Therefore, from whatever angle these propositions are approached, it is impossible to find any merit in them or any real justification for them. They are anti-democratic, and, as I said before, they have been framed and organised as a Party-political conspiracy. That is the only purpose for them and of them—to try to keep the present Parties in office and to try to ensure that in future elections the present small majority of the Government shall be increased.

In Western Australia we take the democratic system of Government for granted. It is here, and it has been here for generations. It was not established from choice, either—certainly not in its present form. Those who fought and have fought through the years to prevent it getting even into its present form, were men whose outlook politically was very much the same as the political outlook of the Ministers of this Government.

We have heard about the danger to democracy and democratic systems from the extreme left. We have heard and read a tremendous amount about it—mostly by way of Party-political propaganda. However, anyone who has studied history and has studied it with his mind and eyes open, would know only too well that there is today—and has always been in the past—a far greater danger from the extreme right. Therefore, in my judgment, it is not impossible that some day in Australia the democratic system of Government as we have known it and inherited it, will be displaced by a dictatorship.

If that situation is ever brought about, it will be as the result of the activity of the extreme right element in this country, and not the extreme left. The powerful financial and vested interests of this country are becoming more and more concentrated and powerful, while the smaller men are being displaced. Those vested interests would not hesitate, if the opportunity offered, to overturn democratic Government as we know it and establish in its place a dictatorship of their own. Legislation such as this is a step in that direction; and it is a great pity that the Ministers of this Government should become willing and deliberate tools, as it were, of the extreme elements of the right. I hope this legislation will meet the fate it deserves.

We have an amazing situation in this Chamber, in relation to this legislation. Both Bills, if passed, must be passed by a constitutional majority; and the Government, among its own members, does not possess that majority—it is short of one vote. The necessary constitutional majority, provided that when a division takes place the Government can marshal the whole of its pledged membership, will not be available; and the one member who will decide the fate of this legislation is a member here almost as the result of a fluke. I think his majority at the election was about 11 votes, and at all events, it was under 20. So we have the incredible situation, in regard to the fate of these Bills, that a person who was turned down by 49½ per cent. of his electors will cast the vote that will decide whether or not these proposals are to become law. I ask Ministers and members to think hard about that one.

On motion by Mr. I. W. Manning, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 2.5 a.m. (Friday).

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 3rd November, 1959

CONTENTS

CONTENTS—*continued*

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

BILLS (6)—ASSENT

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

1. Tourist Bill.
2. National Fitness Act Amendment Bill.
3. Land Tax Assessment Act Amendment Bill.
4. Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill.
5. Juries Act Amendment Bill.
6. Kalgoorlie-Parkeston Railway Bill.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

DIESEL LOCOMOTIVES

Performance and Number in Use

1. The Hon. J. D. TEAHAN asked the Minister for Mines:
   (1) What is the total number of diesel locomotives owned by the W.A. Government Railways?
   (2) Of the total, what number are now in service?
   (3) What was the average number in service during the past six months?
   (4) Is the performance of the diesels now considered satisfactory?

   The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:
   (1) Sixty-nine.
   (2) Fifty-six were available for service on the 24th October, 1959.
   (3) 55.7 units per day.
   (4) There are three types of diesel locomotives in service, viz:

X-type diesel electric main line	48
Y-type diesel electric shunters	18
Z-type diesel mechanical shunters	3

   Compared with expectations based upon diesel performances reported by some other railway systems, the X-class diesel electric locomotives cannot be regarded as being completely satisfactory. Nevertheless the improving degree of utilisation and service being obtained is encouraging and the locomotives are financially advantageous by comparison with steam units. The Y and Z-type locomotives are entirely satisfactory.

SUPERPHOSPHATE

Use in War Service Land Settlement Areas

2. The Hon. C. H. SIMPSON (for the Hon. A. R. Jones) asked the Minister for Local Government:
   (1) How many tons of superphosphate (including mixtures) have been purchased by war service land settlement since the beginning of development, up to the time when properties were allocated in the following project areas—
      (a) Jerramungup;
      (b) Gairdner;
      (c) Denbarker?
   (2) At what rate per acre was superphosphate applied in each of the areas?
   (3) Is the superphosphate transported by rail or road?
   (4) What is the cost per ton of superphosphate delivered to each area?
   (5) Is the superphosphate delivered in bulk or in cornsacks?
   (6) How are the costs for superphosphate made a charge against each property?

   The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:
   (1) (a) 12,774 tons.
   (b) 23,710 tons.
   (c) 3,403 tons.
   (2) (a) 180 sup. cu. zn.—150 super—112 super 90 super;
   or,
   150 sup. cu. zn.—112 super—90 super 90 super.
   (b) 180 sup. cu. zn.—150 super—112 super 90 super.
   (c) 270 sup. cu. zn.
   (3) By rail, when available; otherwise, by road.
   (4) (a) £14 19s. 0d.
   (b) £14 19s. 0d.
   (c) £14 3s. 6d.
   (5) Cornsacks.
   (6) Superphosphate is charged to each farm according to tonnage used.

WOOROLOO SANATORIUM

Sale of Land

3. The Hon. A. L. LOTON asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Has all or portion of the land at the Wooroloo Sanatorium been sold or leased since 1957?

(2) If the answer is in the affirmative, what was the area, and on what date was the sale or lease made and to whom?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) The only portion of the Wooroloo Hospital area which has been leased is that embracing the dairy farm. None has been sold.

(2) Area approximately 955 acres. Leased as from the 1st July, 1958, to Mr. W. B. Wallace.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE ADDITIONS

Italian Marble for Facing

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

Is it a fact that Italian marble for facing is to be used in preference to Western Australian stone on the new wing at Parliament House?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

As yet no decision has been made. Active exploration is taking place at Donnybrook now, and this promises to be successful.

HOMES FOR NATIVES

Type 79A Plan, and Housing Programme

5. The Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Has the Government discarded the type 79A plan for native homes?

(2) If so, what are the improvements to the plan of the new type of home?

(3) (a) How many native homes are proposed to be erected this financial year; and

(b) where are they to be situated?

(4) What is—

(a) the estimated individual cost of these homes;

(b) the rental to be charged?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) The State Housing Commission ceased to build this type of house almost three years ago.

(2), (3) and (4) A survey of native housing has been carried out in an endeavour to ascertain the position generally in respect to native housing as well as demand. The Minister for Native Welfare and the Minister for Housing are in the process of conferring on these questions.

SILICOSIS

Compensation for Sufferers

6. The Hon. E. M. HEENAN asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Is he now in a position to advise whether the proposed committee to deal with the question of sufferers from silicosis and their compensation has yet been appointed?

(2) If the committee has been appointed, will he name the personnel thereof and the approximate date when sittings will be commenced?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

(1) The composition of the committee is still under consideration.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by the Hon. R. C. Mattiske, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to the Hon. J. Murray (South-West) on the ground of ill-health.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING

1. Electoral Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

2. Constitution Acts Amendment Bill (No. 2).

Introduced by the Hon. R. F. Hutchison and read a first time.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: Mr. President, I have to ask for a ruling. Is it too late for me to ask a question without notice of the Minister?

The PRESIDENT: It is too late.

METROPOLITAN REGION TOWN PLANNING SCHEME BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Town Planning) [4.45] in moving the second reading said: It is unfortunate that a Bill of this nature has been subject to so much procrastination; so much so that it is necessary to bring it before the House in the form of being reduced to the Bikini stage, instead of being dressed from neck to knee. I say "unfortunate," because this Bill is of major importance.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It is better than next to nothing.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Had the late Mr. Fraser agreed to the extension of the sittings of this House for a couple of days in November, 1957, this Bill would have become law. The measure introduced previously was practically a facsimile of the Bill now being introduced. It was in November, 1957, when that Bill was

debated in this House, and the second reading was passed. We had a notice paper of 11 pages at that time, and we were told that the business of this House had to be finished by that night. Some members implored the Government to agree to this House being called back in the following week in order that the measure could be dealt with properly. At that time Mr. Griffith, Sir Chas. Latham, and I implored the Government to agree to this House coming back on the following Tuesday to deal with the Bill. We only received the Bill on the 27th November—a day when we had an 11-page notice paper. Although the previous Bill would have gone through in 1957, if an extension of a couple of days had been agreed to, the Bill now before us is being subjected to much procrastination during the session.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You are suggesting that this is similar to the measure previously introduced.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It would make no difference if I said it was.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It would make a lot of difference. You did not say so.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I could say so, but I have not. To let members know what Sir Erskine May thinks about this, I shall read a quotation from his book, *Parliamentary Practice*. On page 564 this is stated—

> In the case of Bills which have passed one House and been rejected by the other, the rule is not applied so rigidly as to prevent a portion at any rate of a rejected Bill being introduced again as a new Bill.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It does not matter what May says. It depends on what this House decides.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Therefore, it would have been quite in order for this Bill to have gone through. Surely May is the authority on which Parliament relies!

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You are on pretty dangerous ground in going through it.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: We have not had a Bill like this before this House—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: We had. It was debated.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: We have not had a Bill like this. The honourable member said it was not in order for the Bill to be before this House, so it could not have been here. We appreciate that it is not in order to bring in almost exactly the same Bill. That did not happen. The original Bill was altered in a good many respects, but it was still rejected.

The PRESIDENT: Is the Minister speaking to this Bill or the one he introduced previously?

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The Minister should change his tune. He is on dangerous ground.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am on safe ground in what I am saying. This is an important Bill. It might be a good idea if I were to refer to what Mr. Tonkin said when he introduced the Bill in 1957. On page 3439 of *Hansard* he is reported to have said—

> One of the main purposes of a plan and a planning authority for a region is co-ordination and guidance of major development functions to produce the most satisfactory total result. It is no longer adequate for those functions to proceed relatively independently.

Exactly the same applies today. It is essential, while we still have time, to introduce this plan for the metropolitan region.

Anyone who has followed the pursuits of Rigby and Ward through Paris, will find a very interesting article written by Ward in regard to town planning in Paris. One of his last remarks in summing up was, "Thank goodness we still have time in the City of Perth to make a plan instead of getting into the chaotic mess that Paris is in."

Therefore, I hope that on this occasion we will be able to set up a regional authority in order to put the Stephenson Plan into operation. Remarks have been made earlier in regard to the costs which people will have to pay. Reference has also been made to the representation on the authority, and I know one particular road board has been very active in its endeavours to have a representative appointed.

As we know, the metropolitan area was divided into four areas to cover local authorities, each road board having a representative on the committee itself from which one representative would be selected to sit on the planning authority. I do not think it would have been possible to put those local authorities into a different zone; and, therefore, there is a little unbalance in regard to the amount which each particular zone will pay.

From group A—which covers North Fremantle, Fremantle Municipality, East Fremantle, Melville, Cockburn Sound, and Rockingham—the contribution towards the amount of tax, which we hope will be collected under the taxing Act, will be 15 per cent. From group B—which covers Wanneroo, Perth Road Boad, Subiaco, Nedlands, Claremont, Cottesloe, Peppermint Grove, and Mosman Park—the amount will be 26.8 per cent. But from the City of Perth itself the amount to be collected will be 39 per cent. Therefore a request from any particular road board for representation on this authority, and especially when it asks for the representation to be on the same basis as that for the Perth City Council, is unjust—or at least unwarranted.

From group C—covering Belmont, South Perth, Canning, Gosnells, Armadale, Kelmscott, Serpentine-Jarrahdale—the amount

will be 13 per cent. Group D—covering Swan, Bayswater, Bassendean, Midland Junction, Guildford, Mundaring, and Darling Range—will pay 5.1 per cent.

Therefore, on the whole, the set-up as shown on the plan on the wall of the zones of these particular local authorities is about as near as we can get it. If we are to enlarge this authority by having every nominee on it, we will have an unwieldy and unworkable authority. That is exactly the same argument as was used by Mr. Tonkin in 1957 when a move was made to have extra representation on the authority.

Some mention has been made of the amount of tax paid by the individual. I have some figures which I think I had better quote now, instead of waiting until the tax Bill is introduced.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: When will that be?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It has been on the notice paper all the time. Its title will have to be altered, that is all. I have been able to extract some figures of what will be paid on average houses and city businesses in the areas concerned. In central Hay Street, a business with a 50-ft. frontage would pay £156 5s.; a Cottesloe householder would pay £1 9s. 2d.; Subiaco 15s. 7d.; Leederville-Floreat Park £2 1s. 9d.; Nedlands £2 18s. 4d.; Claremont £1 13s. 4d.; Mosman Park 14s. 7d.; and Mosman Park-Peppermint Grove £3 19s. 2d. The householder in Peppermint Grove will be paying the highest of the amounts paid by individual householders under the regional tax.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Can you give a figure for residences within the City of Perth area?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: In the city itself?

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Yes, say, in King's Park Road.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: They would not pay as much as those in Peppermint Grove. In that area they will pay £3 19s. 2d. North Fremantle residences will pay 10s. 5d.; the business area in Fremantle £35 8s. 4d.; East Fremantle 18s. 9d.; Melville £1 5s.; South Perth £1 2s. 11d.; Victoria Park-Albany Highway businesses £8 6s. 8d.; the residences in the same area 18s. 9d.; Belmont 12s. 6d.; Bayswater 14s. 7d.; North Perth 16s. 8d.; Mt. Lawley £1 7s. 1d.; Scarborough £1 0s. 10d.; North Beach 14s. 7d.; and Midland Junction 8s. 4d.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: What was the figure for the businesses in Hay Street?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: £156 5s. for those with a 50-ft. frontage. The figures I have quoted give an indication of the amount to be paid by the average householder. Some would pay a little more and some a little less, according to the valuation.

For the benefit of members who have raised the issue in regard to valuations on rural properties, and in case members might think that those people are getting let off, it might be a good idea to give an indication of the valuations of these rural areas as valued today, and an idea of what they are paying in local authority rates. This will enable members to appreciate the fact that, because we have no legal plan, the valuations on these properties are considerably high.

At the moment they are based, to a certain extent, on a subdivisional value, and not having regard to the fact that they are rural properties. Because of the absence of a legal plan, it is impossible to ask the taxation valuers to bring the values down to make them parallel with others.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Market gardeners?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes, market gardeners and the like. I have taken out some values in each of the road boards concerned, and members would have to be pretty good to believe they could make a big living on these valuations in the rural areas.

Of the bigger areas there are nine acres in the Perth Road Board area valued at £130 an acre; there are three acres valued at £208 an acre; 2¼ acres value at £352 an acre; 3½ acres at £378; two acres at £250; and so on. In the Canning Road Board area there are 5½ acres valued at £140 an acre; 12 acres at £121; six acres at £148. In the Cockburn Road Board area there are 33 acres valued at £331 an acre; five acres at £230; another five acres at £160; a further five acres at £180; eight acres at £148; 8¼ acres at £152; 11 acres at £210; one acre at £648; and 1½ acres valued at £1,100 an acre.

In the Gosnells Road Board area there are 10 acres at £200 per acre; 10¼ acres at £280 per acre; and two lots of four acres at £150 and £144 per acre respectively. In Darling Range the valuations are a bit lower. There we find 68 acres at £21 per acre; 50 acres at £21 per acre; five acres at £48 per acre; one acre at £210; and one-half acre at £420 per acre. I think it will be appreciated that these people, who have been bound by the interim development order, have not been able to subdivide; and yet they are paying rates and taxes on these high valuations.

I am hopeful that, with the passing of this Bill and the setting up of the authority, we will be able eventually to find a formula by which some concession can be given to these people. I do not think I need speak at great length on this measure. It is, as Mr. Wise suggested, different from the original measure. As I said earlier, it was shorn from a neck to knee to a bikini; and therefore I intimated that it had been somewhat amended. All the undesirable features of

the original Bill have been taken out; and the set-up with regard to the five members of Government instrumentalities has been altered; and the long title has been altered. The words with reference to the mayor, and so on, have been taken out. The offending clause in the original Bill has been removed and a time limit has been placed on the legislation.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Then it must have been debated before.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I am talking about the debate in another place. I admit that there are a lot of differences in this measure as compared with the other one. Probably the principle is the same; but this will be much more difficult from the Minister's point of view, as regards putting it into effect, than the other would have been. I was going to say that it might be easier, as I would not have everyone on my back; but in fact I think they may all be on my back, because instead of five departments being defined, they are no longer defined; and I might have a lot of other departments trying to get on to the authority.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: We will see what we can do for you when the Bill gets into Committee.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It is, of course, in the hands of the House. I only hope that on this occasion we can have the Bill passed, so that it becomes an Act; because I think it is essential in the interests of all concerned. We have under the Stephenson Plan at the moment an area including Francis Street, Roe Street, and James Street—on the other side of the railway line—set aside as a cultural centre; and while the Government owns some of the land in that area, there is a lot which it does not own. At the moment I have two requests from landowners in that area, asking the Government to take their land over; but the Government has not the money with which to do that.

I think it will be agreed that the opening of the Narrows Bridge on the 13th instant will create a considerable traffic hazard; because the switch road is not ready to take the traffic at the same time as the bridge is to be opened. While all the cost of the switch road will not be borne by this authority, it will have to bear the cost of the resumptions. Some Main Roads Department funds will probably be used for the road itself; and the Perth City Council may have to pay a portion of it.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Some of the land has been acquired.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes; but to do all that is necessary would reduce the finances of the Government by so much that, in effect, its programme would have to be curtailed. I do not think any member would want to see us curtail the building of hospitals and schools, the provision of water supplies, and so on. When we examine the situation and the need for this measure, I hope members will give it their earnest consideration and their support. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [5.5]: In view of the Minister's natural and instinctive aggressiveness, I was afraid that he would proceed much too far in his opening arguments in regard to this new Bill; this Bill which is not a case of an alteration from neck to knee to a Bikini. As I said, by interjection, the difference is that it has been altered from a neck to knee to a next to nothing, in so far as any likeness to the previous measure is concerned. Otherwise the Minister must be casting a reflection on a decision of this House; which I think would be wholly wrong. This House made a decision and did not procrastinate—I object to that—on a very different Bill, which was not in order, and which was ruled by this Chamber to be not in order.

I propose now to deal with this very different Bill and the principles which it contains. I think most members of this House will support the principles found within this Bill to give effect to and to constitute a metropolitan region planning authority, in order to enable that part of the Stephenson Plan, which so far has been able to be approached only by an interim order, to be put into effect. It is a very important part of the plan, and this measure is important in implementing the beginnings of the vital functions of the Stephenson Plan.

My only objection to the measure is that it has been shorn of so much in regard to the ideas of Governments with respect to matters which were presented in vastly different Bills, that it becomes quite new in principle on many aspects. However, the only provision that I cavil at is the method of obtaining finance under part VI; or at least one method prescribed for the obtaining of the finance. I believe that the proceeds of the metropolitan region improvement tax are not essential. I believe that whatever sum may be assessed—I think the the figure is under £200,000—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It is £140,000 to be raised by the tax; but that is not the total amount wanted.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I know. I am aware that although more than £200,000 will be needed, less than £200,000 will be collected. I do not wish to be pushed into giving a figure which has been quoted on other occasions; but it is not necessary to get this money from a land tax source. The benefits to accrue from this legislation in effective action are State-wide; and the State as a whole should meet

the needs of the operation of this Act from Consolidated Revenue. It should meet whatever is the requested sum and not a sum short of the needs to be raised by tax. Consolidated Revenue should meet the entire sum needed to give effect to the financial requirements; and I hope that the Minister, therefore, will lift another Bill which is on the notice paper up to its rightful place, right underneath this one; so that it may be taken not simultaneously but successively.

If the Minister does as I suggest, the Leader of the House and the Minister for Local Government will be able to get an indication of whether this House likes the taxing provisions to which I have raised objection; and there will be a chance, before this Bill goes into Committee, of assessing the merits of the subsequent measure.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You would like item No. 14 dealt with next?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Not necessarily today; but I suggest that the two measures should be kept together as inseparables.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I will be happy to do that, if that is what you want.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: My point is that no taxing Bill should be deferred until this one has been passed through Committee; because we cannot give effect to the needs of this Bill in regard to amendments, because the taxing Bill must pass after this one, and the provision regarding finance is contained in the relevant clauses. I would hope that in the debate on this Bill—both on the second reading and in Committee—we will hear the views of a number of members of this Chamber as to the merits of the formation of the metropolitan region improvement fund, which is to be established at the Treasury; as to how the contributions to that fund should be properly made; and whether, in the view of members, the money should come from Consolidated Revenue rather than from a sectional tax to be imposed on people only within the region.

I have no further comment to make on this measure. I support the Bill and its principles, and I think it represents a good step towards beginning to have the Stephenson Plan implemented.

On motion by the Hon. H. K. Watson, debate adjourned.

TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Second Reading

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Town Planning) [5.14] in moving the second reading said: This small amending Bill is required owing to the necessity to introduce a new measure relating to the town planning regional plan. Because it is imperative to carry on the interim development order until such time as the authority can be set up and begin functioning, and because this new measure has been divorced—as a separate Bill—from the town planning and development legislation, it becomes necessary to make amendments to that Act. This Bill seeks to alter only three provisions. The first amendment provides for the inclusion of the building line; the second alters the date of the termination of the interim development order to 1961; and the third alters the names of the municipalities of South Perth and Nedlands to the cities of South Perth and Nedlands, and changes the name of Canning to Cockburn. These names, which are in the original Town Planning Act, are now out of date. Those amendments comprise the functions of the Bill. Members might ask why it is necessary to give an extra two years life to the interim development order. I believe it will take some time to set up the regional authority, and it is essential for progressive development and planning that we have the interim development order to cover the plan until such time as it becomes law.

It is not only the setting up of the authority that is concerned. If members read the Bill they will realise the amount of time that will be taken after the authority itself develops the plans, bearing in mind the fact that they must be published, placed on public display, and come back to Parliament. This being so, considerable time will elapse before they can be effected. Accordingly, two years is not too long to permit that planning to go ahead, knowing full well that the regional plan is coming up. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Hon. F. J. S. Wise, debate adjourned.

BUNBURY HARBOUR BOARD ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [5.18] in moving the second reading said: Section 55 of the principal Act provides that all drafts upon the Treasury, or cheques for expenditure by the Bunbury Harbour Board shall be signed by the chairman, or acting chairman of the board and another member of the board, and countersigned by the secretary of the board. The Commonwealth Bank has requested that all drafts and cheques on behalf of Government instrumentalities whose accounts will be handled by the Reserve Bank, when the new Commonwealth legislation is proclaimed in December next or early next year, shall be signed by two persons only, and without description on the drafts or cheques of the signatories' designation or office.

The Bill, therefore, seeks to enable this procedure to be adopted for the Bunbury Harbour Board, and to come into operation as from the 1st December, 1959. It proposes that all drafts and cheques shall be signed by one member of the board and countersigned by the board's secretary. Approval of persons acting as signatories has to be obtained from the Treasury, which ensures that only persons authorised under the Act are appointed as signatories. This is a simple Bill which brings about the administrative action to which I have referred. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North) [5.20]: This Bill will do exactly what the Minister said in his explanation to the House. It is a most desirable measure, and I see no reason why it should not be proceeded with and go through all the stages. I have no objection to it whatever.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Thank you.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING

1. Albany Harbour Board Act Amendment Bill.
2. Hire-Purchase Bill.

Received from the Assembly; and, on motions by the Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), read a first time.

COUNTRY AREAS WATER SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading—Defeated

Debate resumed from the 29th October.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban —Minister for Mines—in reply) [5.22]: I was somewhat surprised to listen to the tenor of the debate on this matter, particularly as it was delivered by some members of the Chamber. The discussion on the Bill was practically confined to the proposal to institute a uniform rating system for towns supplied with water from the Mundaring scheme.

Some members who objected strongly to the proposed increase in rating were apparently of the opinion that consumers would have to pay a much larger sum for the water they used. Those fears, as I shall demonstrate in a few moments, are completely groundless. I thought Mr. Cunningham explained very adequately and clearly just what the position was. As a matter of fact, he was a great help to me when dealing with this Bill and explaining how he saw it from the Goldfields point of view.

He presented an example of a person whose valuation was £70 and whose last commitment, including excess water, amounted to £17 6s. 3d. Under the proposed increase the amount payable would be £18 7s. 9d.; an increase of £1 1s. 6d., or 5d. a week. Surely this 5d. a week is not as vicious as some members would have us believe! After all, costs are rising everywhere, including, of course, the cost of administering the Mundaring water supply scheme.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: What bills will we get at the end of 12 months?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am trying to indicate to the honourable member now what some of the bills are likely to be at the end of the year. In connection with the cost of administering the Mundaring water supply scheme, I point out that last year a loss of not less than £848,000 was suffered.

The Hon. W. R. Hall: That would be brought about by maintenance.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will also cover some of those points. But surely this does not prove that the Government is being harsh on those people who use water from the Mundaring water supply. A few further examples as to the impact of the increased rating may help to convince members of the mild effect of the proposal.

An example was given by Mr. Cunningham so far as Kalgoorlie was concerned; and he stuck chiefly to that. This increase which, as I said, would represent 5d., applies also to the towns of Southern Cross, Coolgardie, Bullfinch, Marvel Loch, Toodyay, York and Westonia. On an annual valuation of £62, consumers in Beverley would pay a further £1 4s. 1d. per annum, or 5½d. a week.

The Hon. A. R. Jones: How much water will they get in a year?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will come to that in a few moments.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Does not Norseman come under that?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Members must have read my mind. At Goomalling and Norseman the amount would be £1 0s. 7d., or less than 5d. weekly. Nukarni, Nungarin, Nokaning, and Belka would be increased to 15s. 6d. a year, or 3½d. a week. The residents of Northam would pay a further £1 9s. 2d. a year, or 7d. a week, if their rating were increased to the full 3s.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: On what rating is that?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is possible that somebody might query why the amount for Northam appears to be so much more; and it is perhaps extraordinary to note that Northam—and I do not

know whether the ex-Premier's representation of the district had anything to do with it—was rated at 1s. 6d. when other towns in that district were paying 2s. As I have said, if Northam's rating is increased to 3s., the residents will pay £1 9s. 2d. or 7d. a week. At present Northam is rated at 1s. 6d. When, during the last Government's regime, the areas served by the Goldfields Water Supply were increased in rating, the increase in Northam was only to 1s. 6d.—it had formerly been 10d.—whereas other towns such as York, Westonia, Baandee, Doodlakine, Merredin, Burracoppin, Boddalin and Moorine Rock were increased to 2s. from varying amounts. I think most of them were based on 1s 6d. in the £.

I would point out at this time that 3s. rating is a maximum figure. Northam is rated at less than the maximum at present, and it is possible, therefore, that the rating of that town will not be increased to a maximum of 3s. if the Bill is agreed to. Towns which are closer, such as Bakers Hill, Chidlow, Mt. Helena, Mundaring, Stoneville, Sawyers Valley, Wooroloo, and Wundowie would pay an extra 12s. 5d. rating, or 3d. per week. Persons with a valuation as high as £94 would pay an average of £1 13s. 8d. more, or 8d. extra per week.

I point out that all these figures are based on the annual rate plus the average amount of excess water that is used by consumers in the towns I have mentioned. Members should realise that the increase for domestic consumers is relatively small. In answer to a question asked by Mr. Bennetts, prior to the introduction of this Bill, I indicated that market-gardeners would pay from 7s. to £1 8s. extra in a year; and I hope this additional statement will allay his fears in respect to market gardeners.

Business people who use excess water will actually pay less than they do at present. Another point raised, I think by Mr. Bennetts, concerned the subject of pensioners. Pensioners will not be penalised. At the present time 244 pensioners are receiving exemption, and 92 pensioners, who paid for excess water, will benefit from the increase in rates. Mr. Wise stated that the Treasury would benefit by an amount of £58,000 from the proposed increase. That figure is not accurate. The actual increase to the Treasury will amount to £36,000. It must be said again that this is not an increase in taxation.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The figure I quoted was taken from a question in another place.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have checked the point, and my advice is to the effect that £36,000 will be obtained from the increased charge. As I said a moment ago, this is not increased taxation; it is merely a charge in respect of goods and for services rendered to people who are being supplied with water. The desire of the Government is to bring the charge more into uniformity than it is at the moment. After all, why should the people at one town pay more for water than people pay at some other town? It is reasonable that the charge be made uniform.

The Hon. W. R. Hall: What about a flat rate for the lot?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think we will keep out of that one, because it could be dangerous.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: It could be the fairest.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Not necessarily.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Not necessarily. Other members, when speaking to this Bill, referred to an increase in revenue of £400,000. Where on earth that figure came from I do not know. I think reference was made to such an increase by Mr. Teahan and Mr. Lavery.

The Hon. J. D. Teahan: I was mixed up with the increase in traffic fees.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think so. Maybe Mr. Lavery was mixed up in the same thing. I think he said £400,000. The amount will be nothing like that; it will be the figure I mentioned in approximation.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: That is?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It will be £36,000. As I said a moment ago, the Bill was not introduced for the purpose of obtaining more revenue. It was introduced in an effort to equalise something which has been unequal. If members will take another look at the position at Northam they will see how unequal it is.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Even the price of haircuts goes up now and again.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will not comment about that as the President may not allow me to change the subject. The intention of the Government was to remove the anomaly whereby towns such as Koorda, Bruce Rock, Narembeen, Kondinin, and Kalamunda are paying 3s. for Mundaring water while other towns receiving water from Mundaring are paying a price much lower than the cost of supply because of the maximum rate of 2s.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: Who furnished those figures?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Water Supply Department.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: They furnished a contradictory lot to another Minister.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I regard that department as a most reliable source.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: In Committee I will quote another lot of figures.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. Wise visualised that the Bill, if agreed to, would have a far-reaching effect, at present not envisaged—I think those were his words. How this can be so when the impact of

the increase on consumers is so slight is difficult for me to understand. I remind the honourable member that by administrative action, the Government of which he was a member increased the rating of areas served by Mundaring to a uniform rate of 5d. per acre. Prior to that, the rate had varied from 2d. to 5d. per acre.

This does not tally with the honourable member's objection to uniform rates in the town to which I have referred. Last year his own Government, by ministerial action, increased the rate for country land; but that could not be done in a like manner in regard to country towns. Statutory action was required in that case. Had that not been necessary, it is possible that the previous Government might have placed country towns on a uniform basis.

I hope the information I have given will satisfy Mr. Garrigan's fears that the proposal will heavily penalise country residents. To my mind, that fear is completely baseless.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: I think they are penalised enough now without any more increases.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. Bennetts was most voluble when he said that the increases would seriously affect the goldmining industry. I noticed that on the 24th October he rushed into the Kalgoorlie Press to say that these increases would affect the goldmining industry and that the people were being misled. I say that the people were being misled by Mr. Bennetts.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: That was very good!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If the honourable member did not know the position he should have made certain of it. Then he would have discovered that this proposition would not affect the goldmining industry.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: I am glad to hear it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I was distressed to see in this report—it appears to be a full report taken from *Hansard*—this interjection by Mr. Garrigan: "Where are the Liberal Party members?" I interjected and said, "That is very unfair." I say again to Mr. Garrigan that it is unfair to make interjections of that nature.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: State your reasons why.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will tell the honourable member. When the honourable member is away, nobody questions where he is; and in a friendly manner, I offer him some advice. I took the trouble to see where the Liberal members were on that occasion, and I ascertained that Mr. Murray was in hospital; Mr. Willmott was away in his electorate; and the remaining Liberal members were registered with the Clerk as having been in attendance on the day in question.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: They were not in the Chamber when I made my interjection.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There are times when members are absent, but, I repeat, one does not draw attention to the fact, unless one desires to take some unfair advantage of them.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am sure that when the honourable member is next absent, none of the members of my Party will take advantage of the fact.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: Thank you very much.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: As I said a few moments ago to Mr. Bennetts, this proposition does not touch the goldmining industry at all. If the people on the Goldfields have been misled, this has been done at the instance of the honourable member and not the Government.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Good.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: As Mr. Cunningham pointed out, the goldmining industry receives its water under a special agreement, which will not be affected by the proposals set out in this Bill. I advised Mr. Cunningham I would ascertain the cost of supplying water to Kalgoorlie. The last available figures are for the financial year 1956-57, the cost, exclusive of interest and sinking fund charges, then being 7s. 2d. per 1,000 gallons.

Interest and sinking fund costs amounted to 3s. 6d. per 1,000 gallons. The same figures for Norseman were 10s. 8½d. and 6s. 6½d. The mines are charged a flat rate of 5s. 1d. per 1,000 gallons, this figure having remained since 1932. It ill becomes the honourable member to rush to the Press and tell the residents of Kalgoorlie what this Government is going to do, when what he says is without truth! His contention that the proposal would retard the development of the outback could not have been made seriously.

Mr. Teahan endeavoured to show how business people would be affected by the Bill. In my opinion, his fears are baseless, because, as I pointed out, trading concerns that use excess water will pay a lesser overall amount than they do at present.

The honourable member referred to the fact that properties in Kalgoorlie and Boulder had been revalued some years ago, and, in reply to an interjection, said this may have been during the time of the McLarty-Watts Government. Revaluation for Boulder, Coolgardie, Kalgoorlie, and Norseman was adopted from the 1st July, 1953, which was after the date the Hawke Ministry took office. This was not done by the McLarty-Watts Government; it was done by the Government that was supported by the honourable member. Just accept it—there is no need to embellish it!

The Hon. J. D. Teahan: It must have been continued. The Labor Government did not upset it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Revaluation took effect as from the 1st July, 1954, for Bullfinch, Marvel Loch and Southern Cross. I have details of the revaluation of 67 towns served from Mundaring, and they are available to members who may wish to see them.

The Hon. J. D. Teahan: The sting is just as hard, no matter who imposes it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member's position is now—"I was a bit wrong in where I tried to put the blame, so I will get out of it a little bit if I can."

The Hon. J. D. Teahan: One of those can be challenged, too.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister had better stick to his Bill.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am. These revaluations were made during the time of the Labor Government's term of office. I merely say that to point out that it is not so very disproportionate that this present Government should be bringing these valuations up to a point where they will be nearer equality than they are at present. I think I have answered Mr. Teahan's comment that increased rating would be disastrous in its impact.

Mr. Loton stated that the Bill was for the purpose of obtaining additional revenue. This is not so, as I have already explained; although the action of equalising the rates will, I admit, be the means of some additional revenue.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: But you have not brought all the towns up to the same rating, even now.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I will wait for the honourable member to tell us more about that.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: You have told us that yourself. What about the rating at Northam?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The rating at Northam can now be the maximum.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It can be 1s. 6d.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; and it was 10d., which was lower than the rate in many other towns. The reason for the Bill is to correct the anomaly of two different maximums for towns, drawing water from the one source. Mr. Hall opposed the proposal because, in his opinion, it placed a further imposition on the residents of the Eastern Goldfields.

The Hon. W. R. Hall: That is right.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: He pointed to the fact that many people on the Goldfields had to pay a charge for excess water. As explained by Mr. Cunningham, the increase in rating allows for an additional amount of water.

The Hon. W. R. Hall: It does not matter. There are many people paying for excess water on the Goldfields, the same as people do here.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This will give them an additional allowance for water, thereby reducing the amount of excess water that they will use. This will result in a very small increase in the overall cost to the consumer.

The Hon. W. R. Hall: It will be very little, too.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Of course it will!

The Hon. W. R. Hall: It will be very little that they will get by way of increased water for the £1 extra.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: What are the amounts for the 2s. and the 3s.?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If I said what came into my mind, I would let myself down on the advice I gave to Mr. Garrigan.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Bill will have no effect on the towns being supplied from the Wellington Dam.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan interjected.

The PRESIDENT: I hope the honourable member will keep order.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: Why keep referring to one particular member?

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member must obey the Chair. The Minister may proceed; and should not take any notice of interjections.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The towns being supplied by the Wellington Dam are already liable for the maximum rate of 3s.; and the persons connected to that supply are paying the maximum. The towns in the North-West also have a 3s. maximum with the exception of Derby.

The cost of the main taking water from Mundaring to the outer metropolitan suburbs was met from the Metropolitan Water Supply Department funds. Mr. Strickland addressed himself a little on this subject, I think. No revenue from the Mundaring scheme is used to offset interest charges for this work. I would say that the Government is fully aware of its obligations to those persons living in the country areas, particularly those in the more outer districts; but it cannot be said that the proposal in the Bill will have any really noticeable effect upon country districts. It follows a recommendation of 1958 by a departmental committee which recommended uniformity of country rating.

The previous Government put this recommendation into effect so far as country lands were concerned, as I have already indicated, by administrative

action, but it did not take the statutory action necessary to make town rating uniform. But time may not have allowed for this.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Would you have supported it then?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not know how far back I could go, or what sort of a Bill it would have been; but if it had been on this basis, the answer would be "Yes."

No profit is made out of supplying country people with water. In fact, their rating is very much of a concession nature. I would like to give some of the operating costs for the last financial year in connection with, say, the Mundaring scheme which showed a loss of £236,000. The earnings amounted to £529,837, being water rates and minimum charges, £168,887; water sales, £337,915; other charges, £8,626; and reimbursements, £14,409.

Working expenses were £765,821. This was made up of pumping, including direct salaries, £378,520; maintenance of pipeline—here Mr. Halls' questions are answered—£143,524; maintenance of reservoirs, £14,537; water distribution and local management, £116,397; superannuation, £10,523; reimbursement expenses, £9,606; salaries other than direct pumping salaries, £79,977; incidental expenses, £12,518; and audit and legal expenses, £219.

Provision of £238,842 was made for depreciation and retirement of assets. Interest on capital moneys amounted to £364,763; and the stores suspense account was £8,493. This all resulted in a loss of the figure I gave when I started making this speech—£848,082.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: Does the interest figure include interest on all the new mains?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I suppose it does.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: They are not bringing in revenue.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; I believe it does. There is not much more I want to say except to deal with one or two queries that were raised. Mr. Diver said he understood that renewals were met from revenue funds, and that loan funds were utilised for installations. This is quite correct. The honourable member asked that I advise the reason why the last Government placed all country lands on a flat rate of 5d. per acre, or 3 per cent. of the unimproved value of the land, whichever is the lesser.

As I have already advised the House, this was done administratively by the previous Minister for Water Supplies, who acted on a recommendation by a departmental committee that uniformity in rating was desirable. Section 65 (2) of the parent Act provides that the rating of country land shall not exceed 5d. per acre of the area of the land rated, or 3 per cent. of the unimproved value of the land, whichever is the lesser. Prior to Mr. Tonkin's decision, the rating varied from 2d. to 5d. per acre. Now it is all rated at the maximum. Mr. Diver mentioned that there was a difference in charges for excess water. This is so; they do vary between districts; and that is another anomaly.

Mr. Heenan said that the increase in rating was one that Goldfields people could ill afford to carry. I hope that the honourable member will be convinced by the remarks I have made, and by the instances and examples I have given, that the burden should sit very lightly on his constituents.

The only persons who will suffer an increase of any note will be those who use no excess water. That is admitted. Their rates may increase by 50 per cent; that is if the Government decides to increase the rate to the maximum of 3s.

The Hon. G. Bennets: That will apply to most of the business premises on the Goldfields.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member made one dangerous statement for which he got headlines in the Press; I hope he does not go wrong again. Mr. Heenan insisted that this was a taxing measure and that it was introduced as such. Its purpose is not that at all, but to rectify an anomaly, as I have said on half-a-dozen occasions.

Mr. Strickland was quite correct when he advised the House that to achieve a uniform rate throughout the State it would be necessary to amend the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act as that Act provides that the rates charged must be such that the undertaking is profitable.

This is so near the truth that I can remember, as a private member, making applications to the Water Supply Department in respect of areas in the electorate I served when I was a member of the Lower House, as well as areas in the province I represent in this House. Those areas did not have a water supply provided under the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act; and I could not obtain a supply for the people concerned, because it was not an economical proposition under the Act. In one or two instances I was able to get a water supply for the people in question, but only on the basis that they guaranteed the Water Supply Department.

I cannot agree with the honourable member that this increase will handicap the expansion of the State and be a means towards forcing people to move elsewhere. In the light of the increases in past years by the Government of which Mr. Strickland was a member, that suggestion really does not carry much weight. The impact will be so small that it will be virtually

unnoticeable. I suppose it would be correct to say that there will be grumbles, because there always are grumbles. When the price of beer was increased, there were grumbles.

The PRESIDENT: There is nothing about beer in the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: There is water in beer, Mr. President. There were grumbles then, but just as much beer is being consumed now as was being consumed in the past.

Mr. Jones asked what effect on revenue would eventuate if a flat rate of 2s. 6d. was imposed. This is a difficult question to answer, but in the limited time that has been available to the officers of the department to ascertain the answer, they have estimated that this would result in a decrease of approximately £8,000 in revenue.

If I remember aright, the honourable member suggested going up to 2s. 6d. and coming down to 2s. 6d. Under the proposal in the Bill, the return will be £36,000 by the equalisation of the rate.

Mr. Jones also asked for a comparison of assessments. For the first example we will take a consumer living in Kalgoorlie whose assessment was £78, a reasonably high average. His rating is now 2s. in the £ and, therefore, he would pay an annual rate of £7 16s. His rebate is 4s. 6d. per 1,000 gallons and we divide the 4s. 6d. into his rating of £7 16s., which gives a rebate of 34,666 gallons—that is the number of gallons he is entitled to use for the year without paying excess.

If he used 112,800 in the year, as in the case quoted by Mr. Cunningham, he would have used 78,134 gallons excess. This would cost him £9 18s., which, with his rate of £7 16s. would total £17 14s. for the year. If his rate was increased to 3s. in the £ his rate notice would be £11 14s. as against £7 16s. This would entitle him to an increased amount of water, namely, 52,000 gallons instead of 34,666 gallons. On the same basis of using 112,800 gallons in the year, his excess would be 60,800 gallons, which would cost him £7 15s., or an annual total of £19 9s. Therefore, the increased sum he would have to pay as a result of an increase in rating from 2s. to 3s. in the £ would be £1 15s. per annum.

If his rating was increased to only 2s. 6d. in the £, as suggested by Mr. Jones, his annual payment would be £18 11s. 3d., an increase of 17s. 3d. per annum above the 2s. rating, and 17s. 9d. less than the 3s. rating.

As another instance we might take Beverley, and a resident there whose annual valuation is £62. If that person used 80,000 gallons of water, his annual rating and excess commitments would total £13 8s. 3d., being £6 4s. rates and £7 4s. 3d. excess. If his rating were increased to 3s. he would be liable for £14 12s. 4d., being £9 6s. for rates and £5 6s. 4d. for excess water, an increase of £1 4s. 1d. per annum. At a rate of 2s. 6d. the total would be £14 0s. 2d., being £7 15s. rates and £6 5s. 2d. excess. This is 12s. 2d. more than on a 2s. rate and 12s. 2d. less than a 3s. rating.

This should serve to indicate that the proposed increase would not result in an appreciable enlargement of a consumer's annual payment unless, of course, he pays no excess amount. However, I am told that approximately only 20 per cent. of consumers of Mundaring water use excess water.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Use excess water or do not use excess water?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am told that approximately only 20 per cent. of consumers of Mundaring water use no excess.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is better.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have tried, to the best of my ability, to answer all the queries that have been brought forward in connection with this little Bill. In the circumstances it does not seem to me to be a vicious charge upon the consumers of water under the Mundaring scheme. It will have the effect of doing exactly what was done previously in respect to country lands when action was taken, administratively, and the rate was increased from 2d. to 5d. There was no provision to take administratively the action proposed to be taken under this Bill; it had to be done on a statutory basis, and, therefore, the Bill had to be introduced. I hope the explanation I have given has been a satisfactory one, and that members will support the measure.

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

Ayes—11.

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. L. A. Logan	*(Teller.)*

Noes—14.

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

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon. F. D. Willmott	Hon. G. E. Jeffery

Majority against—3.

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 29th October.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON (West) [6.9]: I oppose the Bill on the ground that it seeks to impose nothing more nor less than a sectional tax. We have just

witnessed the result of the Government's action in trying to extract £36,000 from the Goldfields residents of Western Australia by way of increased water rates. Now we find that the Government is attempting to extract £400,000 from certain motorists in Western Australia.

We must realise that at the last Federal conference, the formula which had been in existence for 25 years was altered. Undoubtedly the old formula was acceptable to Western Australia inasmuch as under it this State was guaranteed a certain sum each year. When we look at the new agreement we find that Western Australia will get 17.6 per cent. of the total funds available as against 19.5 per cent. under the old formula. In effect, Western Australia has dropped by 1.9 per cent. But a safeguard was incorporated in the agreement so that the State could not get a lesser share than it did previously.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That statement does not make sense.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I meant a lesser sum than it would have got previously.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That is only for this year.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I suppose it could be said that the £ for £ basis which has been dangled before the present Government was left by the Hawke Government as a result of the last Premiers' Conference. That is not quite correct, because, under the agreement, it is not stipulated how the money which the State has to find is to be obtained. It could be paid out of Consolidated Revenue.

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

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I say it is right.

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

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Then the Minister must be at variance with a speaker I heard in another place.

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

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Under this Bill the average person who owns a motorcar will be forced to pay a 25 per cent. increase in motor-vehicle license fees. It may be said that three years ago the Hawke Labor Government increased license fees by 35 per cent. That is correct, but the 25 per cent. increase proposed does not represent the actual increase which will be made. When we look into the matter, we find that the increases proposed by this Bill represent 34 per cent., which makes a total increase of 69 per cent. since 1956. Against whom are these charges levied? They are levied against the average man and woman in Western Australia—the butcher, the baker, and the grocer, but not the persons who have the ability to pay increased charges.

Are the haulage contractors to have this extra taxation levied against them? Of course not. I have one firm in mind. Its vehicles are licensed to carry a maximum of seven tons, and I have seen members of the firm telling their drivers to load more on to the trucks which are carting phosphate. I have heard them boast about carrying a maximum pay load of 18 tons 16 cwt.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: You should have reported the firm to the Traffic Department.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: We do not see that firm prosecuted for overloading its trucks. Yet they are the people who wreck our roads.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That is casting a slur upon the Traffic Branch.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I have never seen that firm prosecuted. I am open to correction, but I have never seen it. I do not know whether the department has checked up on the matter.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: They have been prosecuted sometimes, but not often.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: The firm may have been prosecuted, but I have never seen or heard of it. I know of complaints about another firm which transports sugar. The local authority—I refer to the Mosman Park Road Board—has made complaints about the damage done to its roads by the vehicles used by this firm. Yet neither of those firms will have to pay increased license fees under this legislation. Pastoralists and graziers are also to be exempted from this extra tax, which is nothing more or less than an extra tax levied on people who own motorcars.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: Before the tea suspension I was pointing out that this is an extra tax to be placed on only a section of the community which uses motorcars for recreation or business, or which considers such vehicles essential for travelling to and from their place of employment. On the other hand, however, heavy road transport vehicles are not to be subject to any increased taxation. I cannot see why this measure is necessary. Over the last few years we have developed good roads throughout Western Australia; and I feel sure that, with the present grants that are coming forward, we can maintain them at a reasonable standard. We can keep to a programme that we have followed over the past 10 years.

There is absolutely no necessity for this increased tax. At present the motorist has to pay a heavy tax on his petrol, and heavy sales tax on a new vehicle and on spare parts; and now he is to be subjected to an extra tax on his registration fee and driver's license fee. It is the responsibility

of the State to provide good roads, not at the expense of one section only of the community, but at the expense of the whole community. In regard to the point raised by Mr. Strickland that, for every £1 contributed by the local authorities the State is going to contribute at least 30s., I assume that under this new agreement with the Commonwealth, that would be the minimum and the maximum amount the local authorities would receive. I do not think the local authorities will be very impressed with that proposal inasmuch as this State is going to receive 10s. more for Commonwealth grants, compared with the previous subsidy grant; but this will not be enjoyed by the local authorities to develop the roads in their own districts.

If this Bill is passed—which I hope it is not—the driver's license fee will have risen by 300 per cent. since 1952. I am not sure what the driver's license fee is in the Northern Territory, but, assuming it is 10s., the average over all the States would be 15s. Therefore, if the Bill reaches the Committee stage, I intend to move an amendment to reduce the driver's license fee from 20s. to 15s. to bring Western Australia into line with other States.

I would like the Minister to explain why heavy transport operators are not to share the burden of the extra taxation proposed in this Bill. Why should the ordinary motorist be subject to this extra impost when the heavy transport operator is to be exempt? Perhaps the Minister will also explain how old age or invalid pensioners, who possessed an old motor vehicle prior to being granted the pension, and who enjoy a drive on a Sunday afternoon, will be able to afford the increase in the registration fee and the driver's license fee.

I pointed out previously that if this Bill is agreed to, the registration fee on a motor vehicle will have increased by 69 per cent. since 1956. No other charge or tax throughout Australia has been increased to such an extent in three years. Although the Bill contains some clauses that will tidy up the Act, I must vigorously oppose the measure because it represents sectional taxation, and it will be John Citizen who will have to shoulder this extra burden. For those reasons I intend to vote against the second reading; but if the Bill does go into Committee I will move some amendments.

THE HON. C. R. ABBEY (Central) [7.39]: I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill because there is a great need to spend more money on our roads, and we must obtain it from somewhere. The principle of obtaining £ for £ from the Commonwealth for the construction and maintenance of roads is good business. There are two services which are badly needed to be rendered by the Main Roads Department. One is the provision of more surveyors, and the other is for local road boards to enjoy, to greater advantage, the advice and assistance of the traffic engineering branch of that department.

In the administration of local road boards it has been found difficult, on many occasions, to obtain sufficient money to engage surveyors to survey the route for a road, or to obtain advice on traffic engineering, which is urgently necessary for the establishment of a road. I understand the Main Roads Department will be establishing a branch to handle traffic engineering in the country; and I am sure, if this is done, it will be of great benefit to many local authorities. Therefore, I support the provision to increase the driver's license fee from 10s. to 20s. because the extra revenue that will be obtained will be used to establish this branch.

I impress upon the Minister, if it is the intention of the Main Roads Department to set up a traffic engineering branch for the country, to ensure that its services are made available to road boards; and, if possible, to take steps to have the services of more surveyors made available to local authorities to expedite the surveying of new roads.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: The traffic engineering branch is pretty large now.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: Yes, but we do not get sufficient advice in the country from that branch; and I would like to see it extended because if country road boards could have their roads properly surveyed and the traffic engineering properly based, it would prove of great benefit to them. We have had many roads laid down in the past, but they do not measure up to modern-day standards. It is essential that roads should be established on a proper basis instead of two or three bites being made at the job, as sometimes has happened.

Another matter upon which I would like the Minister's advice is the question of whether it would be possible for the revenue obtained by the road boards from the increased drivers' license fees to be paid into a special account—as long as sufficient proof was supplied to the Treasury that that had been done—which would enable the local road boards to maintain a credit account instead of having overdrafts in their general accounts. If this were agreed to, the road boards would be saved a great deal of money because they would not have to pay any interest on their overdrafts. This is a suggestion that is worthy of consideration because many road boards, at some period of the year, operate on an overdraft; but were they permitted to have a special credit account set aside—and evidence could be supplied to the Treasury that that had been done—I am sure it would be sufficient justification for that department to advance a lump sum in order to obtain this £ for £ subsidy from the Commonwealth.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I do not think a road board would be permitted to pay money into a credit trust account to counter a debit in another account.

The Hon. C. R. ABBEY: In any case, I would be glad if the Minister could give that suggestion some consideration.

Another point which strikes me in regard to traffic license fees is the proposition for the calling of a conference of all the States, with a view to bringing all the fees into line so that there will be a uniform rate of fees. There would not then be the need for the Commonwealth Grants Commission constantly to say that one particular State imposed a lower license fee than the others. If such a conference is brought into being it may be possible to straighten out the existing anomalies and bring about uniformity in these fees. Perhaps the Minister can enlighten us on this point. This Bill is a step in the right direction, and I support it wholeheartedly.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [7.46]: It is my intention to support this Bill; but I do so with none of the enthusiasm shown by Mr. Abbey. It would appear that people who own motorcars, consume liquor, and smoke cigarettes are being taxed, and that every Government department is queueing up for a turn to dig into the pockets of those people.

This Bill brings to light one matter on which I want to sound a note of warning; that is the basic principle of subsidies in tax collection. This principle of a £ for £ basis of contribution for funds raised is fair enough, and indeed works quite well in the raising of money for charitable purposes. In the case of a home for the aged appeal, where a local drive is undertaken to raise, say £1,000, it is a good idea to subsidise the organisation to the extent of £2 for every £1 it raises.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: This principle was not one of our own making.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is a bad principle, when it is applied to State taxation by the Commonwealth Government. The Minister has just interjected and said it was not of our own making. Were this of our own making, I would vote against the measure; but because it is not, I am prepared to support it.

My claim that it is a bad priniciple is not based purely on my own experiences in the State. In the U.S.A. it was found to be so bad that some States refused such grants from the Federal Treasury. When we analyse the matter in detail, we find that a central tax-collecting authority can overtax the people to the tune of, say, £10,000,000. That authority can decide to return that money to the States; but rather than return it without any proviso, the central authority returns it on a subsidy basis, in order to ensure that the States will be more careful in the expenditure of the money. If, say, £500,000 is returned to this State, that is its per capita share, and this State has been overtaxed by that amount.

In effect, the central authority is saying "You raise another £500,000 to match our £500,000, and you will get the extra money from us." The State then taxes the people again to the tune of another £500,000, which is placed into the fund. The State then approaches the central authority and it is given another £500,000. This means that the people in the State have been over-taxed by £1,000,000.

In the case of the poorer States, this principle proved to be disastrous when it was applied. I suggest that the Government should examine the situation. I strongly recommend that a very firm stand be taken with the Commonwealth Government with a view to limiting this type of financing as much as possible. The more one goes into this principle, the more one will find that it is not a good one.

If it is considered worth while to contribute a certain amount of extra money to one or another State, the money should be distributed for the purpose for which it is required. For those reasons, there appears to be an ever-pressing need for a very careful analysis to be made of the Commonwealth-State financial relationships. This question has been debated in this House by men of far greater experience of the subject than I have. We heard at least two very well prepared addresses by Mr. Wise on the subject. Whilst I support the measure, I do not wish to let the occasion pass without voicing what I consider to be a very timely warning about the basic principle which applies in respect of this particular piece of legislation.

On motion by the Hon. A. L. Loton, debate adjourned.

ENTERTAINMENTS TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 29th October.

THE HON. H. K. WATSON (Metropolitan) [7.53]: This Bill prompts me to suggest that it is quite an interesting experience for one to throw a reasonable suggestion into the ring, and then to sit back and wait to see how long before the suggestion sinks into the minds of those in authority and prompts them to put it into effect.

In 1953 when Mr. Hawke felt disposed to impose this tax on entertainments, I not only expressed the view, but did my best to prevail upon the House to give effect to entertainments tax exemption to what are generally known as live shows. I revived that request in 1956 when the Act was amended, but again without success. I am pleased to see that in 1959, the plea is at last being acceded to.

So it was with respect to entertainments conducted by religious and charitable organisations. In 1953, and again in 1956, I made strenuous representations that entertainments of that nature should be exempt from entertainments tax. Again it is pleasing to know that, in 1959, dances organised for charitable purposes and so on will be exempt from that tax.

In 1953 I also offered a few other suggestions, which so far have not been put into effect. One was that entertainments tax should not be imposed upon admission charges under 4s. I notice that a step towards that suggestion is contained in the complementary measure before this House, to the extent of exempting the tax in respect of admission charges up to 2s. I also threw out the suggestion—and I repeat it—that since 80 per cent., or thereabouts, of revenue from the entertainments tax is derived from picture theatres and horse-racing, it should be confined to those two items. It seems to me rather futile to impose the entertainments tax on the residue of entertainments—such as country dances organised by football, cricket, and other sporting clubs.

The Hon. J. M. A. Cunningham: And church organisations.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: Charitable organisations are exempt under this Bill, but dances conducted by country sporting clubs are not exempt. These dances provide employment for musicians. I understand that in these days the musicians are experiencing a hard time as a result of the falling off of dances through the introduction of the entertainments tax.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: On the Goldfields they are not having a hard time.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: In the metropolitan area they are. The occupation of musicians is not like that of any other person. It is precarious, and anything which can be done to help them ought to be done. I am pleased to see that the Bill seeks to ease the incidence of entertainments tax in the two directions I have mentioned; that is, to exempt live shows, and to exempt entertainments organised for religious and charitable purposes. I am still not without hope that one of these days we will see this tax abolished altogether.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [7.59]: I certainly will not oppose this measure, because it does introduce practices which will tend to assist the entertainments field. There are, however, one or two points in the Bill which I want to criticise.

Firstly, I am not very happy about the lifting of all controls in respect of charitable entertainments. I think some control is needed. If I remember rightly, when this legislation was originally introduced, it was pointed out that charitable shows and organised entertainments of that type were being held with very little profit to the causes themselves. It was for this reason that the Bill was introduced. I believe that it is difficult at times to keep within the limit of 60 per cent., but I think there should be some control. I am not very happy about the complete removal of this control under clause 3 of the Bill.

The second Bill is interesting because it stipulates the amounts to be charged; and there are comments which one could make in that regard. I am not at all certain that I would agree that an audience does not come under clause 2, because surely all of the people who are providing the entertainment for the audience are human beings playing in a band or orchestra; and I think we would find that they would be able to claim exemption.

That is all I have to say in regard to this measure; but I would draw attention to the fact that in clause 2 in the description of the forms of entertainment we find that there are six types mentioned. They are all described by a noun and there is one that is described by an adjective. I am referring to the word "recitational" which worried Mr. Wise. There is a noun to describe this form of entertainment, and I feel it should be used. The noun is "recitative", and I think that the Minister might delete the contentious word and insert the correct one because he will realise that all the other forms of entertainment are referred to by nouns and this is the only adjective referred to in the clause.

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [8.2]: There is very little I would like to add to what has already been said in connection with this Bill. I propose to support the second reading because I approve of the relief that is being given to live shows. It is interesting to know that this tax last year brought in £291,000. If this Bill becomes law, the public will be relieved to the extent of approximately £80,000. I know that live shows such as stage plays, ballets, instrumental and vocal entertainments, and variety entertainments find it uneconomic very often to come to Western Australia. This is because the expense of travelling is so heavy to start off with and then, added to that is the entertainments tax which, in many instances, has precluded worth-while forms of entertainment coming to Western Australia.

I know for a fact that in a number of instances companies have brought these types of shows to this State and have suffered heavy losses; so much so that the organisations which control them hesitate to embark on such ventures in the future. I do not think that it is a good thing for the people of Western Australia, and I do hope that if this Bill becomes law it will do something to correct that state of affairs. I also express the hope that the people who are responsible for bringing these forms of entertainment to Western Australia will see that the public get the benefit—

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Will they? That is the question.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN:—of the remission of this entertainment tax. I believe that is the desire behind the Bill, and it is certainly the motive which prompts me to support it. The companies should benefit indirectly by lowering admission charges, thereby making it possible for larger audiences to patronise the shows.

Like Dr. Hislop and Mr. Wise, I am amused, somewhat, by this word "recitational" but these days we get used to the coinage of new words; and I think we all know what it means. A couple of years ago there was a world-famed artist—I forget his name—who appeared at His Majesty's Theatre. He gave recitations from the works of Charles Dickens and Shakespeare. It was a one-man show and I suppose that is the type of show that is meant by "recitational." The word, to my mind anyhow, connotes that type of performance; and the use of the word is not going to worry me so much that I feel we should alter it.

The other provision in the Bill, dealing with voluntary organisers, will, I know, meet with a good deal of approval on the Murchison because from time to time we have had brought to our notice the fact the picture-shows and the like are organised on a voluntary basis. The expenses are very heavy up there, and frequently exceed 60 per cent., thereby making the payment of entertainments tax necessary. I know that has been a very sore point at Cue and other places for many years; and the injustice of the situation has been pointed out to me by voluntary workers, whose interest in their communities is above reproach, and who run their shows on the highest standards.

I am very pleased that the amendment has been introduced, and I hope again that this remission which is proposed will be of benefit to the general public; and that devious ways will not be found whereby the real intentions of the Bill will be defeated. For the reasons I have mentioned, I propose to support the Bill.

THE HON. J. D. TEAHAN (North-East) [8.10]: I am pleased that this Bill will give relief to a number of shows which are worthy of receiving such relief. In the last few years I have several times pleaded the cause of country entertainments whose object was either philanthropic, charitable, or religious, and which were prevented by the 60 per cent. barrier from getting the relief to which they were entitled; because, for reasons beyond their control, they were genuinely not able to keep within the 60 per cent. allowed. I know it will be said that sometimes the concession is abused. I could cite some instances myself. For example, say an organisation was to hold a rather elaborate ball. The provisions of the Act would be known, and the organisation could arrange for some charitable body to benefit to the extent of £2 or £3, and thus avoid the necessity of paying £25 or £30 tax.

I do not know how we are going to overcome that situation. If we legislate in order to control it, we are going to impose a hardship on those entertainments which are genuinely held for a charitable or religious purpose.

This Bill will particularly help entertainments in the country. I have had requests from smaller towns on the Murchison and the North-Eastern Goldfields for some relief from the entertainments tax. Members can imagine that in places like Cue, Laverton, and Leonora, not many entertainments are held. There might be an annual hospital ball, one to assist the local school, and a couple of other like functions. And then after all the work and time has been spent on such efforts, it is found that very little is gained because of the limit imposed at present. However, this Bill will ensure that such entertainments will be totally exempt, which is what I have been seeking.

There are other places, like Sandstone, which would not have more than 12 or 14 functions a year. They would be run by local inhabitants themselves, but by the time they pay the various amounts in connection with such efforts, they find that they have not kept within the 60 per cent., and, therefore, they have to pay the tax. Because this Bill will benefit the country dwellers so much, I intend to support it.

THE HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [8.13]: I am very grateful indeed to the Government for introducing this measure to amend the principal Act. It is something which has been necessary for country areas, in particular, for a long time; especially in regard to entertainments sponsored or run by various organisations for charitable concerns.

The people of Buntine—a small part of the area attached to the Dalwallinu Road Board—recently organised a function in connection with the opening of the hall. They decided to do the right thing by the people of the district and the visitors, and so they engaged a band from Perth. They organised the function —not lavishly, but reasonably well—and when it came to the time of totalling up the receipts and expenditure they found they had exceeded what the law allowed, and they therefore had to pay, I think, £52 in entertainments tax. While it was pointed out that it was a function held to open a hall that had been recently built, no remission was made by the Treasury. I know that many other organisations work very hard—Mr. Teahan mentioned various places on the Eastern Goldfields and on the Murchison where there are only a few functions held every year, and

they are for charitable purposes—to organise shows in order to raise money for some charity or other; and so I believe this Bill is a step in the right direction.

I would like the Minister to tell us, when replying, whether the exemption from the tax means that people conducting these entertainments will not have to make some report to the Taxation Department or the Stamp Office. If it is not intended that such reports should be made, I think it is wrong, because many people will take advantage of it.

I come now to the question of the reducing or removal of the tax on live shows, and I do not feel the same way in this regard; particularly in the case of shows where the tickets are very expensive. I think it was Mr. Wise who mentioned that a person who could pay anything from perhaps £1 up to £3 or £4 for a ticket to see a live show, would not feel the extra few shillings tax. I agree that where a person can afford to pay from £1 to £3 or £4 per ticket he would not notice the 5s. tax; and the entertainer would add the tax to the admission charge in any case, and so would not be the loser.

I think that provision should be reconsidered. I agree that the live shows could be excluded, where the admission charge is only a few shillings; but a line should be drawn somewhere and a tax should be imposed where the admission charge is high. I support the measure.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban —Minister for Mines—in reply) [8.17]: This Bill has been introduced with the intention of making a start in the reduction of entertainments tax. Perhaps it does not go as far as the Government would have liked it to go. But in the light of existing circumstances, I suggest that it should be given a trial; and later—next year—the Government will examine the position further, in order to see how the legislation is working out and whether any further amendments should be made.

Mr. Jones asked whether a charitable organisation would be obliged to make a report on its activities to the Stamp Office of the Treasury. I think that under this provision such an organisation would certainly have to give an account of itself under the provisions of clause 9. There the commissioner still has to be satisfied that the function being conducted is a *bona fide* one, and that the people concerned are entitled to relief.

The Hon. A. R. Jones: They will have to seek relief?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. Clause 9 also provides that the commissioner can give relief—as it appears in the Act—where atmospheric conditions upset the show and cause loss. A watch will be kept on that sort of thing. This portion of the measure has been introduced to give relief in country areas. I am informed by the Treasury that it is extremely difficult now to police that sort of thing in the country.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: It costs more than it is worth.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; it involves a great deal of paper work.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Will the concessions be passed on to the patrons?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The provision of which I am speaking now is solely for philanthropic purposes; and so it can be that where the patron is charged heavily, the charity can show a greater profit. However, under this portion of the Bill I do not think it matters much, and the fact is that the Government is desirous of removing the 60 per cent. provision. I think it would be true to say that there could be some infringement of this provision for relief, as suggested by Mr. Wise; but I doubt whether it would be of very grave consequence. The commissioner has to be satisfied, in any event.

Let us have some faith in those persons and organisations that set out to conduct functions for charity. They are usually well meaning and well purposed, with a desire to make a maximum profit for some charity. I do not think there is a great fear in that regard. The idea of removing the 60 per cent. provision is to make things easier in country districts; and I know country members will agree that in the running of a charitable function, if an orchestra is employed it may cost from £50 to £60, particularly if the members have to travel a long way; and the impact of such a charge on the overall takings might easily be such as to cause the organisers some embarrassment.

Either Dr. Hislop or Mr. Heenan raised the question of dances. Section 8 of the Act states that entertainments tax should not be charged on payment for admission to any entertainment where the commissioner is satisfied, and so on; and then later on it states: "Entertainment does not include dancing or skating unless conducted for competitive purposes." So dancing will not be free of tax. Representations have been made personally to me by various people interested in dancing. But all I can say at the moment is that during the trial period dancing will not be free of tax. Next year, when the Government has an opportunity to re-examine the legislation, further consideration can be given to that aspect.

Mr. Wise mentioned the impact of television and the effect it might have on picture theatres. He doubted whether its impact would be such as I indicated I thought it would be; but, after all, we have not yet had an opportunity to assess what the impact on the community will be—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I concede that.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. I think it is fair to say that in some parts of the world television has had a great effect.

When I was in the United Kingdom about three years ago, the introduction of television had had a disastrous effect on the picture-theatre business in Great Britain.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Did they have syndicated American programmes?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Some of the programmes were good and some were not so good; but at that time meetings of picture-theatre proprietors were being held in London in protest against the impact of television; and they were asking the Government for extensive relief from entertainments tax, so that they could hand that reduction of tax on to the picture-goer and consequently keep themselves in business.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: I believe that 18 picture shows in the suburban areas of Melbourne are being closed down because of television; and that could happen here.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It could be so. Mr. Watson said he was disappointed that the prices were not based on 4s.; but at present the prices are based on 2s.; and I repeat that the question of the tax will be reviewed at a later date. I do not think there is a great deal more for me to say in reply to the points raised by members; but with regard to the word "recitational" I wish to say that I have been seeking it in the original Act, because I had an idea that it appeared somewhere there. I thought that somewhere in the Act the word "recitation" was used and that it was decided to change it to "recitational."

I have not any doubt in my mind as to what the word means, and I am sure the Commissioner of Taxation will have no doubt as to the manner in which he will apply it. I do not think there is any great necessity to change it. I am sorry I cannot find it in the Act; but perhaps it is not there, although I had the idea that the word "recitation" was previously used somewhere. I do not really know why I struck the word "recitational" out of the speech I was making; but I did so, perhaps, without taking a great deal of notice of the fact that the word "recitational" was in the Bill and there was no necessity for it to be removed. I do not think there is any doubt that the Bill will give some relief and I am pleased with the support it has received.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (the Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; the Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2—Section 8 amended:

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Does "recitational" cover such things as readings from Shakespeare and other works which it is normally meant to cover? If we take the word "recitation" as a base, there may be some trouble. We have people like Evan Williams coming here who put on a wonderful show. But what he did was not all recitation; some of it was reading. We should stick to the English language, and I suggest the Minister inquire the exact meaning of the word from a professor of English before the third reading of the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The word "recitation" is not being used as a base. The word "recitational" is plainly written. However, I will ascertain in the closest detail what phase of entertainment will be covered by "recitational," and let the Committee know before the third reading of the Bill.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3 and Title put and passed.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

ENTERTAINMENTS TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 29th October.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [8.34]: I trust the House, when regarding this measure, will take into consideration the words of the Minister himself; namely, that this is a measure to reduce entertainments tax and not to readjust it both up and down. I doubt very much whether it is realised that when charges for live shows are over £1—and sometimes they go up to much more than £1—the loss on those shows can be quite considerable.

Accordingly we are fairly safe in the amounts that live shows are exempt from taxation. I only want to draw the attention of members to the fact that although there is a high charge for an entertainment, there may still not be a profit from it. The more profitable shows are the light comedy and vaudeville shows, to which the public go in large numbers; but the cultural shows sometimes have a very difficult row to hoe.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Jack Kramer and the Harlem Globe Trotters would come into this.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The charge for the ballet was very high, but, if I remember rightly, during its season here it suffered a loss of something like £6,000. If a tax had been added in addition to the measure of charge that was made, the loss, of course, would have been considerably greater. These are the sort of things which we must protect. Mr. Wise is probably right when he says that Kramer and his team would come into this field. They are nothing more than sporting bodies giving an exhibition of their skill.

But it would be difficult to distinguish between those as live shows and stage shows. If we look at the previous Bill, I wonder whether we would really regard Kramer's sporting tennis entertainment as being within the scope of the measure we have just passed. I doubt whether we would.

I am referring mainly to the stage plays. I realise that now we have passed the previous Bill they are safe from an increased tax; but I would draw the attention of members to the fact that because a high price is charged for an entertainment, it does not necessarily mean that it makes a high profit. In some of the highest-priced entertainments we have had in this State, the loss has been the greatest. The profit which the entrepreneurs have made has come from the more attractive stage shows which could be classed among the vaudeville and light comedies I have mentioned.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Deputy Chairman of Committees (the Hon. A. R. Jones) in the Chair; the Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3 put and passed.

Clause 4—First and Second Schedules repealed and Schedule substituted:

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: As I said before, this does not purport to do everything. It merely attempts to give some relief by way of tax. I doubt whether Kramer and his troupe would receive relief under this provision. They are in business and exhibit themselves. They play exhibition tennis for a fee which people pay for admission.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: A skating troupe at His Majesty's would come into this.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No. The other Bill says entertainment tax does not include dancing or skating unless conducted for competitive purposes.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: They are all run as competitions.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: They are professional competitions and are classed as such.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I think it is worth looking at.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Commissioner of Taxation will decide who comes within the scope of the Bill. But in respect to Kramer and his troupe, I think the admission fee was advertised together with the amount of tax.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop.: What about a travelling show?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is entirely different from professional tennis players.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Some of them were designated as circuses.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is outside the scope of the Bill.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

MUNICIPALITY OF FREMANTLE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 29th October.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH: (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [8.43]: My notes on this Bill seem to be temporarily misplaced. My colleague persists in hiding them from me! However, the Bill appears to do that which Mr. Davies said it did when he introduced the measure. I have no objection to the Bill and agree to its provisions.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN INDUSTRIES AUTHORITY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 28th October.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [8.45]: In any category, this Bill could be regarded as a most important and far-reaching one. It is a Bill for an Act to constitute the Western Australian Industries Authority and to define its functions, powers, and duties, and for other purposes. The other purposes are not necessarily relevant or relative, but are as wide apart as the poles. It is a Bill which I shall endeavour to analyse, and which I hope will not pass the second reading.

The Minister, in his introduction, concentrated on the need for industrial development in this State, an objective which every citizen of Western Australia would support strongly. It is also an objective which every Labor Government has not only applauded, but has given very strong support, ministerially and in every practical way. The initial work to encourage local industries back in the days of the depression—the work done by the late J. J. Keneally and the then secretary of the department (Mr. McCartney)—will be remembered by many in this Chamber.

During the years, the work of the Department of Industrial Development has been creditable, indeed, to the officers

concerned, the department generally, and the Minister controlling them. In the course of his speech, the Minister for Mines said that the previous form of encouragement of industry had not really been as effective as would be desired, and a new form of departmental activity was required. Therefore, he submitted the proposal to constitute an authority consisting of three businessmen of our community with the functions and powers as set out in the Bill. They are to be given extraordinary powers, which I hope to analyse in due course. In his introduction, the Minister concentrated on a few clauses, dismissing the remainder as being machinery clauses. This is far from the true situation.

In my view, he gave a very incomplete explanation of the powers and functions of the authority. I refer to a statement of policy as published in *The West Australian* of the 19th March last which quoted the Premier as saying—

> What we intend to do with the State Trading Concerns is first to make them payable based on sound business principles instead of Departmental principles and when this is done put them on their own as public companies with shares on the Stock Exchange to continue their operations as free enterprise concerns.

That quotation was part of the starting point for this legislation. It is an utterance of the Premier stated as a matter of policy in March last. The businessmen to be constituted as the authority are to be subject to the Minister and to give effect to his direction; but, in addition to giving effect to the desires of the Minister, the authority will of itself have extremely wide powers; and it can very easily run off the rails in so far as the public interest is concerned, with or without the complete sanction of the Minister, and certainly without any reference to Parliament.

The authority will assume and discharge the functions of the Department of Industrial Development. If the Bill is ever proclaimed, there will be no Department of Industrial Development; there will be no link directly ministerially and departmentally with industries already established and new industries intending or desiring to come to the State. The only link with the Minister will be three outside people, not of the Public Service. In many respects, once authority is handed to them, they will act of their own volition; and they are people whose interests are opposed in many respects, at this moment, to the very activities and practices of the Department of Industrial Development as it has operated through the years.

So the department will be superseded by people not of the Public Service; people not associated with the Minister and his department, but with a department created, constructed, and operating really extraneous to the Minister, in spite of clause 7 of the Bill. I think it is a most dangerous experiment in so far as the public interest is concerned.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: It is a scandal!

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: These people will be from vast business interests; interests which conflict with State interests, and which certainly conflict with anything owned by the State. Therefore, in my view, their interests will conflict with public interests. As I proceed in analysing this Bill I will show just how vast the authority of these people will be once matters are vested in them, subject to the Minister, but giving them outright authority on which to act.

They will be created and established as a body corporate, detached from any State department. However, they will have the right to assume control over many departments and the officers of those departments. The action of creating them a body corporate is described in almost identical words as are used in many statutes as they exist today. Almost identical words will be found in the State Electricity Commission Act; in the State Government Insurance Office Act; in the State Transport Co-ordination Act; in the Superannuation Act, and in several others. The authorities set up under these Acts are wholly associated with the Crown, and they are established as bodies corporate.

Authority is vested in them because they are acting as Crown instrumentalities and not something detached from the Crown. Those authorities are not operated upon by people of outside business interests. They are people whose services belong to the Crown; they are people who are allied with the activities of a Crown instrumentality or a State department; and their private interests are actively dissociated therefrom.

Many things point to the selection of two members of the authority already having been made; namely, Mr. H. L. Brisbane, and Sir Russell Dumas, who are acting in this field for the Government in an advisory capacity. The Department of Industrial Development is not functioning as formerly, and these two gentlemen are already actively taking their part in the interviewing of people representing industrial interests that may be coming to this State, or indeed that may not yet be in the State.

If the assertion is correct—and it has not been denied—these gentlemen are likely to be two of the members of the authority; and there will be another as yet unknown. It is well to say that Mr. Brisbane has had a very long and successful career as a businessman in this State; and he has many and varied interests. To his credit, he was able, as the founder of a certain type of industry in this State, to absorb a major competitor. Mr. Brisbane is associated with many activities, not only

in business circles as such, but in the field of insurance and other spheres. He is a very busy man.

The other member, Sir Russell Dumas, is a retired Director of Works and an engineer associated with many public works, including the Canning Dam. He is now a director of many public companies. It is obvious in the framework of this Bill that these two gentlemen are more than likely to be two members of the authority. One of them is in his 67th year, and the other is approaching 73 years of age. Both have extensive interests —as I have stated—and were described by the Minister as having the ability to meet major industrialists on even terms and being able to talk the same language.

I feel sure they will understand to the full what may be done in the name of business, but their ideas will be in line with those of the Minister. I refer to the Minister for Industrial Development and not the Minister in this Chamber. Their thinking will be in line with that of the Minister in regard to his fetish against anything State-owned. Their thinking will be in line with the desire to get rid of State enterprises and State instrumentalities as soon as they come within the category described in the speech of the Premier, and stated as policy on the 19th March last.

We must remember, too, that they will be anxious, if they can find a ready and willing buyer for any Crown instrumentality, to effect a ready sale. We must also remember it is the desire of the Government to repeal the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Control Act. Members must keep that in mind. So in addition to the destroying of the Department of Industrial Development as it has existed, and the new authority taking over a department which at present is under the control of the Minister, members of the authority will have control of the machinery of a department which has given great service; and they will be detached entirely from the channelling, experience and knowledge which has been operated in that department.

The Bill provides that existing Crown estate or real or personal property of the Crown may be vested in the authority, after which it may exercise the extraordinary powers contained in clause 20. The authority must assist and advise in the disposal of State trading concerns and any State industry to private enterprise. One of its functions is to advise the Minister on the policy which should be adopted in regard to and the best methods of undertaking the transfer of State trading concerns and other industry controlled or carried on by, or on behalf of the State or a department to the field of private enterprise, and assisting in any such transfer.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: Would that apply to Robb Jetty?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It undoubtedly would, and I shall deal with that in a few moments. We must read what I have just mentioned in clause 17 (f) with the definitions in the interpretation clause of the Bill on page 2. If members will examine the interpretation of the words "department" and "industry," which appear on many occasions through the Bill, they will get some appreciation of the enormous powers which will be handed to this authority by the Minister, of his own will, and without reference to Parliament. The definition of "department" is—

> "Department" means any department under the administration of a Minister of the Crown in the Government of the State, and includes any State trading concern.

The next words in the definition are to be amended by the Minister in Committee, so I shall omit them. The definition continues—

> The Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners, and any Crown instrumentality which controls or carries on an industry.

That is as broad as any interest of State can be. "Any department" includes any State trading concern, any department under the administration of a Minister of the Crown in the Government of the State, and any Crown instrumentality which controls or carries on an industry. So, not only does it apply to the Fremantle Harbour Trust and to all State trading concerns, but it may equally apply to any other harbour trust. The definition of the word "industry" is as follows:—

> "Industry" includes any trade and any business, and any activity or undertaking which has association with commerce or industrial activity whether carried on by a department or otherwise.

So that anything, whether it comes under the State Trading Concerns Act or not, which has an association with any Crown instrumentality that carries on an industry, can be examined by this authority at the will of the Minister; and it will come within the powers of the authority once such things are vested in it.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Where is that?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I will show that to the honourable member as I proceed. If we now refer to the powers contained on page 7 of the Bill we will find—

> Subject to the provisions of this section the Governor may—
>
> (a) refer to the Authority any contract which has been or is made by or on behalf of the Government of the State, the Authority or a department with respect to an industry; or

(b) vest in the Authority any estate or interest of the Crown in any real or personal property except land classified under the Land Act, 1933, as of class A or class B reserve.

The Governor may vest in the authority any estate or interest of the Crown in any real or personal property. If we pass to subclause (3) of clause 18, to which I am referring, we will find that it provides—

> In relation to a contract referred to, or to property vested in the Authority under this section, the Authority shall have and may exercise the powers mentioned in section twenty of this Act unless and until the reference or vesting is revoked.

In the operations of the authority as a body corporate, acting in conjunction with the functions as designated in clauses 17, 18, 19 and 20, members will get an idea of the serious implications in spite of the fact that for all the purposes of the Bill, the authority is subject to the Minister and shall give effect to his directions.

Indeed, in addition to being subject to the Minister, and to his whims and instructions, the authority will, on receipt of some of these instructions be a ready and helpful buttress to the Minister to do the things which he would not dare to do, I suggest, of his own volition; and I shall give an illustration of the statement a little later.

In the case of the body corporate, if the authority were a branch of, or an authority under the Public Service, there could be no cavil about giving it that right; to giving it that authority; and to giving it the protection within it. But there is a grave doubt about giving that right to someone quite detached from the department and with interests not identical with any departmental interests—a department of outsiders and others under the direction of a Minister whose policy it is not only to direct industries to this State but to ensure that State trading concerns which show a profit immediately come within the categories of those to be disposed of to private enterprise, and, those with having shares on the Stock Exchange.

I now pass to the clause dealing with the functions of the authority; and in connection with this clause, I propose to give notice of several amendments which I shall put on tomorrow's notice paper. I object to the very first paragraph of the clause which provides—

> The functions of the Authority are—
>
> (a) subject to the Minister, to assume and discharge the functions hitherto discharged by the Department of Industrial Development in the Government of the State.

Why destroy something accountable to the Government and accountable directly to the Minister, and detach it entirely from ministerial control; because by clause 20 the authority is exempted in its operations from any ministerial control? But before proceeding to that clause, I would like to draw attention to the innocuous padding contained in subclauses (c), (d) and (e) on page 6 of the Bill, which is merely frill and embroidery, and means nothing. I concede absolutely that subclause (b) covers all the purposes contained in subclauses (c), (d) and (e) which come within the category and description of subclause (b). But subclause (f), of course, is the one that should not be in the Bill at all.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: To advise the Minister.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: As if the Minister needs any advice on a policy dealing with what should be done with State enterprises; because the Minister has decided that policy. This means that the Ministers want advice given to them, as a Government, through the Minister in charge of the Bill, as to the best methods of undertaking the transfer of State trading concerns and other industries controlled by the Government.

As a unit of this Parliament, not only am I in principle opposed to the disposal of State trading concerns, but I am absolutely opposed to this method of disposing of them. Before sitting down, I intend to give an illustration of private enterprise in action, and of a State trading concern in action, to compare the objectives of both and to show where Parliament—not such an authority as this, or the Minister, but Parliament—should have the right to determine what should be done with them.

I shall do this so that when we consider that the Government may vest in this authority any real or personal property, and we turn to page 7 of the Bill and again consider the words I quoted earlier, we will see that any real or personal property of the Crown vested in the authority may be dealt with in accordance with the powers reposed in the authority under clause 20.

The clause preceding clause 20 gives to the authority very wide powers of recommendation to the Minister; and the authority, on the Minister referring a matter to it, may make contracts under the direction of the Minister with a very wide responsibility only to the Minister.

This authority has the right or the power under clause 20 to make any inquiries and investigations with respect to any industry anticipated or existing, and in respect to any industry which may be under examination by the authority. By the Bill, if it becomes a statute, the authority will have the right to inquire into

all sorts of things coming within the definition of "industry." A particular paragraph limits the authority's operation, in regard to financial assistance, to £5,000 for any industry. This assistance can be made of the authority's own volition; it can be made by the authority as a contract for considerable expenditure.

There will be vested in the authority power to make contracts and decide the things which even the Government itself intends to enter. The powers in subclauses (e) and (g) on page 9 of the Bill are so wide that any existing instrumentalities, and all things coming within the definitions of "department" and "industry" may be vested in the authority under the subclauses to which I have just referred; and the authority then has the right to sell, lease or grant any right or interest in them.

The Minister will reply that that is subject to the Minister. But at that stage the Minister has handed over to the authority—has vested in it—and has directed it to take a certain course of action. Can it be expected or assumed that such gentlemen as those who will comprise the authority will be worried about detail? We have evidence that Sir Russell Dumas, in the handling of big matters associated with the staff, has never been worried about detail. But detail may be very costly, as has been shown in the past.

With the Government pledged to its policy, and being pushed along by parties which are the monopolistic champions of private industry, and whose activities are directed from outside, and with the authority advising the Government on how quickly it should dispose of State instrumentalities, not one concern will be safe. We know, as a fact, that anything State-owned is anathema to the present Minister for Industrial Development. We need only take the case of those concerns which originally came under the State Trading Concerns Act. Initially that Act had a safeguarding section in it—section 25—which was cancelled by Act No. 46 of 1930. By that legislation, any State trading concern was made available for sale if the Minister so desired. The words deleted were—

> Provided that possession shall not be given to an intended purchaser or lessee under a contract of sale or agreement until the approval of Parliament has been obtained.

That section now reads—

> The Minister may sell or lease any trading concern for such amount, and upon such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Governor-in-Council.

Let me make it clear: As that is the law at the moment, this Bill will make no alteration to it. It means that if the Minister desires to dispose of a State trading concern the matter need not come to Parliament for decision; because that is the law now. This legislation will mean that any industry, instrumentality or department which comes within the definition clause will also be able to be sold without the authority of Parliament.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Which ones would have to come before Parliament now?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Only those which are not prescribed in the State Trading Concerns Act.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think most of them could be sold.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: There is no doubt that the State Electricity Commission could not be sold at the moment.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is one, is it?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Nor the State Government Insurance Office.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Nor the R. & I. Bank, nor the Robb Jetty Meat Works.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: That need not be brought to Parliament.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Yes it must; it is governed by statute.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Let me read out a portion of the Act covering that authority. It is governed by the West Australian Meat Export Works Act, No. 24 of 1942. I know a lot about this Act because I introduced it; it was to validate a transaction between the directors of the W.A. Meat Export Company and the Government. I will tell the whole story a bit later on. Section 3 of the Act states—

> The West Australian Meat Export Works, as the same is being carried on at the commencement of this Act, is hereby established as a State trading concern under the name of "The West Australian Meat Export Works," and it is hereby declared that such trading concern shall be subject to the State Trading Concerns Act, 1916.

Will the Minister deny that it can be sold now?

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The Wyndham Meat Works is another one.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: That is so; the same position applies there as applies at Robb Jetty. It is a State trading concern, and it could be sold. I forecast a long while ago that the Government would sell it if it had the opportunity.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That is not the intention.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: With this authority buttressing the Government, and pushing it from outside, I repeat that nothing is safe. If men of the stature of those I have mentioned are employed, and the recommendations which they make are turned down, how long do members think the combination will last? There can be

no doubt about the powers given to the members of this authority under clauses 18, 19 and 20 of the Bill. As I said, section 25 of the State Trading Concerns Act makes clear what can be done now; and the Premier has said that once these concerns show a profit they will be sold. Once they show a profit they become attractive, and people will want to buy them.

The Hon. L. A. Loton: Robb Jetty shows a profit.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It shows a handsome profit, as I will mention later on. Other State trading concerns which are covered by statutes, and which are described in the definition clauses, will be able to be sold without reference to Parliament if their control is vested in the authority. That is my great fear—the implications of the clauses I have mentioned.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: You have every cause for fear, too.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: With the anti-State-ownership bias of the Government, and its stated policy to sell as soon as a concern becomes eligible to be sold—that is when it starts to show a profit—I suggest that there will be some splendid bargains available for someone.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Some of these blokes might get a part in it, too.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: What are the great merits of private enterprise in so far as the public welfare is concerned? They are free and unfettered from any price control; and monopolies are given full rein.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: An open go.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: There is ample evidence now of the action of combines and near-combines in controlling and rigging prices to the detriment of the public and the Government alike. The Cockburn Cement Company has been a much-lauded example of private enterprise, and an industry for which the Government paid a high price. I propose to compare it with State trading concerns. The Cockburn Cement Company is an offshoot of a very wealthy English company with £5,000,000 worth of shareholders' capital—the Rugby Portland Cement Company. In 1947 that company showed a profit of £713,000 of which £438,000 went into reserves. In 1958 it showed a net profit of £827,000, of which £569,000 went into reserves; and the 5s. ordinary shares brought a 25 per cent. dividend, and the A-class shares, which were employee shares, paid nearly 150 per cent. I wish to quote from the *W.A. Law Reports* in which His Honour, Mr. Justice Wolff, now the Chief Justice (Sir Albert Wolff), had this to say—

> The appellant company was incorporated in Western Australia in July, 1952, as a private company under section 37 of the Companies Act. Its shares are, therefore, unlisted on the Stock Exchange.
>
> In 1950 . . . . certain local industrial interests considering the practicability of establishing another company to manufacture cement as there were large reserves of high grade raw materials available for the purpose and on the prospects of the market it appeared that Swan would not be able to meet the demand. The Rugby Portland Cement Ltd.—a very large producer in England of long standing,—was approached by these interests with a view to establishing a company to carry on manufacturing.
>
> Following the approach, about 1952, a representative of that company visited the State, and the local interests, with the support of the then Government, invited Rugby to establish new works capable of producing a minimum of 100,000 tons of cement a year. To that end heads of an agreement were drawn up under which Rugby was to invest capital in a proposed new company and a reserve of shares was to be held for those interests instrumental in making the approach.

His Honour proceeded—

> It was estimated that the capital required for the new venture would be approximately £2,200,000, and a representative on behalf of the Government assured Rugby that the capital would be contributed by the Government on a £ for £ basis with a condition that the Government's contribution was to be treated as a loan and that Rugby would have to provide either a share capital or as loan moneys the balance of the estimated requirement.

The Cockburn Cement Company was commenced as a private company with a Government guarantee of £1,100,000. The then retired Director of Works and Co-ordinator of Industrial Development, R. J. Dumas—now Sir Russell Dumas—negotiated with Sir Halford Reddish, Chairman and Managing Director of the Rugby Portland Cement Company for the establishment of the Cockburn Cement Company, and with a Government loan of £1,100,000. As is well known, Sir Russell Dumas is now a director of the Cockburn Cement Company.

It has been hailed as a great advance in our industrial welfare to have a company of that magnitude operating in this State; but what has often been overlooked is what it has cost this State, and is continuing to cost this State both in regard to capital expenditure and the unfair impost placed upon the State in regard to cement purchases. An appeal against a charge of unfair trading was upheld. The charge made against the company by the Commissioner for the Prevention of Unfair Trading was—

> Now therefore I, the said Commissioner (W. J. Wallwork) acting under and pursuant to section 29 of the said

> Act hereby charge you with unfair trading in that on and continuously since the coming into operation of the said Act and up to the date hereof you have continued to use two Indentures both bearing date the First day of November, 1956 and made between your Company of the one part and Swan Portland Cement Limited of the other part and your rights and powers thereunder to monopolise or attempt to monopolise or to combine with the said Swan Portland Cement Limited to monopolise a part of the trade or commerce within the State of Western Australia namely the trade of Portland Cement.

That charge, which was part of a long document and a report by the Commissioner, was contested before the Chief Justice, from whom there was no appeal. Although a learned professor of law has criticised the findings of the learned judge, there could be no appeal, and his judgment may be found in the Law Reports of this State.

It is true to say that although the charge of unfair trading in this case, and of the venture being monopolistic, failed, the facts are that the Cockburn Cement Company possesses the economic power to exclude further competition, controlling as it does an output capacity of 180,000 tons a year —that is exclusive of the 40,000 tons from Swan. It is true also that through its wholly owned and controlled subsidiary—Cement Sales Ltd.—the company controls the delivery, price and distribution of all cement made in Western Australia. The prices controlled by it are both wholesale and retail—the price to manufacturers and users of cement products is also controlled. There is no competitive power remaining—no power whatever remaining—in the hands of any other person in respect to locally manufactured cement.

Cockburn Cement Pty. Ltd. controls the use of the brand "Swan" on 40,000 tons of cement manufactured per annum, irrespective of the origin of manufacture. If it is made in the works of the Swan Portland Cement Ltd. it may be branded "Cockburn Cement," and if it is manufactured in the works of Cockburn Cement Pty. Ltd. it may be branded "Swan." The cement works of Swan Portland Cement Ltd. handled 140,000 tons in 1945. It is also true that that company spent £338,000 in the three years prior to its amalgamation with Cockburn Cement Pty. Ltd. to modernise its plant; and I would point out that none of that money was called in from the shareholders. Swan Portland Cement Ltd. has vast assets. At the time it did not have a very strong cash position, but it had large amounts of money invested outside its own company. It has never ceased to pay satisfactory dividends.

If members would care to check the stock market quotations in tonight's issue of the *Daily News* or this morning's issue of *The West Australian* they will find that yesterday the shares of Swan Portland Cement Ltd. jumped by 1s. 9d., and that the price quoted for each of its 20s. shares was 35s. That was the price for odd lots only, with not many sellers, and showing a return of 7.6 per cent. per annum. On the evidence of a highly-qualified accountant, Swan Portland Cement could have met any competition. However, it accepted a loan of £100,000, interest-free for 20 years, from its competitor on the condition that Cement Sales Pty. Ltd.—the wholly-owned and controlled subsidiary of Cockburn Cement Pty. Ltd., with two £1 shares and two directors—should be the medium through which all cement would pass in the process of being sold to the public.

At that time arrangements were entered into that no cement was to be picked up at the works by any carrier other than Kiernan. Therefore, not even the Government of this State, which is the largest financial backer of Cockburn Cement Pty. Ltd., and which is the largest purchaser of cement from both companies, can take delivery of cement at the works, nor can any other company of the type of Humes Ltd. or James Hardie & Co. Pty. Ltd. Therefore, should any member notice one of Kiernan's vans passing along any of our streets he will see printed on its canopy the name "Cement Sales Pty. Ltd." with the proprietor's name, Kiernans Carrying Co. Ltd. printed underneath. The learned judge, at that time, said—

> I see nothing wrong in a merchant deciding on those persons who he thinks are best suited to sell his product. That is done every day in commerce. If a merchant is to carry on satisfactorily he wants to be assured of the calibre of his distributors, the extent of their business, what supplies they are likely to take and their ability to push the sale of the product . . . If a manufacturer is to make a success of his business he must surely be allowed some latitude in organising the marketing of his product.

I know that many large concerns in this State have hauliers call at their factories and their works, and those hauliers alone; but in this case, when the arrangement was being entered into with Cement Sales Pty. Ltd.—which handles the output of Swan Portland Cement Ltd.; and which controls its price and its sales—to loan Swan Portland Cement Ltd. £100,000 for 21 years free of interest, I think Swan Portland Cement Ltd. knew nothing about this arrangement in regard to the transport of the cement being conducted by one firm only.

The commissioner said it was a device used to deceive the public. He may be quite wrong in that contention, and the judge may be nearer the truth. However, I do

not think it is unfair to comment, without any purpose other than that it should be made public information—because it is public information—that Sir Russell Dumas is also a director of James Kiernan Pty. Ltd. We know, too, that in Western Australia cement is costing the Government almost £4 a ton more than the cost per ton of cement purchased by Governments in the States of Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania.

Should we desire to make some research into this subject, let us have a look at the financial columns of the *Bulletin* of January last, and of the issue dated the 2nd September, 1959. In the last issue the history of Adelaide Cement Pty. Ltd. is published, and from it members will be able to judge whether the price of the product manufactured by Cockburn Cement Pty. Ltd. is right and proper or whether it is extravagant. It will be found that the cost of the product in other States is considerably less than the cost of the product in Western Australia.

However, so many things are done in the name of business that those who are on the outside of large enterprises would have great difficulty in following them. Most of the big concerns with reputable directors and controllers would undoubtedly be acting within the law. That law, however, may not necessarily always be in the interests of the public. I suggest that if we permitted free enterprise to continue untrammelled and uncontrolled —unfettered in whatever it may undertake—the public would be placed at a great disadvantage.

Mr. Loton made an interjection in connection with the Robb Jetty meatworks. I have quoted from the Act which controls those works. I introduced that legislation in 1942. The history of those works, in brief, is that the company was formed in 1920. The nominal capital was £250,000. At that time, 74,064 shares were taken out and no more were issued at any stage in its history. By 1941, the company owed its shareholders £74,064, and owed the Government £164,000, plus interest, a total of approximately £184,000, as far as I can recall.

Although other meat treatment firms were interested in the purchase of Robb Jetty meatworks at that time, the directors—the late Ernest Lee Steere, the late Mr. Monger, and Mr. John Forrest—asked the Government to take over the works at the best price possible. They had experienced a very sad time during the 20 years the company had been in operation. The directors had worked in a voluntary capacity. The works had treated export lambs and had built up a considerable overseas trade not only for themselves but also on behalf of other firms for the benefit of the public.

Between the Government and those directors an arrangement was entered into that a valuation would be made; and this was made by three experts. The Government took over the works from private enterprise and paid the full price—at the request of private enterprise. I would point out that the Government could have exercised its right of foreclosure on the works, but it did not take advantage of this move which was available to it, and therefore by the Act of 1942, Robb Jetty meatworks became a State trading concern.

Under Government control and by dint of good management—by assistance at one stage from the Commonwealth Government in regard to storage—these works have been built up to be worth—I should think—not less than £1,500,000. Despite pressure from private meatworks and by private enterprise generally, the Robb Jetty meatworks have resisted all requests to raise charges for the slaughtering of lambs and the storage of apples, crayfish or potatoes. Those works contain more cold storage space than all other cold storage works combined in the metropolitan area.

The works have also resisted any pressure to raise killing charges. That could be proved because I could advise the Minister of the number of the relevant file if he so desires. As a result, those works today treat lambs at a price less than that charged by any other meatworks in the Commonwealth of Australia. They have proved to be a great asset to the State in keeping charges down for the benefit of consumers; and therefore it would be a great blow to the State if the Government were to sell the Robb Jetty meatworks. I will take every step possible to ensure that these works will not be sold.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How are you going to do that?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: By an amendment to this Bill.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am pleased to know you are going to give it a second reading.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I hope the Minister has not misunderstood me. I hope the Bill does not pass the second reading stage, but, if it does, I will be prepared for it in Committee. Many amendments will have to be made to it in the interests of the people of the State. If the works are taken over by private enterprise they may even be closed down. One of the many good reasons for these works continuing to operate is the goodwill they have built up, which cannot be measured in any price which may be offered for them. They have built up goodwill with every other firm in the State; it does not matter whether it is Dalgetys, Elder Smith, Goldsbrough Mort or Westralian Farmers. All of those companies use Robb Jetty meatworks.

Let us suppose the works were owned by a private firm. It might be a completely different story if they were under the control of free enterprise. However, the important point is that Great Britain has

the right—under a trade agreement entered into with Australia—to establish quotas in meat export not from this State but from this continent. There was a time, during the war, when quotas were announced for Australia, and this State had the greatest difficulty in retaining a portion of those quotas; but we succeeded because we had a Government-owned meatworks. Suppose the works were owned by some vast overseas organisation.

The Armour group, the Angliss or the Vestey interests, or even a local concern of some moment could be affected if a quota for Australia were applied—and quotas are still being applied. If a firm with very big Eastern States backing acquired a small show, it may not suit it to continue operating in Western Australia. Business has no feelings in that regard. Whether or not an Argentine works shows a profit does not matter. The closing of the works does not matter one snap of the finger to people with power of the sort I mentioned.

Robb Jetty and its operations have assured the primary producer through the years of a market for cracker ewes. In one year it took over 300,000 cracker ewes when other works could not, and would not handle them. These would otherwise have been destroyed, but Robb Jetty took them. So, it is no use suggesting that because an entity of this kind is flourishing, and because it shows a profit while keeping its costs down to the minimum—and it has paid a large sum into Consolidated Revenue—it will not be disposed of. What a plum this will be for a ready buyer within or without the State! What a mess it would be to the interests and to the rural economy of Western Australia if it were sold!

As I have said, I concede that State trading concerns may now be sold without reference to Parliament; but there are some which even this Government would not dare to sell unless it had the recommendation of an authority, such as the proposed authority, behind which the Government could shelter; and its very strong advice, which the Government must accept in the disposal of such State trading concerns.

With the passing of this Bill, anything coming within the category of the definitions of "department" or "industry" may be vested in the proposed authority and quickly come under private ownership. I hope this Bill does not reach the Committee stage, but if it does I hope we will be able to amend it in the public interest.

There are very many debatable clauses and parts of clauses in the Bill. One provision gives the right to the proposed authority, with the approval of the Minister, to take over the officers of a department, and to pay such officers a rate which the authority decides, regardless of the amount paid to kindred officers in the Public Service. The authority can take over upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed, and make use of the services of any officer or servant employed in the Public Service of the State or by the public authority. That is shown on page 10 of the Bill.

Surely that is a very dangerous situation. The prospects of dislocating the Public Service are enormous. It is not merely a question of making use of the services of those officers temporarily or at rates at which they are being paid at present, but upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed on. The authority is to have the right, with the approval of the Treasurer, to borrow money. It is to have the right to buy or sell, to deal in industries, and, in effect, to become a State trading concern.

Once such an authority is vested with those powers, it can, of its own volition, act according to its discretion. It is all very well to suggest that under clause 7 the authority is to be subject to the Minister at all times. There is power in the Bill for the Minister to vest in the authority certain Crown properties, and for the authority to do many things with those properties in accordance with the provisions in clause 20.

As I said initially, this Bill is one of the most important and far-reaching in effect of any yet introduced during the session. While I fervently hope it will not pass the second reading, if it does, I submit it is the responsibility of this House to ensure that the rights and interests of the public are well protected by safeguarding those interests with amendments to the Bill. I oppose the second reading.

On motion by the Hon. F. R. H. Lavery, debate adjourned.

ADMINISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (The Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; the Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2—Section 74 amended:

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I move an amendment—

> Page 2—Insert after paragraph (a) the following paragraph:—
>
> (b) adding after the word "gift" in line four of paragraph (b) of subsection (2) the words "or by the trustee for any such person" and

I suggest that the two paragraphs contained in the amendment on the notice paper be dealt with separately. This is purely a drafting amendment. It does not in any way weaken or extend the

exemption covered by paragraph (b) of section 74 (2), but it does clarify the provision.

The courts have held that, where trustees take on behalf of a beneficiary, the beneficiary takes. One should not be compelled to turn up law reports to see the development of this provision. The amendment makes it clear to anyone reading the Act that if a trustee receives in respect of a direct gift, and not the beneficiary, then the action applies no less than in the case of a gift made direct to a beneficiary.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member states this is a drafting amendment which does not weaken or extend the paragraph. My advice is very much to the contrary. The Crown Law officers have advised as follows:—

> The first of the amendments, if passed, would permit of the possession and enjoyment of a gift of property to be *bona fide* assumed by a trustee of the donee, whereas at present such *bona fide* assumption must be by the donee himself, if the gift is to be non-dutiable.
>
> The proposed amendment would result in enlarging the number of gifts which would be duty free, so that any gift made to a trustee for a person, instead of to the person himself, would be non-dutiable so long as the possession and enjoyment of the subject matter of the gift was *bona fide* assumed by the trustee.
>
> Hence, by making a gift to a trustee for a person duty could be avoided thereon, although for some reason the property the subject of that gift could not be transferred to the desired donee, or he was unable to *bona fide* assume possession and enjoyment of it.
>
> For example, a parent may create himself trustee of his own property for the benefit of his son, and as such trustee remain in possession of it—if he died within three years, the property would not be chargeable with duty.

This Bill seeks to give relief under certain conditions, and the provisions include the three-year period. If this amendment were agreed to, the parent could appoint himself as a trustee of the property owned by him in the interests of his son; he could remain in possession of it; and if he died within three years it would not be dutiable.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Everything is dutiable if that person died within three years.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Not according to the advice given by the Crown Law officers, as indicated in the last paragraph I have just read.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: There appears to be something wrong with the advice given to the Minister. Where a father creates a trust for the benefit of his son and appoints himself trustee, and where as trustee in a fiduciary capacity he enters into possession and enjoyment of the property, under the existing Act that gift is exempted from duty. My amendment merely makes the position clear.

The word "trustee" is not mentioned, and we have to read Privy Council cases and law reports to find that it is included. My amendment makes the position clear that if a trustee takes, he is taking on behalf of the beneficiary; so long as he takes in his capacity as trustee. I assure the Minister that that is the position under the present legislation, and my amendment simply makes that clear.

If the Minister has any doubts on the matter I would refer him to what Lord Reid said in delivering the judgment of the Privy Council in Oakes' case in 1953. He said—

> If property comprised in a gift is to be excluded from the estate of the deceased donor the statute requires that *bona fide* possession and enjoyment of the property shall have been assumed and retained by the donee to the entire exclusion of the donor. If property is held in trust for the donee, then the trustee's possession is the donee's possession for this purpose, and it matters not that the trustee is the donor himself. The donor is entirely excluded if he only holds the property in a fiduciary capacity and deals with it in accordance with his fiduciary duty.

He takes *bona fide* possession as trustee, and is exempt; and my amendment makes that position clear so that anyone, who has not the Privy Council judgments alongside him, can understand its real purpose.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This is a difficult state of affairs. I must take the advice that I have received on the point, which is as I have indicated. The honourable member says it will not have that effect. I am not a lawyer and I cannot take the matter any further, other than to suggest we postpone consideration of this particular amendment and continue with the others. Before we discuss the matter tomorrow, I can gain some further information.

I do not know whether Mr. Heenan could help us here, but I would be grateful if he could. In any case, I think it would be desirable for us to postone this clause for the time being because the information I have is in complete contradiction to Mr. Watson's contention.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I am in support of the Minister and opposed to Mr. Watson's amendment. It might be

as well for us to recall the principle involved. Any gift made within 12 months of the donor's death is taxable. In other words, if I give my wife a block of land and I die within 12 months of doing so, she has to pay gift duty on it. As the law stands, if I owned a farm and I made it over to my son and retained any interest in it—if I lived on it or had a partnership in it—and I died in 10, 15, or 20 years, it would be included in my estate. The purpose of the Bill is to make a limit of three years. Under that proposition, if I make over a farm to my son and retain an interest in it, and I die within three years, it goes into my estate. However, if I lived three years and a month it is exempt. I consider that this is a good amendment to the Act. I feel that we are being generous in cutting down this limitless period to three years; and we should not have any trustees included. Otherwise we will find people disposing of their properties to avoid death duties. I do not believe that is the intention of the Bill.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I would say with respect that I do not feel that Mr. Heenan's contribution has thrown much light on the subject. I would remind him and the Committee that subsection (1) of section 74 defines a gift. It is very clear that if it is a direct gift, the person takes it; but when it is given to a trustee, the beneficiary does not take it directly but through the trustee, which is why he is appointed. It is to make this point clear that I have moved my amendment.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: What about when the trustee is himself?

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: The court has said that that does not make any difference under the Act at the moment.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Don't worry about your amendment then.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I do not know whether the extract I read from the judgment was clear to the committee, but it states that if a man appoints a trustee, even if it is himself, so long as he acts purely as a trustee and does not obtain any enjoyment from the property, it is all right. In any case, I would suggest that the Minister is wrong when he says the amendment would exempt a gift made within three years. If the Minister would be good enough, I would be obliged if he would postpone further consideration of this clause until he has consulted with the Crown Law Department in regard to the extract I have quoted.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am not completely satisfied about this matter myself, and I would be good enough to postpone consideration of this clause until I gain some more information about it.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask Mr. Watson to withdraw his amendment to simplify matters for the clerks.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

On motion by the Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), further consideration of the clause postponed.

Clause 3—Refunds of excess duty paid:

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: The Committee may remember that when I was discussing this question on the second reading, I referred to section 81 of the Administration Act which has some bearing on the matters we are discussing, but which really seems to contain provisions of an extraordinary nature. Section 81 (1) of the parent Act opens up the field as wide as it can be opened, and it could well defeat the limitations in regard to the exemption granted by subsection (2) of section 74. Unless we are going to disregard every gift made, I do not see how a person can make a gift with the intention of avoiding death duties.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you agree that your amendment will nullify secion 81 of the Act?

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no amendment on the notice paper to clause 3. I take it the honourable member is dealing only with clause 3.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member may proceed.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: In reply to the Minister's question, I would say that my proposed amendment does not nullify section 81, but makes it reasonably clear. I think it is necessary that we make it reasonably clear, too, that section 81 does not nullify section 74; because section 81 is in the widest terms possible. To me it seems to be capable of any construction as it now stands. Whilst it has been in the Act for 25 years, I do not know whether any action has ever been taken under it. It seems to be a most dangerous section to remain in the Act without some slight modification, having regard to what we are doing now to section 74.

The amendment which the Bill proposes to make to section 74 deals with an unexpected decision which upset a long-standing interpretation of over 50 years; and unless we correct section 81 we might find some extraordinary decision being given in regard to it. The whole purport of my proposed amendment is to make the exemption under section 74 effective. It is a rather complicated matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will realise that, because of a previous clause being postponed, he cannot proceed with a new clause which is on the notice paper. We can deal only with clause 3, then the Minister for Mines will have to move that progress be reported.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I thought we were dealing with the proposed new clause.

The CHAIRMAN: No; only with clause 3. I pointed that out to the honourable member.

Clause put and passed.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. Chairman, would this be the right place for me to ask a question regarding the new clause?

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister cannot proceed any further with the Bill this evening, because new clauses come after postponed clauses.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Very well.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 3rd November, 1959

CONTENTS

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

BILLS (2)—MESSAGES

Appropriation

Messages from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the following Bills:—

1. Electoral Districts and Provinces Adjustment Bill.
2. Constitution Acts Amendment Bill.

BILLS (6)—ASSENT

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

1. Tourist Bill.
2. National Fitness Act Amendment Bill.
3. Land Tax Assessment Act Amendment Bill.
4. Fire Brigades Act Amendment Bill.
5. Juries Act Amendment Bill.
6. Kalgoorlie-Parkeston Railway Bill.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ROLLING STOCK

Derailments and Accidents

1. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Railways:

   (1) How many derailments and accidents to rolling stock have taken place during the years 1957-58 and 1958-59?

   (2) What was the cost of rolling stock involved in accidents for the years 1957-58 and 1958-59?

   (3) What was the cost to the permanent way, caused by derailments to rolling stock, for the years 1957-58 and 1958-59?

   (4) Have any working personnel been injured as a result of derailments and damage to rolling stock for the years 1957-58 and 1958-59?

   Mr. COURT replied:

   The following figures deal only with main line derailments:—

   (1) The 1st July, 1957, to the 30th June, 1958—32. The 1st July, 1958, to the 30th June, 1959—25.

   (2) The cost of repairs to rolling stock involved in the above derailments was—

   The 1st July, 1957, to the 30th June, 1958—£3,279. The 1st July, 1958, to the 30th June, 1959—£44,633.

   (3) The cost of damage to the permanent way caused by main line derailments—

   The 1st July, 1957, to the 30th June, 1958—£2,187. The 1st August, 1958, to the 30th June, 1959—£5,609.