of the existing members of the council will be affected by this provision; but, as I have said, there are three vacancies which are unfilled and it is desired to fill them, and the vacancies which may occur hereafter, for a period of five years only—with, of course, the right of renewal—rather than continue with the present method where no period is stated in the Act and where members remain in office until they die.

The second amendment is to provide for a situation when the chairman, who is the Minister for Education, and the Deputy Chairman, who is the Director of Education, are not able to be present at a meeting of the council. Such a position, unfortunately, frequently happens, particularly when Parliament is sitting and, coincidental with that, when the director is called away into the country or, perhaps, to a conference in the Eastern States. In the present circumstances the council elects someone to take the chair, but it is thought that it would be better for the Minister to nominate a substitute from the council to be acting deputy chairman, and the Bill seeks to provide accordingly.

The next amendment seeks to abolish what is known as the co-ordinating committee. This was supposed to co-ordinate the reports of various sub-committees of the council and, subsequently, present them to the council itself. I am informed that this provision has fallen into disuse. It has been found more convenient for the sub-committees to report direct to the council meetings; and, in consequence, this Bill proposes that the latter shall be the procedure in the future.

The next amendment is to enable the council, with the written consent of the Minister, and in the Minister's name, to acquire, hold, lease, and alienate property for the purpose of giving effect to the objects of the Act. We are advised that there is considerable doubt at present as to whether the council is entitled to enter into such arrangement in regard to property; or whether the Minister, even on behalf of the council, is eligible to do so; and it is desired to remove that doubt by the provision in the Bill. Those are the four amendments contained in the measure. I think I have fairly explained each of them, and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. W. Hegney, debate adjourned.

## ART GALLERY BILL

### *Council's Amendments*

Schedule of 11 amendments made by the Council now considered.

#### *In Committee*

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Roberts) in the Chair; Mr. Watts (Minister for Education) in charge of the Bill.

No. 1.

Clause 6, page 2—Delete all words in sub-clause (1) after the word "shall" in line 32 and substitute the following:—

be appointed by the Governor and shall consist of seven members including the chairman and vice chairman.

Mr. WATTS: The first amendment from the Legislative Council is one that I propose the Committee should not agree to. Members will recall that the Art Gallery Bill, like the Museum Bill—which has passed in both Houses—provided for a board of five members, including the chairman and vice-chairman. The Legislative Council proposes the board shall consist of seven members, including the chairman and vice-chairman. In my discussion with the President of the Trustees and the Chairman of the Art Gallery Committee there was no disagreement whatever to the proposal of five members being on both boards. Both Houses have agreed to the Museum Board having five only, and I see no necessity for seven members being included on the Art Gallery Board. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 2.

Clause 11, page 4, line 22—Add after the word "chairman" the words "and another member to be vice chairman."

No. 3.

Clause 11, page 4, line 24—Add after the word "chairman" the words "or vice chairman as the case may be."

No. 4.

Clause 11, Page 4, line 26—Add after the word "chairman" the words "or vice chairman as the case may be."

No. 5.

Clause 11, page 4, line 28—Add after the word "chairman" the words "or vice chairman."

No. 6.

Clause 11, page 4, line 31—Add after the word "chairman" the words "or vice chairman."

No. 7.

Clause 11, page 4, line 32—Add after the word "chairman" the words "or vice chairman."

No. 8.

Clause 11, page 4, line 34—Add after the word "chairman" the words "or vice chairman."

No. 9.

Clause 11, page 4, line 35—Add after the word "chairman" the words "or vice chairman."

Mr. WATTS: The Council's amendments Nos. 2 to 9 have the same purpose as were agreed to in regard to the Museum Bill consequent upon the remarks made by the member for Warren in regard to that Bill. As they are exactly the same, and in consequence of the honourable member's discussion on this subject, I requested that they should be made. I move—

That the amendments be agreed to.

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

No. 10.

Clause 13, page 5, line 16—Delete the word "three" and substitute the word "five."

Mr. WATTS: This amendment is consequential on amendment No. 1, since it alters the quorum from three to five, because of the Council's amendment to alter the number on the board from five to seven. As the Committee has rejected seven members being on the board, I ask it to reject five. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 11.

Clause 26—Delete.

Mr. WATTS: This is a deletion of the clause in the Bill which provided that artists should not be permitted to offer for sale their pictures in the art gallery. As I informed the House, this clause had been inserted as a result of a request from the Chairman of the Art Gallery Committee. It was considered that the Art Gallery of Western Australia was not the place for the exhibition of pictures for sale; but, perhaps more strongly, the idea was to make it easy for the trustees, or the board, to refuse, because hitherto they had refused to permit such sales, but they had no statutory or other authority for doing so. Accordingly the clause was inserted.

During my recent visit to Queensland on the conference in connection with proposed uniform company legislation, I visited the Art Gallery in Melbourne, and asked the director there if any such sales

as these were permitted in his Art Gallery. He assured me they were not allowed. Inquiries in Adelaide brought the same result. So in all the circumstances I do not feel disposed to agree to the amendment at this stage. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

A committee consisting of Mr. W. Hegney, Mr. W. A. Manning, and Mr. Watts drew up reasons for not agreeing to certain of the Council's amendments.

Reasons adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

*House adjourned at 11 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 16th September, 1959

### CONTENTS

	Page
<b>QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE :</b>	
Workers' Compensation Act, discussion of motion regarding amendments	1609
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :</b>	
Government Tourist Bureau, employees, wages, and overall cost	1609
Gwalla State Hotel, net profit	1610
<b>BILLS :</b>	
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment, 3r.	1610
Health Act Amendment, 3r.	1610
Industry (Advances) Act Amendment, 3r.	1611
Nurses Registration Act Amendment, report	1611
Tourist, 2r.	1612
Art Gallery, Assembly's message	1628
State Electricity Commission Act Amendment (No. 2), 1r.	1628
Industrial Development (Kwinana Area) Act Amendment, 1r.	1628
Noxious Weeds Act Amendment, 1r.	1628
Interstate Maintenance Recovery, 1r.	1628
Main Roads Act (Funds Appropriation) Act Amendment—	
2r.	1628
Com., report	1628
Land Agents Act Amendment, 2r.	1628
Fatal Accidents, 3r.	1629
<b>ADJOURNMENT, SPECIAL</b>	1629

## QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

### WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

#### *Discussion of Motion Regarding Amendments*

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Mines:

When will the House be given an opportunity further to debate the motion moved by Mr. Heenan as regards amending certain sections of the Workers' Compensation Act? It was moved in this House a month ago.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

I am sorry that it has not been possible to reach this order of the day since Mr. Heenan moved the motion. The subject matter of the motion was handed to the appropriate Minister for his advice; and, from inquiries I made this afternoon, I understand that that advice is on its way to me. If I receive it today, the matter can be dealt with if we reach that order of the day.

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### GOVERNMENT TOURIST BUREAU

#### *Employees, Wages, and Overall Cost*

- The Hon. A. L. LOTON asked the Minister for Local Government:  
Will the Minister inform the House—
  - The total number of persons employed by the State Tourist Bureau on the 11th September, 1959 at—
    - Perth office;
    - Fremantle office?
  - The total weekly wages paid to such staff at—
    - Perth office;
    - Fremantle office?
  - The overall cost of the Tourist Bureau for the year ended the 30th June, 1959?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

(1) (a) 19.	
(b) One.	
(2) (a) £375.	
(b) £21.	
(3) Salaries	£25,072
Publicity	£12,906
Incidentals	£3,549
	<u>£41,527</u>

This total includes the cost of salaries and maintenance of the Melbourne and Sydney branches, there being a staff of four at Melbourne and three at Sydney. The

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (the Hon. W. R. Hall) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.