

# Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 10th December, 1952.

## CONTENTS.

	Page
Assent to Bills .....	2845
Questions : Wheat, as to quality of deliveries	2845
Housing, (a) as to district allotment of homes .....	2845
(b) as to treatment of components against siren wasp .....	2846
State finance, as to collecting outstanding amounts .....	2846
Unemployment, as to legislating against evictions .....	2846
Traffic, as to rules governing Great Eastern Highway .....	2846
Railways, (a) as to sale of delicensed hotel, Midland Junction .....	2846
(b) as to construction of chord line .....	2846
(c) as to Anglo-Indian employees .....	2847
Water supplies, as to pipes for Port Hedland scheme .....	2847
Lake Monger, as to abating midge nuisance .....	2847
Boards and Commissions, etc., as to number, personnel and fees .....	2847
Gas, as to extensions, Maylands area	2847
Bus services, (a) as to extending Caledonian Avenue terminus .....	2847
Drainage, as to Queen-st. swamp, Maylands .....	2847
State Shipping Service, (a) as to retention of "Dorrig" and "Dulverton" .....	2848
(b) as to transfer of vessels .....	2848
Iron-ore, as to transportation from Koolyanobbing .....	2848
Oil Fuel, as to inquiry by Royal Commission .....	2848
Bills : Bulk Handling Act Amendment, 3r.	2848
Alsatian Dog Act Amendment, 3r. ....	2848
Referenda on Proposals for Marketing of Wheat, Oats and Barley, Council's amendment .....	2849
Loan, £19,627,000, Message, 2r. ....	2849
Abattoirs Act Amendment, 2r., Com. ....	2850
Milk Act Amendment, Council's message	2870
Brands Act Amendment, Council's amendments .....	2870
Government Employees (Promotions Appeal Board) Act Amendment, returned .....	2870
Fremantle Electricity Undertaking (Purchase Monies) Agreements, Council's amendments .....	2870
State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment, returned .....	2870
Stamp Act Amendment (No. 2), 1r., 2r.	2870
Adjournment, special .....	2871

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.0 p.m., and read prayers.

## ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

- 1, Education Act Amendment.
- 2, Traffic Act Amendment (No. 2).

- 3, Marketing of Barley Act Amendment (Continuance).
- 4, Plant Diseases (Registration Fees) Act Amendment.
- 5, Mining Act Amendment (No. 1).
- 6, Main Roads Act Amendment.

## QUESTIONS.

### WHEAT.

#### As to Quality of Deliveries.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Is any large proportion of wheat being delivered cracked or in other ways below f.a.q.?

(2) Is this wheat of less than export quality?

(3) Could this wheat be used by poultry farmers, etc., with the same ease as f.a.q. wheat?

(4) Are arrangements made for the disposal of this lower grade wheat to poultry farmers, stock breeders, etc., at a price equivalent to the value of the wheat?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied:

(1) No. A small portion of wheat has been delivered this season containing an amount of broken grain in excess of that allowed for f.a.q. sample.

(2) Yes, unless it is mixed with wheat shipped as above f.a.q.

(3) Yes, it would be equal to f.a.q. Some poultry farmers would regard it as better.

(4) Not at present, but if sufficient quantity becomes available to necessitate it an approach will be made by brokers of the Australian Wheat Board for instruction.

### HOUSING.

(a) As to District Allotment of Homes.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Is it the policy of his Commission to give applicants for houses no consideration as to district or type of dwelling when allotting houses to persons from the priority list?

(2) Are persons who decline houses in districts unsuitable to themselves counted as suitably housed?

(3) Are such persons precluded from obtaining other assistance from the Commission?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Every endeavour is made to allot houses as convenient as possible to the person's place of employment. This is governed by the size and type of house available in any particular district at the time of allotment.

(2) Each case is dealt with on its merits.

(3) No.

(b) *As to Treatment of Components against Sirex Wasp.*

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) What is the total of the expenditure by the Government on the treatment of the components of imported Thermoban houses against sirex wasp infestation?

(2) How has the expenditure been treated in the Government accounts?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) To the 5th December, 1952—£20,267 17s.

(2) The expenditure has been debited to the Imported Houses Suspense Account.

### STATE FINANCE.

*As to Collecting Outstanding Amounts.*

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Treasurer:

In reply to my questions of the 3rd instant, relating to Revenue Outstanding, the Treasurer stated that various amounts "should be collected." Will he state when?

The TREASURER replied:

All the amounts referred to in my previous reply should be collected during this financial year, with the exception of the amount of interest and sinking fund outstanding against the State Brickworks. This concern should reduce the outstanding sum in due course as its financial position improves with increased sales arising from the construction of the new works at Armadale.

### UNEMPLOYMENT.

*As to Legislating Against Eviction.*

Mr. BRADY asked the Premier:

In view of the increasing number of unemployed in Western Australia will he state if any legislation will be introduced to protect families from being evicted for non-payment of rent?

The PREMIER replied:

Present unemployment is not considerable and is largely seasonal.

Special legislation is not considered necessary at this stage.

### TRAFFIC.

*As to Rules Governing Great Eastern Highway.*

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is it a fact that the Great Eastern Highway does not run through the township of Guildford municipality, and is not regarded as a main road for the purposes of the Traffic Act?

(2) If such is the case, will he state what traffic laws should be observed in that locality?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The Great Eastern Highway as gazetted in the "Government Gazette" of the 14th April, 1938, does run through the township of Guildford municipality. This section of road is specifically mentioned and described in Section 14 of the Act.

(2) Answered by (1).

### RAILWAYS.

*(a) As to Sale of Delicensed Hotel, Midland Junction.*

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

(1) Will he state if any tender was accepted for the purchase of the delicensed Victoria Hotel in Midland Junction recently offered for sale in "The West Australian"?

(2) If the answer is in the affirmative, will he say who was the successful tenderer?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) No.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

*(b) As to Construction of Chord Line.*

Mr. J. HEGNEY asked the Premier:

(1) Is he aware that the owners of properties in the Belmont Road District through which the Bassendean-Welshpool railway line has been surveyed are very anxiously awaiting a definite and final decision by the Government as to whether it intends to proceed with the construction of the line, or not?

(2) Is he aware that the uncertainty as to whether the line is to be constructed or not, is causing real hardship, uneasiness and lost opportunities to the property owners concerned?

(3) Is the real reason for the delay in paying compensation to the owners referred to, that the Government has not sufficient funds?

(4) If the answer to (3) is "no" will he make a statement informing the House and the people in the districts concerned what has caused the delay, and how soon a final decision in this important matter can be expected?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) Property owners desire to know the Government's intentions.

(2) Individual cases of hardship have been considered, each case being dealt with on its merits.

(3) No.

(4) The Government is re-examining the chord line proposal in the light of altered circumstances brought about by the Kwinana project. A decision will be made as soon as possible.

*(c) As to Anglo-Indian Employees.*

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

How many Anglo-Indians are in the employ of the Railways Department?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

If the hon. member will define what he means by the term "Anglo-Indian" the question will be further considered.

**WATER SUPPLIES.***As to Pipes for Port Hedland Scheme.*

Mr. RODOREDA asked the Premier:

(1) Has the promised rate of delivery and shipment of pipes for Hedland Water Supply (250 pipes per week since the 6th October) been maintained?

(2) If not, what is the reason?

(3) If so, what is now the estimated date when water from the new scheme will be available in Port Hedland?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) Since the 6th October, average pipe deliveries and shipment have been 220 per week (44 per day).

(2) Manufacturer's output slightly below anticipation.

(3) If the present manufacturing rate and shipment are maintained, water will be delivered to Hedland by mid-March, or the end of March, allowing for contingencies.

Completion would be earlier but pipe factory shuts down from the 23rd December to the 11th January for Xmas vacation.

Above time is within two weeks of the promised date.

**LAKE MONGER.***As to Abating Midge Nuisance.*

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Health:

On the 13th March, 1952, in reply to a question relating to the control of the plague of midges in the region of Lake Monger and Anzac-rd., she stated, "I have discussed this with the Commissioner of Public Health, who is taking the matter up with the local authority which is responsible." Will she state what steps have been taken to mitigate this disability—

(a) by her department;

(b) by the local authority?

The MINISTER replied:

(a) This is not a responsibility or function of the Public Health Department.

(b) The local authority, with the assistance of the Government Entomologist, has investigated the breeding habits of the midge.

The breeding habits are such that eradication methods are extremely difficult.

A suitable method of dealing with them has yet to be ascertained.

**BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS, ETC.***As to Number, Personnel and Fees.*

Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:

(1) How many boards, commissions, trusts, committees, etc., are there in existence and operating under statute or Government authority?

(2) What are their names?

(3) Who are the people that constitute them?

(4) What fees or other allowances are payable to each of the office bearers?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) to (4) This information would take a great deal of time to collate and could not be completed before the end of the session.

Mr. Graham: Will you send me the information later?

The PREMIER: I shall try to do so.

**GAS.***As to Extensions, Maylands Area.*

Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Works:

When is it anticipated that extensions will be made in gas services in the Caledonian Avenue, Maylands, area?

The MINISTER replied:

When materials and labour required are available.

**BUS SERVICES.***As to Extending Caledonian Avenue Terminus.*

Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

In view of the fact that Lisle, Kelvin, Stone, Snell and Queen-sts., Maylands, have been reconditioned, will he consider extending the Caledonian Avenue bus terminus to the corner of Stone and Snell-sts., buses to travel outwards via Lisle, Kelvin and Stone-sts., returning via Snell, Queen, Kelvin and Lisle-sts.?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

As the construction of Queen, Snell and Stone-sts. is unsuited to omnibus operation, an extension of the Caledonian Avenue bus to Snell-st. cannot at present be favourably considered.

**DRAINAGE.***As to Queen-st. Swamp, Maylands.*

Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Works:

What is the likelihood of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department proceeding with the proposed scheme for draining the Queen-st. swamp, Maylands?

The MINISTER replied:

No provision has been made in the current loan estimates for drainage of Queen-st. swamp, which in May last was estimated to cost £35,150 for the main drain.

Further consideration will be given to this scheme when next year's Estimates are prepared.

#### STATE SHIPPING SERVICE.

(a) *As to Retention of "Dorrigo" and "Dulverton."*

Mr. LAWRENCE asked the Premier:

(1) In view of the statement by the Federal Minister for Shipping that the Commonwealth Government intends to sell the Commonwealth Shipping Line, and also Press reports that the sale of the line is almost finalised, will he disclose to the House whether the Government has bought or has made some solid agreement with the Commonwealth to buy the "Dorrigo" and "Dulverton"?

(2) If these vessels have not been purchased, or some final arrangement has not been reached for their purchase, will he state what is the hitch in the negotiations?

(3) Has any provision been made in the Budget for the purchase of these two vessels?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) Firm negotiations are being conducted with the Federal Government for the acquisition by the State Government of the s.s. "Dulverton" and s.s. "Dorrigo."

(2) The basis of the present negotiations is for the transfer of the vessels to the State free of cost or for payment over an extended period as a measure of assistance to the North-West.

(3) No.

(b) *As to Transfer of Vessels.*

Mr. LAWRENCE (without notice) asked the Premier:

Can he give the House any idea as to the date and the time when agreement may be reached on the purchase or the transfer of the two vessels?

The PREMIER replied:

No, at this stage I am afraid I cannot. The negotiations are proceeding with the Commonwealth. The only assurance I can give the hon. member is that there is no danger of the Western Australian Government losing these vessels.

#### IRON-ORE.

*As to Transportation from Koolyanobbing.*

Mr. KELLY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

Has the Government considered, or has it any intention of instituting, a policy of transporting iron-ore from Koolyanobbing with Government-owned vehicles?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING replied:

The Board of Management proposes to transport ore from the workings at Koolyanobbing to the railway at Southern Cross with its own vehicles, when the ore-crushing plant is installed at Koolyanobbing.

#### OIL FUEL.

*As to Inquiry by Royal Commission.*

Mr. SEWELL (without notice) asked the Premier:

As oil fuel is such an essential commodity for country districts, and as it is considered that a more equitable basis should be arrived at for the fixing of the price of such fuel in country districts as compared with the metropolitan area—

(1) Will he state whether he has received a request from the road boards or their association for a Royal Commission to inquire into the question of the price of fuel—motor spirit, distillate and kerosene—in country towns as compared with the metropolitan area?

(2) If so, will he grant permission for such a Royal Commission?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) and (2) I have received a number of requests from road boards asking that there should be an inquiry into the price of petrol and requesting a Royal Commission. The Attorney General has just informed me—and I knew—that the question of petrol prices in country districts is now being gone into by the Commissioner of Prices. Taking a broad overall view, it would appear to me that as the headquarters of the oil companies in Australia are situated in Eastern States capitals, and all the bookkeeping and management generally is done there, we would not get very far in Western Australia by appointing a Royal Commission. It is more a matter for Commonwealth action.

Mr. SEWELL: In my question I also mentioned distillate and kerosene, but the Premier referred only to petrol. I think distillate and kerosene would be more important to primary producers than petrol. I do not know whether the Premier overlooked that part of the question.

The PREMIER: I can only say that the same remarks would apply. Here again, the price is being considered by the Prices Commissioner.

#### BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Bulk Handling Act Amendment.

2, Alsatian Dog Act Amendment.

Transmitted to the Council.

# **BILL—REFERENDA ON PROPOSALS FOR MARKETING OF WHEAT, OATS AND BARLEY.**

## *Council's Amendment.*

Resumed from the 4th December. Mr. Hill in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on the amendment made by the Council as follows:—

### Clause 3.

Page 2—Insert after the word "of" in line 15 the words "the respective".

The question is—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: When this message was previously considered in Committee, I think it was about 1 o'clock in the morning. The Minister gave a brief explanation of what the Council's amendment proposed to achieve. I have since had an opportunity to look at it myself. It proposes to make it clear that any ballot which is to be held at any time shall be participated in only by those growers concerned with that particular ballot. If it is to be a ballot on oats, for instance, only oatgrowers will participate, and if it is to be a ballot in connection with barley, only barley-growers will take part, and so on.

Whether the amendment is legally necessary would be arguable. I cannot imagine any court interpreting the Bill as it stands in any other way than by deciding that the only growers who should participate in a ballot regarding oats would be the growers of oats. However, members in another place are displaying some special care in this matter. They evidently want to make doubly sure. I see no harm in the amendment and no reason for rejecting it, and therefore I support it.

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

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

## **BILL—LOAN, £19,627,000.**

### *Message.*

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

### *Second Reading.*

THE PREMIER (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray) [2.21] in moving the second reading said: The object of the Bill is to give the Government the necessary authority to raise money for the purpose of carrying out the works detailed in the Loan Estimates, and for the temporary financing of revenue deficits. The various

items for which authority is required are set out in the Schedule, and the amount appearing against each item is based on the anticipated expenditure during the year, having regard to any unspent balances of previous authorisations.

The general principle followed is that, after allowing for unspent balances, sufficient new authority is provided to enable the works to be kept going for about six months after the end of the financial year, or to complete the work if completion is expected during that period. The position of previous Loan Act authorisations, together with the proposals included in this Bill, are clearly shown on pages 6 to 43 of the Loan Estimates, from which it will be seen that there is no unnecessary or excessive provision in the Bill.

Item No. 33 in the Schedule is to provide authority temporarily to finance the accumulated deficit on the Consolidated Revenue Fund, which, on the 30th November, 1952, was £1,946,297. The money is provided by the Commonwealth Bank on the security of Treasury Bills issued by the Commonwealth Government, and it is hoped that revenue collections later in the financial year will be sufficient to enable the Bills to be redeemed. The authority sought, viz., £4,000,000, may not be all required this year, but, on the other hand, the occurrence of deficits during the next two or three months may entail the issue of further Treasury bills up to an amount approaching that figure, and the authority should be sufficient to cover all eventualities.

During the year 1951-52, the public debt was increased by £15,101,765, and at the 30th June last stood at £138,288,531. Of this amount £10,049,000 was provided by the Commonwealth under a guarantee given to the State Premiers at the meeting of the Loan Council held in August, 1951, that the Commonwealth would underwrite the loan programme to the extent that the amount obtained from the market by means of public flotations fell short of the approved programmes. Under the guarantee the Commonwealth provided a total of £160,000,000 which sum was handed to the National Debt Commission, and the Commission in turn invested the amount in Commonwealth securities at two per cent., with a currency of three years.

From Commonwealth loans raised on the market, the State received £3,943,000, of which £2,898,320 carried interest at 3½ per cent., and £1,044,680 at 2 per cent. Other loan proceeds were £2,073,000 from the Commonwealth Savings Bank, and £28,920 from investments of trust funds under the control of the Treasury. The money from the savings bank represents 70 per cent. of the increase in depositors' balances, which is available to the State under the Savings Bank Transfer Agreement. Here, as members know,

under the arrangement that was made when the Commonwealth took over the State Savings Bank, the Government obtains money from that source at one per cent. above the interest rate paid to depositors.

The total amount received from this source is now £10,500,000, on which the interest rate is at present 3½ per cent. Redemptions of the public debt during the year amounted to £992,000. Accretions to the sinking fund during the current year will amount to approximately £1,400,000, and as there was a cash balance of £323,000 carried forward from last year, there will be about £1,750,000 available for redemption purposes this year. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. A. R. G. Hawke, debate adjourned.

# **BILL—ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT.**

## *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**HON. J. T. TONKIN** (Melville) [2.37]: This is another Bill, involving considerable changes, that is brought here in the last days of the session. The Government must have had this scheme in contemplation for some time, and I want to know what explanation there is for keeping it back until the last week. This is not fair. It gives no opportunity for those concerned to make the necessary inquiries to find out whether the proposals are acceptable or whether there are strong reasons against their introduction.

We had a Bill of this nature—the Bulk Handling Act Amendment Bill—before the House previously, and it involved major policy upon which there could be room for a big difference of opinion between the parties. That Bill did not come here until the last days of the session. Now we get this one which seeks to take away the control of the abattoirs of Western Australia—or the main one—from the controller and place it under a board. I am one of those who have been slowly but surely coming to the conclusion that boards are not the last word in perfection.

The Premier: I think a lot of us agree with that.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That makes me all the more surprised at this proposal.

The Premier: Sometimes they are necessary.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Here we have an outstanding man in his job. He could have gone to Tasmania, and would have done so had not the late Minister for Agriculture prevailed on him to remain here. I think he was actually appointed to the job in that State. He was also offered an important job in another State,

but he chose to remain in control in Western Australia because of his interest in the job.

Mr. Yates: He will still be retained in that position.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: We shall see. I was the Minister when he was first appointed. I can remember that his application was outstanding, and I regarded the State as being particularly fortunate in getting his services because of his wide knowledge of the industry and his proved efficiency. The Minister said nothing the other night to show that the present controller was not capable of satisfactorily controlling and managing the new set-up, one which is brought about by the change from the open-hall system to the factory system of working abattoirs.

When he was putting forward a proposal for a change from one-man control to a board, I think there was a real obligation on the Minister to supply some reasons for the change and to show wherein the present control would fall short of what was required. The Minister did not supply any reasons to justify that; he did say that the open-hall system was all right up to a population of 150,000 people, but that when it increased beyond that figure the factory system was required and that involved a matter of arranging industrial relationships, co-ordinating accounts and the like. That is all freely admitted, but the Minister did not advance a single reason to show that the present controller was incapable of making those changes and efficiently controlling the abattoirs.

Before we are asked to change to a board, I think we ought to be shown wherein the existing control falls short of what is required for maximum efficiency and satisfaction, and wherein a board would effect improvement. It is a half-baked proposition because the board is to control only the Midland abattoirs, and the controller will remain in charge at Kalgoorlie and any other abattoirs which may be brought under the Act. It is quite feasible that we could have a different policy, which would be the board's policy, for Midland from what we would have for Kalgoorlie and other abattoirs under the Act, which were being controlled by the controller. That does not make for efficiency, and if a changed policy is desirable in Midland it will probably be equally desirable in Kalgoorlie and elsewhere. If new ideas are to be introduced, they should be introduced uniformly. So what satisfactory explanation can be advanced for leaving the controller in control at Kalgoorlie and responsible for the policy at Kalgoorlie, and leaving him in control of any other abattoirs which may be brought under the Act but making him subservient to board control, the members of which would not have a fraction of the knowledge and experience of the manager whom they would control?

Mr. Yates: I think the board will have that knowledge.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Where will they get it from? All we are told at present is that one is to be an accountant, one is to be a representative of the producers and one is to be a representative of the butchers.

Mr. Yates: But all three will have that knowledge.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I would say that the whole three of them would not have half the knowledge of the present controller in the running of abattoirs.

Mr. Yates: They would have enough to sit on a board.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It is not a question of sitting on a board. They will have to run the show.

Mr. Yates: They will have enough knowledge to do that.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: If the proposition is merely to allow men to sit on a board, why not come out into the open and say so and we can dress them up for the occasion?

Mr. Yates: Two out of three will be practical men.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: If this is to be justified it must be shown that this board is necessary to maintain or improve the efficiency. We do not set up boards for the sake of setting them up because this is all added cost that must be borne by somebody—the consumers, I suppose.

Mr. Brady: Meat is too dear already.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: If this is to be a part-time board we will not find an accountant becoming a member of it unless he is satisfactorily remunerated, because he can earn plenty of money at his own profession. An accountant would not be prepared to give up his time to sit on a part-time board just for the love of it. He will expect to be adequately remunerated for the time he puts into it. The same will apply to the butchers' and producers' representatives. So we can expect that appropriate fees will be paid to the members of the board. Before we set up a board which contemplates additional expenditure to be imposed upon the industry, I think there is an obligation to show that the one-man control would be insufficient and unsatisfactory, and that a board is required to do the job properly. I do not think the Minister would claim that he advanced any reasons which could be taken to prove that a board was essential and that the management of the controller was unsatisfactory. It is not a matter of getting an idea that a board would be a good thing and then bringing in a Bill to set it up, more especially as it involves expense. We ought to realise that some onus is cast upon us to justify the proposal. Has there been some pressure from somebody—

Mr. Brady: Now you are getting somewhere.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: —to set up this board? Perhaps the Minister will say what was the genesis of the idea. Did the suggestion come from inside the department? Did it come from the controller himself? Or did somebody outside suggest that there ought to be a board? If the suggestion came from outside, there is all the more reason why we have to seek some justification, because it would appear that somebody has an axe to grind.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: A chopper.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I notice that it is proposed to put on the board that will control the Midland abattoirs a representative of the butchers. The butchers have never shown that they are amenable to control because, over the years that price-fixing has been in operation, they have on many occasions complained that it was impossible to obey the law and that they did not intend to do it. There were numerous cases of fines for over-charging and on each occasion, when the butchers were fined, they said they were not going to obey the law because they could not. So they do not like being controlled themselves and if they are placed in an important position on the board—there is nothing to say that their member shall not be chairman—I think the industry will be placed in a position of too great importance, having regard to the job to be done.

Why was not provision made, if the Minister is set upon a board, for putting the present controller on it? We have instances of this where the man in managerial control is also a member of the board, and I believe on some boards controlling abattoirs in the Eastern States the manager is a member of the board, and this is understandable. It is not proposed that this board shall be a full-time board; it is only to be a part-time one. If all this additional work requires the appointment of a board, will a part-time board satisfactorily handle it? I do not think it would unless the manager were a member of the board. If that were so, I can conceive that the manager who would be carrying out the decisions of the board would be able to go ahead without let or hindrance in anticipation that he could get support for what he was doing. But if he is not on the board himself his powers will be distinctly limited, and he will be hindered considerably in between meetings of the part-time board by not knowing what policy to pursue. So, if the Minister is set on having a board, then I think there is a strong argument for placing the controller on it.

The Minister for Lands: I think there might be a strong argument for not doing so.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: If the Minister has an argument he may advance it, but if he does not put his argument forward, there is no opportunity for us to consider it. I am not saying there would not be a strong argument against it, as there might be, but I can see more arguments in favour, if the board is a part-time board, of having the controller on it, and the Minister will find some examples of that in the Commonwealth. The arguments to which he refers did not apparently carry weight where controllers have been appointed as members of boards. But in due course I would be very pleased to hear the Minister's argument against the proposal.

Another reason for supporting the idea of having a manager on the board is the fact that he is to remain in control at Kalgoorlie. If we place the controller in charge at Kalgoorlie and any other abattoirs in the State, and that controller is on the board which manages the Midland abattoirs, then we will have the unanimity and continuity of policy which is desirable. There would then be the same argument against having the board here, and leaving the controller in charge elsewhere. But if the Minister insists that there shall be a board for Midland and that the controller shall not be on it but shall be in control at Kalgoorlie, then I think we will not only have a divided control but also possibly conflicting control, which would not make for efficiency.

I also object to the Government, so close to an election, making the appointments to this board for five years. That would make it impossible for an incoming Government to have a say at all, if it remained only one term, and assuming it were a different Government from the present. We are within two or three months of an election; the Government has been in office six years and has done nothing about setting up this board until the last week of the session. It now proposes to appoint three men for five years, which means that it is not only going to decide the policy of the running of abattoirs for the next Government, but it is going to decide the personnel of the board as well and leave no opportunity for change during the life of that Government. Is that a fair and reasonable proposition? If there is urgency for this to be done at once, I could understand the Government making an appointment. I think two years would be reasonable, seeing that it is a part-time appointment.

If the Government made the appointment for two years, they would come up for re-appointment during the term of the next Government and, if the men proved to be unsatisfactory, an alteration could be made. But why hamstringing a future Government? The only reason which could be advanced for being dogmatic about

that would be that the present Government has some persons definitely in mind, and would want to make sure that they were there for a very lengthy period. If they were men who could satisfactorily carry out their job, there would not be much doubt that they would be re-appointed by the new Government, although I can recall instances where this Government did not waste much time in changing the personnel of boards on which there were some Labour supporters.

The Minister for Lands: And you did not lose any time either, when you came into office in 1932, in doing the same thing.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: When I came into office in 1932! The Minister must be dreaming. I came into office long after 1932.

The Minister for Lands: I did not mean you personally.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: But the Minister said "you." The Labour Government did not come into office in 1932, either.

The Minister for Lands: Well, in 1933.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: All right, that is another correction. But let the Minister give us an instance.

The Minister for Lands: You put the country representative off the Fremantle Harbour Trust Board and put Mr. Mann on it.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: In 1933! I think the Minister had better have a look at his history; I feel sure he will find that Mr. Mann was not put on the Harbour Trust Board in 1933. I am sorry this is getting under the Minister's skin.

The Minister for Lands: No, it is not; you can never get under my skin.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: It is too tight!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister must remember that I am not attacking him personally; I have said nothing personal about him. I am attacking the Minister's argument, or lack of it.

The Minister for Lands: I am not attacking you, either. You attacked me by saying you get under my skin; you do not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is too much interjecting.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: If I have misjudged the Minister, I am sorry. I must say it looked a little bit like it. To get back to the argument! To me it seems unfair to hamstring the next Government in this way. I think it is bad enough to make a major decision in the last week of Parliament, just prior to an election, but it is worse to make the appointment for a term of five years and by so doing give the new Government no say whatever as to the composition of the board or its control in any shape or form. If the Minister had tried this at the beginning of the year it might have been all right, but I think



even then objections could have been raised to it, and with justification. But in the last two or three days, it appears that the Government is fearful of a change and wants to sew some of these things up.

The Premier: Oh!

Mr. Manning: Not at all.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: What does the member for Harvey know about it?

Mr. Lawrence: He has had a nightmare!

The Minister for Lands: He knows about it.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That is not much.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: He might know something about the wholesale butchers, mainly.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: We could reasonably expect the Minister to show how the present control could not be adjusted to changing conditions and what are the reasons that require the appointment of the board, the members to have a term of five years. We do not normally make appointments to boards for five years but usually the terms of appointment are for three years. Why the five-year term in this instance?

The Minister for Lands: A different board and different control.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: And different reasons, too. If there are reasons for the longer term, they should be defined. They will require to be fairly solid reasons to justify the Government adopting this course. It means that no future Government will have any say regarding the board nor will it be able to take any control. Any new Government will have no say regarding the personnel of the board at all. The Bill makes provision that in future should a member of the board be guilty of any one of the misdemeanours that are enumerated, that member is to be suspended. Subsequently he will be reinstated only after the matters has been referred to Parliament and one of the Houses decides that he ought to be reinstated. Suppose the House is not sitting?

The clause says that the grounds of suspension must be submitted to Parliament within six sitting days next following the suspension. But Parliament may not be sitting. There may be no opportunity to report the matter to Parliament before it rises. Does the board member remain suspended until the following August when both Houses of Parliament meet again and consider the matter? What a most undesirable situation that would be! If the Minister takes the responsibility of making the appointment, why should not he accept the responsibility of the suspension? If the Minister is to decide whom he will appoint to a job, why should he not decide when the services of that board member shall be terminated or suspended, if he has good grounds for so deciding?

If it is said that the man will only be suspended and the matter is to be reported to Parliament within six sitting days, in the event of Parliament not sitting that officer will be under suspension for months before any decision can be arrived at in the matter. How would the Minister himself like to be in the position of being suspended and not having his case dealt with until six or seven months afterwards? The relative clause in the Bill reads—

(a) If a member of the board—

(i) is absent from his duties for a period of at least one month without the consent of the Minister;

Then the clause goes on to enumerate other circumstances in which the man's office on the board may become vacant, and it proceeds—

his office on the board shall, subject to the succeeding paragraphs of this subsection, become vacant;

(b) In any of the cases referred to in subparagraphs (i), (ii), (v) or (vi) of the last preceding paragraph, the member concerned shall be suspended from his office by the Governor, and thereupon the Minister shall cause to be laid before each House of Parliament a full statement of the grounds of suspension within six sitting days next following the suspension.

(c) Where the occupant of an office of member of the board is suspended from that office pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (b) of this subsection, he shall not be restored to office unless each House of Parliament, within forty days after the day on which the statement has been laid before it, declares by resolution that he ought to be restored.

So we have this situation that, if a member contravenes one or other of these provisions, he is suspended. Within six sitting days next following the suspension, the Minister is to report the matter to Parliament. If Parliament is in recess it could mean a delay of as long as eight months. Then both Houses of Parliament consider the matter. Another 40 days might well elapse before the matter is determined by Parliament and it could be that in the end the board member would be reinstated. What an unfair proposition that is! I cannot understand what justification could be advanced for it. If the Minister is to accept the responsibility of making the appointment, surely he ought to be able to take the responsibility of putting the man off—if the facts are clear.

Parliament is not asked to fill the vacancy. It is left to the Minister. In my view, in the same way if it became

necessary to suspend a man, it should be done by the Minister. I can recall that during the life of the present Government an officer of the Liquid Fuel Control Board was suspended by the Minister and he remained suspended. Nothing further transpired. That was that! Just imagine the situation if that man had been suspended and it was necessary to report the fact to Parliament within six sitting days! Parliament would then debate the matter and decide whether the man should be suspended or not. The Minister will have to conjure up some very sound arguments to convince the House that that is a reasonable proposition.

Mr. Yates: What happens with regard to other boards?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No report of a member's suspension has to be made to Parliament.

Mr. Yates: Is any provision made for the Minister to dispense with their services?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister will have to give very sound reasons for action taken in these matters. Let members consider what the circumstances are as set out in Subclause (5). The board member may be absent from his duties for at least one month without the consent of the Minister. Why report that matter to Parliament? If the action of the member of the board is such, that should be sufficient ground for his suspension—and that should be that. The next ground is that the member may become of unsound mind or be declared under the provisions of any law for the time being relating to mental infirmity, incapable of managing his affairs. The third ground is that the board member may become bankrupt or avail himself as a debtor of a law for the relief of bankrupt debtors. The fourth ground is that he may resign, attain the age of 65 years or die. Obviously in those last mentioned circumstances there would be no reference to Parliament of the matter.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: If he dies, it would be merely a transfer.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The fifth ground is that the board member may, without the consent of the Minister, participate or claim to be entitled to participate in the profit of or in a commission, benefit or an emolument arising from any contracts or agreements made by or on behalf of the board. The sixth ground refers to being guilty of misbehaviour or of incapacity. If the board member is guilty of misbehaviour or incapacity and the Minister is satisfied that he is, why should it have to be reported to Parliament perhaps six months later on, during which time the board member remains under suspension? I cannot see that there is any provision other than the appointment of a deputy who will act in the place of the man suspended, and that is a difficult

situation, too, having a deputy of a suspended member. Apart from that, I cannot see how the board would function satisfactorily in the meantime.

It looks to me as though this legislation has been somewhat hurriedly conceived in order to get it here in time before the close of the session and, if there had been an opportunity for more mature consideration, I think it would have been a better Bill. I do not think that the Deputy Premier would have supported a proposition like the one I have been dealing with. I might be wrong, but I do not think he would have done so had he had the time to study its implications. It seems to me to be quite contrary to the general principles of justice and equity to have a man under suspension for months, with all the attendant worry and anxiety and knowing that at the end of the time considerable publicity is going to be thrown on the whole matter because of a debate in Parliament.

If a man has committed any misdemeanour and has been suspended, I think he would prefer that to be the end of it and to be allowed to forget the whole thing as quickly as possible and start afresh. But if suspension is to be kept hanging over him for months, and at the end of the time there is to be a full dress debate in Parliament and the whole thing revived, what good can that do anybody?

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: We could even have one House deciding one thing and the other another thing.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That is so. It is a most undesirable provision, and my view is that if more time had been available to the Government to consider it, it would never have got here.

The Minister for Education: That is a novel point of view. I think it was inserted to ensure that a man would not be frivolously dismissed. Parliament was to be the court to decide it.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I do not believe much thought was given to the other angles. While I will agree that it has the semblance of a democratic provision, I think it would do more injustice to the man concerned than any possible justice the arguing of the appeal could have for him.

The Minister for Education: Of course the publicity you refer to could equally fall upon a judge of the Supreme Court who could be dismissed only by a resolution of Parliament.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I know; but there is much less likelihood of the question arising over the dismissal of a judge than there is in the case of a member of the board.

The Attorney General: A judge could only be suspended for the time being by the Governor.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I know. We are dealing with that. He is suspended for the time being, until Parliament can give consideration to the matter. But the chances of a judge being suspended would be very long odds.

The Attorney General: Yes.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Even if a judge were of unsound mind I do not think he would be suspended in the way that this suspension would take place. He just would not operate for the time being—that is what would happen in his case. Does not the Attorney General agree?

The Attorney General: Yes.

The Minister for Education: It is a reasonable assumption that the same thing in the same circumstances would apply to a member of the board. It would have to be some heinous offence that was committed before he would be dealt with under that section.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Take the case of the servant of the Liquid Fuel Board to whom I referred! When Mr. Seward was Minister he summarily dismissed an officer of the board. The reasons were never made available to anybody outside the Government, but no action was ever taken for a reinstatement of the person concerned and it can only be assumed that good grounds existed. It is far better for the person concerned that that should have been the end of it, rather than that some six or eight months afterwards the matter should have been under debate in Parliament and his suspension confirmed. That is the angle that makes some impression upon me, because I cannot imagine that any Minister would suspend a man in the first instance unless he was absolutely certain in his own mind that his action would be confirmed by Parliament. So if he is certain in his mind that his action will be confirmed, I see no value whatever in a provision that will result in the matter being raked up again six months afterwards, if Parliament does not happen to be sitting at the time.

The Attorney General: There is this advantage, that it would make the Government loath to yield to pressure groups. There are such things as pressure groups, as we know.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I do not think Governments sack men because of pressure groups.

The Attorney General: They have done it before now. I can remember magistrates being sacked as early as possible on account of pressure groups. You know very well that it was stated publicly that it would be done and it was done.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I can remember one being retrenched in recent years.

The Attorney General: That is so.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: By your Government.

The Attorney General: Yes, and the other by another Government.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I will not give any support to this proposition, because it is of no advantage to the person suspended.

The Attorney General: It would make a Government very careful about a suspension, would it not?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I think it should be careful about such a thing in any case.

The Attorney General: That should be so, but is it?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: One should not be considering the fact that Parliament might be dealing with the matter later on. In any event, there is still opportunity for Parliament. Make no mistake about that! Without this provision, if a Minister unjustly suspends somebody from the board he will hear about it in Parliament.

The Attorney General: He can hear about it, but that is all.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Motions can be moved, too.

The Attorney General: We have had a few this session.

The Minister for Education: It could not reinstate a man after he had been dismissed.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No, but it would probably kick out the Government. If it were a blatant case and were proved in Parliament and a resolution were carried against the Government, I cannot imagine the Government surviving very long. I do not think that would be likely. If it were possible to get a motion carried, it would be akin to a motion of censure against the Government. How long would the Government last in those circumstances? I do not think any sound argument can be advanced for this proposal, which is a case of suspended final sentence which might last for months.

The Attorney General: You suggest that there should not be power of suspension at all?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I am saying that if we leave to the Minister the authority to make appointments, we should leave to the Minister—and, in the final analysis, to the Government—the right and authority to make any changes.

The Attorney General: There is quite a lot in your argument.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The circumstances are clearly set out in the Bill. These are not matters of opinion, but of fact. It would be different if the Minister were making up his mind on matters of opinion, on hearsay. But these are matters of fact. First of all it provides that the office of the member shall become vacant if he—

is absent from his duties for a period of at least one month without the consent of the Minister.

That is perfectly clear-cut. If we decide that that is a reason for a man being put off the board and he contravenes that provision, he is to be put off the board. In those circumstances, what reason is there for bringing the matter up in Parliament? Secondly, it is provided that he can be dismissed if he—

becomes of unsound mind, or is declared, under the provisions of any law for the time being relating to mental infirmity, incapable of managing his affairs.

I take it that there would be doctors' certificates supporting that and if the Minister acted upon those certificates, why should he have to bring the matter to Parliament? The third condition is if he—

becomes bankrupt or avails himself as a debtor of a law for the relief of bankrupt debtors.

That would be a matter of fact. If we decide that in the event of his becoming bankrupt he should not remain on the board, we should give the Minister authority to put him off it.

The Minister for Lands: That is clear-cut.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: They are all clear-cut. No. (v) is—

without the consent of the Minister participates or claims to be entitled to participate in the profit of or in a commission, benefit, or an emolument, arising from any contracts or agreements made by or on behalf of the board.

The Minister would know whether he gave any permission or not, and if he did not and the member engaged in those transactions, he would be automatically disqualified. He would know the consequences before he committed the offence. It is all set down for him to read, and any member of the board who contravened these provisions would do so with his eyes open and should not want any appeal to Parliament subsequently. I do not think there can be advanced any argument in support of this proposal, and I repeat that it is my view that if more time had been available to Ministers carefully to consider the provisions of this legislation, the Bill would never have found its way here. It is one of those things that inevitably follow from hasty legislation, from rushing Bills in the last two or three days of a session. It cannot be otherwise. I suppose I will overlook quite a lot of implications in this legislation which would have been apparent to me if I had had more time to study it.

The Attorney General: No.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes.

The Attorney General: Oh no! Not you.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I think so.

The Attorney General: I do not.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I have had a limited time to consider this legislation and make inquiries.

The Attorney General: Quite enough for you.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Bill was introduced yesterday.

The Attorney General: You are much too smart!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I have forgotten the hour, but I think it was pretty late.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Too late!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: There has only been a matter of minutes available to me. I had no time to consult with the Leader of the Opposition. I wished to discuss with him certain aspects of the Bill and ascertain his views with regard to policy. It was absolutely impossible to have even five minutes with the Leader of the Opposition with regard to this proposal. That shows what results when legislation of a major character—this is not just a trivial matter—is rushed in during the dying hours of a session with insufficient time to consider it. I would have liked the opportunity to get in touch with other States to find out exactly what the set-up is there and what their experience has been.

The Attorney General: This follows very largely the South Australian Act.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: How many are there on the board in that State?

The Attorney General: A larger number.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I think there are nine.

The Attorney General: It is quite a big board.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Too big in my opinion.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: It is a big abattoirs, too.

The Attorney General: Yes, very big. It deals with all the export trade.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I would also like to know—and I daresay I could have got the information from Canberra—what the position is in New Zealand. That would have helped me very considerably. But the Bill was introduced last night and there has been absolutely no opportunity to ascertain what established practice is and to find arguments for and against.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member taking the 45 minutes?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It all depends. I am speaking for the Opposition. A further point is that if it is desirable to represent sectional interests on a board, once we decide to have a butcher on it and a producer and somebody representing the consumers, of course he could be the chairman of the Employers' Federation.

The Minister for Lands: Yes, or the secretary of the Trades Hall, Perth, or the president.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It is not likely.

The Minister for Lands: Do not be biased; we are not.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Oh no! Not much! This board is to be directly representative of certain interests and the accountant is to have regard to the consumers interests. I say that he could conceivably be some important person in the Employers' Federation—not that that would be anything to his detriment, as he might have plenty of ability and knowledge.

The Minister for Lands: I take it that Mr. Webb does a good job on the Market Trust, as consumers' representative.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Seeing that he is still there under the present Government we can take that as axiomatic.

The Minister for Lands: It shows we are not biased.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It might show a little political perspicacity. It would not be unreasonable to include on the board—if there must be a board—a representative of the employees. It is a growing practice in industry all over the world to give the employees a direct say in management and where that method is being practised it is giving satisfactory results, one reason for that being that the representative of the employees brings to bear in the discussions an angle that is unknown to men who live and work in other spheres of life. There are on record many instances of where the employees' angle is an important one and makes a worthwhile contribution to the management of the organisation concerned and its general welfare. We should encourage amicable relationships so that there may be freedom from friction and industrial trouble.

Industrial trouble often arises not from any anger or detrimental action, but from sheer misunderstanding by the parties concerned of each other's point of view. If we have on this board—it is only a part time board—a representative of the employees, he will not be able to control it, but will bring to the discussions the viewpoint of the employees and, I have no doubt, make some worthwhile contributions to the management. That is not a new fangled idea conjured up for this occasion, but something that has been put into practice in many countries with outstanding success. The growing interest of the employees in management and the opportunity for them to feel that they are part and parcel of the show is all to the good and it seems to me that it would make for greater stability and satisfaction if that course were followed in this instance.

I have yet to be convinced that a board is necessary, but if the Government is satisfied that the board and the additional expense involved are justified I believe we should make this other provision. I would emphasise that it is my firm conviction

that it would be a far more efficient board with the controller on it than off it, because he is an outstanding man at his job and I daresay he could qualify for the controllership of any abattoirs in the Commonwealth and that any State would be glad to get his services. We have nearly lost him on more than one occasion. He had secured a job and was on the eve of leaving for Tasmania when the late Mr. Wood, recognising his worth, prevailed upon him to stay here and, because of his interest in the work and in the development of our abattoirs he agreed to stay

I do not know what the financial consideration was or whether he lost money by staying here; all I know is that he was ready to go, having secured a job in Tasmania, but he remained here. I do not think we are making the best use of his talents if we place an inexperienced board over him and make him subservient to it. If we must have a board, let us put him on it so that he will be able to give the other members the benefit of his knowledge and experience and make sure that the Act is implemented as we expect it to be and that the abattoirs are properly run. I do not submit these points to the Minister in a spirit of carping criticism, but in a constructive way and in an endeavour to secure for this State the most satisfactory set-up and the most efficient possible organisation.

I do not think anyone would desire to set up in control of the abattoirs a body that would impair its efficiency and I cannot reconcile with that the decision to leave the controller in complete control at Kalgoorlie—or any other abattoirs in the State which might come under the Act—while making him subservient to the board in regard to Midland Junction. Of course he will be there to give advice and suggestions, but in the final analysis he will be directed what to do and will have no say in the decisions of the board, which will be made by other people. To me that seems to be the very antithesis of efficiency.

If this man were just anyone of about average ability, and not such an outstanding man, I would not argue so strongly for his inclusion on the board, but I doubt whether there is in Australia a more efficient officer or one with more knowledge of the running of abattoirs than he has. If we do not include him on the board we will be throwing away valuable knowledge and experience. The Government should give due consideration to the views that I have expressed although, as far as I am aware, they are my own views only. As I have had no opportunity to consult my Leader or other members of my Party, with the exception of a few minutes hurried conversation with my Leader after the sitting commenced this afternoon.

As this is such an important question and as the State has spent a great deal of money at Midland Junction, and in view of the fact that the abattoirs will develop greatly and play an important part in the economic life of the community, I trust that the closest consideration will be given to the various points that I have raised. A further point is whether a Message has been received from His Excellency the Governor in connection with this Bill.

The Minister for Lands: A Message was received.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I felt that one was necessary, but did not know whether it had been received. That clears up the other point I had in mind and at this stage I have no more to say.

Mr. BRADY: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

**MR. BRADY** (Guildford-Midland) [3.25]: I am sorry that the Minister did not allow me to secure the adjournment as we have had a minimum of time in which to consider the Bill.

The Minister for Lands: I promise that I will adjourn the Committee stage so as to give members an opportunity of considering the Bill further, and to allow me to deal with the points raised by the member for Melville.

Mr. BRADY: That is some concession, but not sufficient in view of the importance of the Bill to the people of the metropolitan area and of my own electorate. I feel that the Minister has taken advantage of his position and of the numbers on his side of the House. We first saw the Bill last night and at 9.30 p.m. I posted copies of it to people that I thought might be interested in it. They have not had time to review it and advise me of their reactions to it.

I take the strongest exception to the attitude of the Minister and of the Government in refusing me the opportunity to secure the adjournment of the debate, but, as I live in the vicinity of the abattoirs I have something to say and when the Bill is in Committee will endeavour to have it amended in certain directions. I feel that the name proposed to be given to the board is wrong. The suggestion is that it should be known as the Midland Junction Abattoirs Board, but actually it will be more representative of the metropolitan area than of Midland Junction.

After all, there are only two or three butchers in Midland Junction and the board will represent all the metropolitan butchers. I think it should be called "The Metropolitan Board" or "The Bushmead Abattoirs Board," because the abattoirs are not at Midland Junction, but on the outskirts, almost in the Swan Road Board area and immediately opposite the Bush-

mead Station, close to where the Military Ordnance Stores are. One provision of the Bill is that no member of the board shall have any participation in profits arising out of contracts entered into in conjunction with the board and I do not know how that would affect a butcher—

Mr. J. Hegney: It says, "without the consent of the Minister."

Mr. BRADY: That may cover the point. I could not see how a master butcher could sit on the board and represent his interests and at the same time not participate in profits arising from the activities of the board. It is most important that the employees should be represented on the board because they are the only ones with expert knowledge of many of the activities of the abattoirs. The employee is expert in many directions.

I do not know whether members and the Minister realise that there are five or six different sections of employees at the abattoirs. I think they should be represented, because of their knowledge and the important functions that they perform in the interests of the community. In view of the importance of the abattoirs to the community I believe that the number of industrial disputes there have been a minimum, compared with the position of any other industry in the State. That speaks well for the workers and shows, in a favourable light, the controller and his relationship with the employees. It is a good argument why the board should be opposed and the controller retained. If it is necessary there could be an advisory board.

*Sitting suspended from 3.30 to 3.51 p.m.*

Mr. BRADY: I was arguing that the most important section of the community interested in the abattoirs would not be represented on the board; that the employees should be given representation because of the very important functions they fulfil. I do not know whether members realise the number of people who are working at the abattoirs and the variety of interests involved. Over the years, industrial relations have been very good, which speaks volumes for the existing control. At the abattoirs there are stockmen, some of whom are engaged all night, while others start in the early hours of the morning, the administrative staff and officers, the slaughtermen who work mainly for the master butchers, together with the slaughtermen's apprentices and off-siders, the engineer and the engine-driver. They are doing a great job and should be given representation on the board because of the knowledge and information they could bring to bear during discussions. Those men carry out a job that is obnoxious and the State should be grateful to them for their work over the years.

To set up a board of the description proposed and absolutely ignore their right to representation is a retrograde step. As the member for Melville pointed out, it is the custom throughout the world, and particularly in the United States of America and England, to appoint representatives of employees to various boards, and where that has been done the gain has been considerable. Only recently, the Commissioner of Railways in New South Wales agreed to the appointment of a joint committee representative of both sides to discuss various aspects of the working of the railways, the possibility of averting the necessity for retrenchment, or deciding what retrenchment should take place. One could cite other instances of the advantage to be derived from having a representative of the employees on the board.

The setting up of a board at this stage amounts more or less to an insult to the controller, who has been doing a very efficient job. If there is one department in the State of which we hear no criticism in the Press, in the street or in this House, it is the abattoirs, and that is due to the excellent control exercised by this officer. I wonder whether members realise that, under the present administration, the revenue of the abattoirs has been built up to £178,000 a year, and the estimated revenue for next year is £227,000. That increased revenue is envisaged under the proposed new control. As the controller has done such fine work, it is only fair that he should be permitted to continue.

I cannot find mention in the Bill of any functions to be performed by the board that would justify its appointment, and certainly none that could not be carried out by the controller. A few weeks ago, we had certain legislation before us dealing with the State Electricity Commission, and a member on the Opposition side of the House maintained that a certain member, who was an employee, should not have a seat on the Commission, and the Minister in charge of the Bill argued that he should. If we are to have a board to control the abattoirs, I suggest that the controller would be the most competent man to appoint to the board. As the member for Melville stated during an exchange of interjections, he could not conceive of any member of the board as envisaged by the Bill being able to bring to bear on the business the knowledge possessed by the controller. That is the attitude I take.

If the controller is now going to be advised and directed by a board that is incompetent and has not a knowledge of the business, he must take a very dim view of the outlook. If I were in his position, I would certainly sit back and say, "Let the board do the job." If that

should occur, I can see a lot of trouble in store for the people associated with the metropolitan meat trade.

The Minister for Lands: I guarantee that it will not occur.

Mr. BRADY: It will occur. I cannot imagine any chartered accountant, any producer or any master butcher being able to take his seat on the board and direct the business as competently as can the man who has been doing it for years and who knows the trade from every angle and has shown himself capable of conducting the business efficiently—

The Minister for Lands: He will do so.

Mr. BRADY: —with a minimum of industrial disputes and a minimum of criticism from the public or from the trade itself. There has been no suggestion in the newspapers or otherwise that the controller should be replaced by a board and I take a poor view of the Government's setting up a board to override him. It would be idle to argue that the project is too big for him to handle. For many years we had only one Commissioner of Railways who was not even subject to the Minister, and yet he conducted a concern worth £30,000,000 and having an annual revenue of £5,000,000 or £6,000,000, but in a small concern like the abattoirs where the controller is doing a grand job, we are to have a board of three set up to direct him.

This departure of appointing three people to do the job one man can do will not make for efficiency, and I protest as strongly as possible against the proposal. The controller has encountered difficult times, but now that the concern shows signs of being reasonably prosperous, he is not to be permitted to carry on. If a board is appointed, its members must receive a fee, which will probably amount to £1,000 a year each, and that will entail more expense to the consumers. The money will have to be paid through the trade and, as I indicated by interjection when the member for Melville was speaking, meat prices in this State are already too high, and should be reduced. Anything that will tend to increase costs in the meat industry should be frowned upon by us. This matter has been brought forward altogether too hastily. No one has had time to consider it thoroughly, and I believe it would not be in the best interest of the State to make such a change at this stage. I hope the Bill will be rejected.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn) [4.0] I wish to enter my emphatic protest against the action of the Government in introducing such an important measure in the dying hours of Parliament. I would not be a bit surprised, unless there are certain specific interests involved, if another place rejects the measure on account of lack of time to deal with it intelligently. If the Minister some time back had I

mind the introduction of the Bill, then the measure should have been brought down at least five or six weeks ago. The Premier has indicated that the House will adjourn no later than Friday, the 12th December, and today is the 10th December, yet we are asked to deal with this Bill. It has already been said that we received the Bill yesterday evening. The House adjourned about 1 a.m. today, so we have had no opportunity to consult those involved, or to make any research to find out what the Bill contains and its implications.

The Minister will be well advised to withdraw the measure and reintroduce it at a more opportune time. The main provision is to remove the actual management of the concern from the controller. The management is to repose in the hands of a board of three members appointed by the Government. The Bill indicates that the controller will, by virtue of his position, be the chief executive officer of the board; yet, as I interpret the measure, the board will tell the controller, in the final analysis, what he shall and shall not do. The Bill provides that a chartered accountant shall be the consumers' representative. I do not know why it is necessary for the consumers' representative to be a chartered accountant because this limits the field.

The chartered accountant could be one who keeps the books of wholesale butchering firms so that he would have an interest not only in the consumers' point of view, but in the wholesale butchers' point of view as well. The Minister said he had reappointed Mr. Harry Webb to the Metropolitan Markets Trust, but on another occasion he removed Mr. Gough—or rather the Government did—from the position of consumers' representative on the State Electricity Commission for no apparent reason, and appointed another person in his place. One or two other alterations were made. The main provision of the Bill is the appointment of a board in lieu of the present system of control. Personally I believe in the management of nationalised industries or Government concerns by boards, but I am a bit doubtful about the personnel of this board. I think there might be a Government representative on it.

There is to be a representative of the butchers and one of the consumers. It has been said there should be a workers' representative on the board. This is in accordance with the policy of the Labour Party of this State. If there is to be a board to manage a nationalised concern, and the Government desires to improve the human relationships between the management and the men, then the least it can do is to appoint some responsible person to act as spokesman for the workers in the particular concern. For many years there has been a great

measure of industrial peace in the Midland Junction abattoirs, but that is no reason why there should not be some representative on the board from the slaughtermen and the other employees there.

After all, the workmen are a very important part of the abattoirs organisation, and if the Bill is to pass the second reading then I suggest a representative of the workers should be seconded to the board in the same way as there will be representatives of the consumers and the butchers. I vehemently oppose a measure of this nature being thrown into the Chamber within two days of the closing of the session. The Government might reconsider its attitude, and withdraw the Bill. If another place is going to be consistent, then the debate on the Bill here, including the Committee stage, will be so much waste time.

On numerous occasions I have heard that the reasons why another place rejected certain Bills was because it would not subscribe to hasty legislation. But I have noticed that on most occasions when another place has rejected Bills they have been of an industrial nature, or designed to benefit the interests of the working people. If the Minister remains adamant and proceeds with the Bill, I hope it will be substantially amended in Committee, and its fate then left to another place.

**MR. J. HEGNEY** (Middle Swan) [4.9]: I emphatically protest against a Bill of 36 clauses, as this one is, being introduced into Parliament at this stage of the session. A Bill that I was interested in was brought here in ample time for consideration, but the Government has still thought fit to keep it at the bottom of the notice paper, but the measure under discussion which I have no doubt has been in the office for quite a time, is introduced in the last days of the session when Standing Orders are suspended. The measure may have a great deal of merit, but there has been little opportunity to examine it. Members who were not in the Chamber when the Minister moved the second reading will have to rely on newspaper comment because they cannot get a draft of his remarks to inform themselves correctly on the merits of the proposal.

The Bill was introduced only last evening, and we had a late sitting, and today we have commenced early. So members have had little time in which to consider it. I have recollections of a Bill being introduced into Parliament in the dying hours of the session two years ago, and the Premier put it to the member for Guildford-Midland and me to be ready to go on with the debate immediately. I contended that Parliament was not properly informed on the Bill, but nevertheless it was passed by the Assembly and another



place. Unfortunately for the people concerned, effect has not been given to it to this day. As a result, many people in my district are suffering considerably.

I do not know what is going to happen as a result of this Bill. It was introduced yesterday, but we are expected to give mature and deliberate consideration to it. There is a deal of inconsistency in respect to the Government's submission in connection with the Bill because it separates the controller of the abattoirs from the board. I draw the analogy with the State Electricity Commission. The general manager of that Commission is a member of the organisation that runs the department, yet when it is suggested to the Minister that the same procedure be adopted here, he rejects it. I would like to know from the Minister when he replies, just why he did not accept that idea on this occasion although he did under another Bill.

Like other speakers, I support the proposition that an employees' representative should be included on the board. As the member for Guildford-Midland said, the workers of the abattoirs are doing an essential work and they know every aspect of the job there. Many of them have been there for years and would be specialists in their vocation. Consequently they would be able to make a real contribution to the administration of the board. Therefore I plead with the Minister to give earnest consideration to the appointment of an employees' representative. This is not a new proposition. A precedent for it can again be found in the State Electricity Commission where an employees' representative is appointed. I know the man personally, Mr. Richter.

If it is essential to have an employees' representative on that Commission, it is equally important to have one on the abattoirs board. The employees' interests are of paramount importance, and the idea of the workers in an industry having a greater say and share in it becomes more dominant every day. Instead of members on the Government side, when they seek the co-operation of the workers to carry industry, giving only lip service to this proposition, let them give practical evidence that they believe in these ideas by making provision in the Bill for the employees to be represented on the board. Therefore I submit that proposition to the Minister and urge him to give it careful consideration.

I also protest against the period of employment for the board. Under the Bill, it is proposed that the board shall be appointed for a period of five years and I do not think that is justified at this stage. As the member for Melville pointed out, the Government is about to face the electors and it is only fair, if the Bill is passed and a board is appointed, that it should be appointed

for a reasonable term so that any future Government, irrespective of its complexion, could make a final decision. In any case I think the period of appointment should be no longer than three years, and if necessary the appointment of those members could be extended for a further term.

Parliament is the most important body in the community. We make the laws for Western Australia and yet we have to face our masters every three years. If it is good enough for members of Parliament to have to give an account of their stewardship every three years, I can see no reason why the same principle should not be included in the Bill. Therefore I hope that when we reach the Committee stage an amendment will be moved to provide for a three-year period. Another aspect, although it is only a minor one, is referred to in paragraph (v) of Subclause (5) of Clause 12. It reads—

Without the consent of the Minister participates or claims to be entitled to participate in the profit of or in a commission, benefit, or an emolument, arising from any contracts or agreements made by or on behalf of the board.

When we reach the Committee stage I will move to insert the words "in writing" after the words "the Minister". I think in such cases the consent of the Minister should be in writing. Another amendment I intend to move concerns the consumers' representative on the board. At the moment the consumers' representative will have to be a chartered accountant, and while I agree that a chartered accountant is an expert on figures he is not to be made a member of the board for that reason. There is already provision for a proper system of book-keeping and auditing of accounts, submission of balance sheets and so on. Therefore there is no reason for having a chartered accountant as the consumers' representative and in any case it limits the choice.

The housewives of Western Australia are an important body in our community and I think that the consumers' representative should be a housewife. These days women are clamouring for equal rights and I consider that a woman, if she does the same work as a man, is entitled to the same remuneration. The policy of the Labour Party is equal pay for the sexes and, although we are not dealing with that question, the principle is the same and I contend that a housewife, who knows all about the price of meat, should be the consumers' representative on the board. A man knows little about the price of meat and this would be a gesture to the women's organisations. I am sure the Minister will agree to this reasonable proposition.

If one had more time one could go into other aspects of this measure. I have been to Midland Junction abattoirs on several occasions and I know many of the men employed there. I hope the Minister will

give the points I have raised earnest consideration, particularly my comments that the consumers' representative should be a woman, that the employees of the industry should have a representative on the board, and that the appointment of members should be limited to a maximum of three years. The Government is approaching the end of its term and it should not hamstring any incoming Government, irrespective of its political complexion. I am certain the Minister will give these points earnest consideration.

**MR. JOHNSON** (Leederville) [4.22]: I wish to say a few words on this measure, but I will be brief because I think nearly everything useful that can be said has been said. The Minister said that he would defer the Committee stage.

The Minister for Lands: I will not be doing that now because we have drawn up a suitable amendment.

Mr. Brady: You are not going to get away with that. That suggests Rafferty rules.

The Minister for Lands: No.

Mr. Brady: Then it is Ned Kelly rules.

Mr. Yates: Who is Rafferty?

**MR. JOHNSON**: The Minister gave an undertaking that he would defer the Committee stages of the Bill.

The Minister for Lands: With a view to drawing up a suitable amendment. That has been done.

**MR. JOHNSON**: I think the Minister should add after the word "defer" the words "for at least a week."

The Attorney General: You are a funny boy at times. You are just childish.

**MR. JOHNSON**: The implications of that amendment must be clear to all members. I have been a member of this Chamber for only a short time and I have not become inured, as so many members have, to political life. Perhaps I know a little better than the majority of members who have been here for a long while, the reactions of the public to politicians. Members of the public, who after all are our masters, do not think very highly of politicians.

The Minister for Lands: What a thing to say!

**MR. JOHNSON**: That is true of both parties. The public is suspicious of politicians and when a proposition is put forward the public has a very suspicious attitude towards it. If a measure is introduced in a hurry, obviously carelessly drawn, the public looks for something behind it to see the reason for the hurry. Two or three members on this side have indicated that they consider there is some reason for the hurry, and they want to know what it is. The Minister, when introducing the Bill, did not tell us; he did not say that the present management of the abattoirs at Midland Junction is in-

efficient. The Bill provides that the present controller shall continue in control of abattoirs throughout the State, with the exception of Midland Junction, and I think that indicates that the Government is satisfied with the controller's capabilities. Yet the control of this single abattoir is to be taken from him and given to a board. That is contradictory to the usual practice of putting a board in control of policy for the whole of an industry.

Here we have an industry as a whole under one controller and one particular section of it under a board. That is most unusual. Had the Bill been introduced to put a board in control of the industry as a whole, I would have thought it sensible, but that is not so; it is a change from normal principle. If the board were to be a board to advise the man in charge as to policy, there might have been some reason for it, because this is a large and growing industry and perhaps it is possible that the pressure of detail might make it difficult for a man to control both detail and policy. But this board is to cover detail as well, and I cannot see the reason for it.

The Government has not given any reason, or at least one that the public will be able to follow. The public is suspicious and will react in the main, as consumers. I think every one of our electors, with few exceptions, is interested in meat from the consumers' angle. A small proportion of our electors are interested in it from the tradesmen's angle, and a minute proportion from the wholesale butchering angle. We are here to represent the whole of our electors and in the main that means the consumers. But the Government is restricting the choice of the consumer's representative to an extremely limited field. The number of chartered accountants in Perth is small, and in saying that, I do not want it to be assumed that I am opposing the principle of putting a chartered accountant on the board. I am not.

If the Minister likes to amend the Bill to make the board consist of three persons, one of whom shall be a chartered accountant, I would agree, but to restrict the consumers' representative to a chartered accountant is unwise. Why should not the butchers' representative or the consumers' representative be a chartered accountant? They may more accurately represent those people. It has been suggested that the Minister has in mind the persons who will be placed on this board. To my knowledge the accountants available to represent the consumers on the board—that is accountants who are experienced in the meat trade and have dealings with either master butchers or wholesale butchers—are few and far between. No consumer requires an accountant to keep his books in relation to meat.

Admittedly the price is far too high but it does not need an accountant to take that point. The most qualified accountant I should think would be one who is already dealing with affairs of the big federation. He would probably be by far the most well-informed. But if it is assumed that because he is the most well-informed accountant he should be put on this board representing consumers I think the public would have reason to be even more suspicious than it is.

I would like to deal briefly with the matter referred to by the member for Melville regarding the suspension of a member of the board. There is provision in the Bill for a member to be suspended and there is no provision for him to be reinstated until Parliament has dealt with him. As the hon. member pointed out that may take anything up to seven or eight months. It could be less, but it could take at least that. There is provision made for a deputy to take the place of a man who is absent or incapacitated, but a man who is suspended is in a slightly different category and it would appear to me that a deputy could not take the place of a man who is suspended. If it is intended that that should be so I think the wording requires adjustment.

If that is not so I would draw attention to a further provision that, although two members of the board can meet and arrive at decisions if they agree, should they fail to agree the matter must be referred to the third man. If the third man is under suspension that disagreement cannot be resolved for anything up to eight months. That point in drafting could perhaps be made a little clearer. If it is not intended to be as I have said then it is at least open to question, and because of that it is capable of causing a delay by test in court if any of these proceedings take place. There is no doubt that the Bill has been brought before the House speedily. Perhaps it has been in a pigeon-hole for a long time. No sound, legitimate or effective reason has been advanced for introducing it and if it has been in preparation for a long time it could very well wait till next session.

If it has been delayed for two or three months another few months will not matter. If it has been brought forward in a hurry for some particular reason that reason should be made clear to us. That has not yet been done. I therefore warn the Minister and the Government that the public will be a little suspicious of hidden reasons, because those given are not convincing. The hidden reasons and the hidden inferences the public will draw will be extremely wide and they will, I am afraid, be without credit to the upright and honourable nature of the Minister who has introduced the Bill. I know he is inured to that, but I would just remind him that that is so. It is not only

to this House that convincing reasons must be given; they must be also given to the people whom we represent and who are at times very poorly informed. I think the Minister should enlighten them of the reasons.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS** (Hon. L. Thorn—Toodyay—in reply) [4.35]: During the debate I indicated that I would suspend the Committee stage with a view to drawing up suitable amendments to meet the wishes of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to some degree.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Did you qualify your offer when you made it?

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** No, I did not, and I did it for that purpose.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: It is a departure from the undertaking you gave.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** The debate has progressed and members have had a little more time to look at the Bill. We expect to have a short sitting and naturally I want to make progress with this measure. The Attorney General has brought up the Parliamentary Draftsman and we have gone to a lot of trouble to meet the wishes of the Opposition. So I think I have been fair in that regard. I have two other Acts here which have somewhat similar provisions to those contained in the Bill. I was somewhat impressed by the arguments put forward by the member for Melville.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Did not you say you would never take my advice?

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** That was on a specific subject. I am always quite willing to listen to what members have to say and to give consideration to their points of view. I look on the member for Melville as a very great orator.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: As a darned nuisance!

Mr. Boveil: Do not encourage him.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** But I would like to give him a little bit of advice. I think the hon. member is an excellent orator, but I do hope that next session he will not repeat himself quite so much.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: He will not need to.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** The hon. member generally has an excellent understanding of his subject, but he spoils a good oration by repeating himself.

**The Premier:** I do not think he will ever do it again.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** I do not think he will. For a year or two the Government has been considering setting up a board to control abattoirs. On more than one occasion I have heard a discussion take place on the set-up in South Australia, and the good results that have come from the operations of the board

there. I understand this Bill was drafted and re-drafted to try to make the most effective measure that was possible.

Mr. W. Hegney: When did you decide to introduce it?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: When it was ready. One never introduces a Bill until it is ready!

Mr. W. Hegney: It took you two years to get it ready.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Other matters cropped up and the Bill might have been laid aside; as the member for Leederville said it may have been pigeon-holed. At least, we now have it to perfection.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: We hope.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I assure the House it will be a most effective Bill and that it will have good results. In concluding his speech the member for Melville mentioned the large amount of money being spent on those abattoirs. They are building up every day and their turnover has been increasing continuously. That is one of the main reasons why the Government has come to the decision—from the point of view of policy also—to set up a board of control.

Mr. McCulloch: You do not believe in boards, do you?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, we believe in boards. I do not think we have set up as many boards as did the Labour Government when it was in office; but in most instances we supported boards. The markets are good today, but if members cast their minds back to 1930 they will appreciate that conditions were different then. I took an active part in assisting to have set up a State and Commonwealth dried fruits board. In those days we found ourselves working hard to clear our produce, and eventually we had to hawk our dried fruits around in paper bags and accept what was offered.

Mr. W. Hegney: That is private enterprise.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That was the start of the board to organise the industry and provide better marketing conditions for it. I have been asked why the controller is not a member of the board. In all sincerity I say that if members want effective management the manager or controller should not be a member of the board.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Is that why you made an alteration to the Milk Board?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: He should be under the control of the board and then we will get effective management. We appreciate his capacity as Controller of Abattoirs and give him full marks for that. He is to be a chief executive officer in the set-up of this board, and it is not advisable to have the controller as a member of the board.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: What about the Milk Board?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am talking about the abattoirs board.

Mr. Graham: A moment ago you were talking about the dried fruits board.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The member for East Perth is right on this occasion.

Mr. Graham: As usual.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The board will give close attention and every consideration to the recommendations of the Controller of Abattoirs. Reference has been made to the large amount of money spent at the Midland abattoirs; this has been long overdue. I live in that area and in the early days I attended the markets regularly. The conditions of the men working there are below standard. In the early days they had no place to have their lunch in comfort away from the flies. Today we are providing those amenities. It is the intention of the Government to take over control of those abattoirs.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: You are taking it away from the Government and giving it to the board.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member should not split straws.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: I am not splitting straws.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Government is taking over full control, and in future the slaughtermen and all concerned with the abattoirs will be employees of the Government.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: The Government has control now.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Who controls and engages slaughtermen?

Mr. Graham: The wholesale butchers.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Of course they do, but under the new arrangement the Government will control them.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: No, the board will.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The board is under the Minister; do not make any mistake about that. There will be an opportunity for all butchers large or small to have their stock slaughtered and get a fair deal. That is the objective of the Government as far as the abattoirs are concerned; besides it will be cheaper.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Why will it be cheaper?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It might not be cheaper, but it certainly will be more efficient. With proper organisation, it could possibly be cheaper.

Hon. E. Nulsen: I have never known a board to be set up and the goods it deals with to be cheaper.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member need make no mistake about this board. This small body of three

will control the position and will create more efficiency. I know there have been instances where certain boards have resulted in increased costs. This board will not be in that category, and it should assist the industry considerably. It will provide representation for the butchers and for the producers. The chairman, who is an accountant and will look after accountancy matters, will also represent the consumers, and it is considered that we could not have got a more suitable man for that purpose. Members can rest assured that the Bill, if it becomes an Act, will increase efficiency and will itself prove effective in the control of the future management of the abattoirs.

To meet the wishes of the member for Melville, I have had an amendment drafted, the effect of which will be to delete the whole provision relating to the suspension of a board member for certain misdemeanours. The member for Melville submitted pretty sound arguments in support of his claim that the provision was not proper. I realise that what he said was true. A board member might be suspended for some irregularity and Parliament might have just adjourned. The result could be that the board member would be under suspension for eight months, after which the House could consider the matter. There is no necessity for any such provision. The strength of the member for Melville's representations influenced me on this occasion, and the amendment I shall submit will overcome his objection.

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

Ayes	....	23
Noes	....	18

Majority for .... 5

#### Ayes.

Mr. Abbott  
Mr. Ackland  
Mr. Brand  
Mr. Butcher  
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver  
Mr. Doney  
Mr. Grayden  
Mr. Griffith  
Mr. Hearman  
Mr. Hill  
Mr. Hutchinson  
Mr. Manning

Mr. McLarty  
Mr. Nimmo  
Mr. Oldfield  
Mr. Owen  
Mr. Read  
Mr. Thorn  
Mr. Totterdell  
Mr. Watte  
Mr. Wild  
Mr. Yates  
Mr. Bovell

(Teller.)

#### Noes.

Mr. Brady  
Mr. Graham  
Mr. Hawke  
Mr. J. Hegney  
Mr. W. Hegney  
Mr. Hoar  
Mr. Johnson  
Mr. Lawrence  
Mr. May

Mr. McLarty  
Mr. Molr  
Mr. Needham  
Mr. Nulsen  
Mr. Rodoreda  
Mr. Sleeman  
Mr. Styants  
Mr. Tonkin  
Mr. Kelly

(Teller.)

#### Pairs.

##### Ayes.

Mr. Cornell  
Mr. Perkins  
Mr. Nalder  
Mr. Mann

##### Noes.

Mr. O'Brien  
Mr. Sewell  
Mr. Coverley  
Mr. Guthrie

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### In Committee.

Mr. Yates in the Chair: the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short Title and citation:

Mr. BRADY: I move—

That progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.

Motion put and a division called for.

#### Remarks during Division.

The Minister for Lands: This is very good!

Mr. Brady: If the Minister makes a promise, he should keep it. The promise that the Committee stage would be adjourned has been broken. It shows how the Minister is prepared to double-cross members.

The Attorney General: Adjourn it till when?

Mr. Brady: That is all right. We can sit all night.

The Minister for Lands: Can you?

Mr. Brady: Yes, we can.

The Attorney General: If your Leader agrees.

Mr. Graham: We will have dinner instead!

The Attorney General: I think that would be better.

#### Committee Resumed.

Division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	....	18
Noes	....	22

Majority against .... 4

#### Ayes.

Mr. Brady  
Mr. Graham  
Mr. Hawke  
Mr. J. Hegney  
Mr. W. Hegney  
Mr. Hoar  
Mr. Johnson  
Mr. Lawrence  
Mr. May

Mr. McCulloch  
Mr. Molr  
Mr. Needham  
Mr. Nulsen  
Mr. Rodoreda  
Mr. Sleeman  
Mr. Styants  
Mr. Tonkin  
Mr. Kelly

(Teller.)

#### Noes.

Mr. Abbott  
Mr. Ackland  
Mr. Brand  
Mr. Butcher  
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver  
Mr. Doney  
Mr. Grayden  
Mr. Griffith  
Mr. Hearman  
Mr. Hill  
Mr. Hutchinson

Mr. Manning  
Mr. McLarty  
Mr. Nimmo  
Mr. Oldfield  
Mr. Owen  
Mr. Read  
Mr. Thorn  
Mr. Totterdell  
Mr. Watte  
Mr. Wild  
Mr. Bovell

(Teller.)

#### Pairs.

##### Ayes.

Mr. O'Brien  
Mr. Sewell  
Mr. Coverley  
Mr. Guthrie

##### Noes.

Mr. Cornell  
Mr. Perkins  
Mr. Nalder  
Mr. Mann

Motion thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Section 2 amended.

Mr. BRADY: I feel that the name Midland Junction as applied to the abattoirs is not appropriate and the undertaking should be called the Bushmead abattoirs or the metropolitan abattoirs. I move an amendment—

That in line 4 of the interpretation of "appointed day" the words "Midland Junction" be struck out with a view to inserting the word "Bushmead".

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. The reference to Midland Junction appears right through the Bill and members will realise what it will mean from the standpoint of reprinting. Apart from that, the Midland Junction abattoirs has always been known by that name. They are situate within the boundaries of the Midland Junction Municipality. There is neither sense nor reason in the amendment.

Mr. Brady: There is a lot of sense in it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There is no necessity for it at all. It seeks to take away the name from a well-established and well-known undertaking that is recognised by its present name throughout the State. Let members think of the printing that will have to be done in connection with the alteration of the name and a whole heap of other matters.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I support the amendment. The abattoirs are in the Bushmead area, although the Minister claims they are within the boundary of the Midland Junction Municipality. The holding paddocks are in Bushmead. The Minister referred to the printing that would be involved in a change of name, but that is a secondary consideration.

The Minister for Lands: Talk sense!

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I suggest that the Midland Junction Municipal Council might like the name of the abattoirs changed.

The Minister for Lands: That is the suggestion.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Yes. I think that the name "Metropolitan" would be more appropriate, because the abattoirs provide the metropolitan area and not Midland Junction alone with meat supplies. I am in accord with the suggestion of the member for Guildford-Midland and believe that the name should be changed from Midland Junction Abattoir Board to the Metropolitan Abattoir Board.

Mr. BRADY: I am not fussy whether it is called the Bushmead Abattoir Board or the Metropolitan Abattoir Board, but the use of the words "Midland Junction" is misleading. The holding paddocks are all in Bushmead, and the abattoirs are on the boundary of the Swan Road Board area and the Midland Junction Municipal

Council area. It is advisable for the name to be changed, and I would be prepared to substitute "metropolitan" for "Bushmead".

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Part II added:

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Before dealing with this clause, I would like to ask whether there should not be a Clause 11. We have a Clause 10 and then a Clause 12.

The Attorney General: The figure "12" does not relate to a clause. It relates to the Part II to be added. Clause 10 is the last clause in the Bill.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I take it then that everything that appears after Clause 10 is part of Clause 10.

The Attorney General: Quite right.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: So if we are going to make a series of amendments from now on they will all relate to Clause 10?

The Attorney General: Yes.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of Subsection (2) of proposed new Section 12 the word "three" be struck out and the word "five" inserted in lieu.

I desire to provide for the inclusion of a representative of the employees and also of the controller. The Minister has expressed opposition to having the controller on the board, but I do not think he declared himself with regard to the employees' representative.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I oppose the amendment. We have made provision for a consumers' representative. If we gave consideration to every section of the community we would have a board of 12.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Do you not think that the employees should be represented?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: They will be looked after all right.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: That does not answer the question.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We have kept the number down as low as we can so that the board will be workable.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I support the amendment. The Minister gave no substantial reason for opposing it. We know that there is to be a consumers' representative, but he will not represent the workers at the abattoirs. The Minister said the workers will be looked after, but they are entitled to direct representation.

The Minister for Lands: They are represented by the union, which looks after their interests.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Is the representative of the union entitled to attend meetings of the board and participate in its deliberations?

The Minister for Lands: There is no need for him to do so. If the board does anything against the interests of the workers, the union deals with it.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The same could be said of the consumers' and producers' representatives.

The Minister for Lands: They have not a union.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Do not worry about that! To use a more polite term, they have an association. The wholesale butchers have their union and the producers have their organisation.

The Minister for Lands: They are not registered industrial unions.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: That does not matter. They have their associations. The Minister said that at one time dried fruits were hawked round and each producer acted individually, but they organised themselves into an association to protect their interests.

The Minister for Lands: But that is not registered with the Arbitration Court.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: It does not matter whether it is registered with the court or with the W. A. Turf Club! The idea is to protect the interests of a particular section of the community. If we are going to have a responsible board to manage and administer the Act, the workers in the industry are entitled to direct representation on that board. The State Electricity Commission has a workers' representative and a consumers' representative. We have heard the Government assure the people how solicitous it is for the welfare of the workers and the industrial organisations. If there is a representative of the workers on this board, then any matters affecting human relationships which crop up from time to time can be dealt with and the workers' viewpoint submitted.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I support the amendment. Lip service has been given to the desire for good relations between the employers and employees, and this is an opportunity for the Government to demonstrate its interest in the workers at the abattoirs. If we want better industrial relations we must give to the producers in the industry an opportunity to exercise an influence. I have no doubt that quite a number of employees would make a real contribution to the administrative side of this board, and I cannot see any sound reason why the Minister should oppose the proposition. The Labour Government made provision for an employees' representative on the State Electricity Commission and he has remained there. That should apply in this instance. We have passed the stage when workers are in industry to be exploited by the bosses, and they should have representation on boards such as this.

Mr. BRADY: I hope the Minister will agree to the amendment. There is a variety of interests at the abattoirs and it is most important that the employees should be satisfied. Even the Minister said he had been surprised at the disabilities that the employees at the abattoirs had suffered in the past and it is not right that they should be asked to endure them in the future. One way of protecting them is to have a spokesman on the board who will submit their point of view. Hardly a week goes by without men being taken to the doctor to have tetanus injections because of accidents at their work.

We want the abattoirs to continue with a minimum of industrial unrest, but unless there is on the board a spokesman of the employees, this will not be a happy organisation. There are inherent disabilities in a board of three such as is suggested, but they could be overcome by the inclusion of a representative of the workers. If such a representative of the employees did nothing but look after the interests of the younger men in the industry, that alone would justify his appointment. He could make sure that the proper amenities were provided. The only way in which to improve the conditions of the men at the abattoirs is to have on the board a spokesman who can put forward their views. I hope the Minister will agree to the amendment.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	22
Majority against	2

Ayes.	
Mr. Brady	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Moir
Mr. Graham	Mr. Needham
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Styants
Mr. Lawrence	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. May	Mr. Kelly

(Teller.)

Noes.	
Mr. Abbott	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Doney	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Totterdell
Mr. Hill	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Manning	Mr. Bovell

(Teller.)

Pairs.	
Ayes.	Noes
Mr. O'Brien	Mr. Cornell
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Mann

Amendment thus negated.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of Subclause (2) the words "chartered accountant" be struck out, with a view to inserting another word.

If the amendment is agreed to, I will move to insert, in place of the words struck out, the word "housewife." I would not object to the inclusion of a chartered accountant on the board if he were being placed there because of his specialised knowledge.

The Attorney General: That is the main reason for his being there.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: The Attorney General should read the Bill.

The Attorney General: The Bill does not say he shall represent the consumers, but that he will look after their interests.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: It is nice to have from the Attorney General an admission that the chartered accountant will not look after the interests of the consumers. The butchers are to have representation—

The Attorney General: No, but that member of the board will look after their interests.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: The Bill sets out whom the members of the board shall represent. Many women's organisations in Perth are urging that women should have representation equal to that of men in many spheres, and in this instance it is a matter of representing the consumers of meat. It is the women of the community who buy the meat and prepare it for consumption, and for that reason there is no-one better fitted to represent the consumers on this board than is the housewife.

Mr. McCulloch: The Minister for Health should support the amendment.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: She should, as the only representative in this Chamber of the fair sex. I have no doubt that the member for Canning will also support the amendment, as more than half his electors are women. His vote on this question could well have a bearing on his future in this Chamber. Most of the expenditure necessary in regard to the abattoirs has already been undertaken, and there is little need now to have a chartered accountant on the board, whose duty will be simply to run the abattoirs on the proper lines.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Before the Minister intimates his acquiescence in the amendment, I would like some information from him in view of the interjection of the Attorney General. The Minister for Lands said, a short while ago, that the workers would be adequately represented by their union, though there is no provision for such representation in the Bill. He further said that the consumers were to be directly represented on the board. The Attorney General says that the consumers are not represented on the board.

The Attorney General: I did not say anything of the sort.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: What did the Attorney General say?

The Attorney General: You read the Bill.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I have read it. What did the Attorney General say? Apparently he withdraws what he said. I think we should have some clarification. One responsible Minister says something and another irresponsible Minister says something to the contrary. Does the Minister mean to indicate to the Committee that the person whom the Government will appoint, and who is to have regard for the interests of the butchers, will not represent them? Of course he will.

The Minister for Lands: Of course!

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The Attorney General is not in agreement with the Minister for Lands as to the interpretation of the clause.

The Minister for Lands: Oh, yes he is!

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Having cleared that up, would the Minister advise the Committee what is behind this proposition of appointing a chartered accountant to represent the consumers on this proposed board? I would also like to know whether the Minister intends to appoint a chartered accountant from the Treasury and further, whom does the Minister visualise shall be the chairman? Will he be the representative of the consumers or the butchers?

Mr. BRADY: Will the Minister tell us what he means by "chartered accountant?" There are all sorts of accountants; certified accountants, qualified accountants and chartered accountants and this limits the field to specialists. Although I have no objection to the appointment of a chartered accountant I think that he should be a member of the staff rather than a member of the board. As a member of the board he could be a single man staying at one of the local hotels and know nothing about the needs of consumers. The amendment is a good one. I am not keen about having a woman on the board, as suggested by the member for Middle Swan. There is going to be a long list of amendments to the Bill, and I wish the Minister had allowed us an adjournment in order to frame some others and so expedite the passage of the Bill through Committee. If he is going to argue against the amendments put forward the Bill will be delayed considerably.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I oppose the amendment. For the information of the member for Guildford-Midland a chartered accountant is one who has passed an examination set by the Chartered Accountants' Association.

Mr. Brady: The Chartered Accountants' Institute.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes. By appointing a chartered accountant to represent the consumers it could be a woman, which would please the member for Middle Swan.

Mr. Brady: The Minister has available a number of women that are chartered accountants?



The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes. It is impossible for me to inform the Committee who is to be chairman because I am asking members to approve of a Bill to give the Government power set up a board, and until it is constituted we will not be giving consideration as to who will comprise its personnel. We have to get the approval of Parliament to appoint the board.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: No, truly!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes. That is the position.

Mr. STYANTS: Until the Minister spoke I intended to oppose the amendment, because I considered it might be difficult to obtain a woman who was a chartered accountant. However, now that the Minister has assured me that there are female chartered accountants available it is the strongest argument that he could have used to specify that it shall be a woman. I realise that to appoint a woman to the board who was not a chartered accountant would not meet the intention of the clause. The chartered accountant's duties will be to keep the accounts of the board. While the Bill states that such chartered accountant shall be the consumers' representative, the Minister blew the gaff, as it were, by saying that he will be there to keep the accounts.

The Minister for Lands: If you read the wording it says, "and a chartered accountant who shall have regard to the interests of the consumers of meat."

Mr. STYANTS: Yes, but that would lead one to believe that the chartered accountant would be appointed as a consumers' representative, but the Attorney General has said that he will be there to keep the books of the board.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It was not until this discussion developed that I became very doubtful about these provisions for the appointment of representatives. I do not think they provide for direct representation. What is the meaning of the words "shall have regard to the interests of?" Does that mean that the person shall have regard to the interests of consumers of meat and shall be the direct representative of consumers, and the person who shall have regard to the interests of butchers shall be the direct representative of butchers? Does that mean that we can appoint anyone to the board who, at some time or other in the discussions, shall have regard to the interests of some particular section? This is an extraordinary way to appoint members of a board. In the Milk Act it is very definite as to who shall be the representative of each section. The words "shall have regard to" do not make a person representative of a section. I would expect members of a board who were considering propositions to have regard to the interests of all persons.

The Minister for Lands: Of course you would!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes, I would, and what good is this?

The Attorney General: And what would you say a representative would do?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: He is appointed particularly to represent the point of view of people by whom he is elected.

The Attorney General: Yes.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It is his job to look after the point of view of the persons he represents. The Government might as well say what it intends to do. If it proposes to set up a board upon which interests shall have representation it ought not to be afraid to provide in that way. If it is only a camouflage and a gesture and the Government has no intention of making proper representation on the board, it should say so. It should say that it intends to appoint a board not particularly representing anybody. Does it intend that on the board there shall be a direct representative of all parties concerned, or does it intend to appoint a board of three that shall not be representative of anybody but shall have regard at times to the interests of different sections?

There is a big difference. I should expect the representative of the consumers to have regard also to the interests of producers and butchers. If I were appointed as representative of the consumers, I would regard it as my special province to see that the point of view of the consumers was adequately expressed, but I would also deem it my bounden duty to have regard to the interests of other sections. The proposed board will not be truly representative. If we appointed the controller to the board, he could have regard to the interests of the consumers, producers and butchers. In view of the peculiar wording of the subclause, it is desirable to support the amendment.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I am wondering why a chartered accountant is being proposed to represent the interests of the consumers.

Mr. Manning: He would not be a vegetarian.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: According to the hon. member, the Government would have to make a survey whether the chartered accountant was a vegetarian or not. The Minister should explain why a chartered accountant has not been suggested to represent the interests of the producers or the butchers. The Attorney General stated that a chartered accountant would be there to advise the board on the financial policy. Is that the intention?

Amendment (to strike out word) put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	.....	19
Noes	.....	23
Majority against	.....	4

## Ayes.

Mr. Graham  
Mr. Guthrie  
Mr. Hawke  
Mr. J. Hegney  
Mr. W. Hegney  
Mr. Hoar  
Mr. Johnson  
Mr. Lawrence  
Mr. May  
Mr. McCulloch

Mr. Moir  
Mr. Needham  
Mr. Nulsen  
Mr. Rodoreda  
Mr. Sewell  
Mr. Sleeman  
Mr. Styants  
Mr. Tonkin  
Mr. Kelly

(Teller.)

## Noes.

Mr. Abbott  
Mr. Ackland  
Mr. Brand  
Mr. Butcher  
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver  
Mr. Doney  
Mr. Grayden  
Mr. Griffith  
Mr. Hearman  
Mr. Hill  
Mr. Hutchinson  
Mr. Manning

Mr. McLarty  
Mr. Naider  
Mr. Nimmo  
Mr. Oldfield  
Mr. Owen  
Mr. Perkins  
Mr. Thorn  
Mr. Totterdell  
Mr. Watts  
Mr. Wild  
Mr. Read

(Teller.)

## Pairs.

Ayes.  
Mr. O'Brien  
Mr. Coverley  
Mr. Brady

Noes.  
Mr. Cornell  
Mr. Mann  
Mr. Bovell

Amendment thus negated.

Mr. JOHNSON: I would like to move to delete the word "and" after the words "chartered accountant" with a view to inserting a full stop and then the word "One."

THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept an amendment on these lines. This would mean there would be four members of the board.

Mr. JOHNSON: I disagree with you, Sir. This would leave the board with only three persons on it.

The CHAIRMAN: No, there would be four. I cannot accept the amendment.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: The Minister told us a little while ago that there are women chartered accountants and that a woman might represent the consumers and the butcher. We should make this more definite. I move an amendment—

That after the word "meat" in line 4 of Subclause (2) the words "one of whom shall be a woman" be inserted.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	23

Majority against 4

## Ayes.

Mr. Graham  
Mr. Guthrie  
Mr. Hawke  
Mr. J. Hegney  
Mr. W. Hegney  
Mr. Hoar  
Mr. Johnson  
Mr. Lawrence  
Mr. May  
Mr. McCulloch

Mr. Moir  
Mr. Needham  
Mr. Nulsen  
Mr. Rodoreda  
Mr. Sewell  
Mr. Sleeman  
Mr. Styants  
Mr. Tonkin  
Mr. Kelly

(Teller.)

## Noes.

Mr. Abbott  
Mr. Ackland  
Mr. Brand  
Mr. Butcher  
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver  
Mr. Doney  
Mr. Grayden  
Mr. Griffith  
Mr. Hearman  
Mr. Hill  
Mr. Hutchinson  
Mr. Manning

Mr. McLarty  
Mr. Naider  
Mr. Nimmo  
Mr. Owen  
Mr. Perkins  
Mr. Read  
Mr. Thorn  
Mr. Totterdell  
Mr. Watts  
Mr. Wild  
Mr. Bovell

(Teller.)

## Pairs.

Ayes.  
Mr. O'Brien  
Mr. Coverley  
Mr. Brady

Noes.  
Mr. Cornell  
Mr. Mann  
Mr. Oldfield

Amendment thus negated.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I move an amendment—

That in lines 1 and 2 of Subclause (3) the words "Such member as the Governor appoints to that office" be struck out and the words, "The Controller of Abattoirs" inserted in lieu.

The Minister for Lands: He will not be a member of the board.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: If the Committee agrees to my amendment he will be made a member of the board. This position obtains in some States where the manager is the chairman or a member of the board. As the manager here has particularly good qualifications it is most desirable that he should be the chairman of the board. The controller would have regard to the interests of the consumers, the producers and all concerned, and in that way would meet all requirements.

Progress reported.

## BILL—MILK ACT AMENDMENT.

## Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Assembly's amendment.

## BILLS (4)—RETURNED.

- 1, Brands Act Amendment.
- 2, Fremantle Electricity Undertaking (Purchase Moneys) Agreements. With amendments.
- 3, Government Employees (Promotions Appeal Board) Act Amendment.
- 4, State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment. Without amendment.

BILL—STAMP ACT AMENDMENT  
(No. 2).

## First Reading.

Introduced by the Premier and read a first time.

*Second Reading.*

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray) [6.41 in moving the second reading said: This Bill is identical with that dealt with the other evening, except that on this occasion there will be two separate Bills, and the measure with which I am now dealing will be known as the Stamp Act Amendment Bill (No. 2).

**Mr. J. Hegney:** What happened to the other measure?

**The PREMIER:** I will explain that. This Bill is distinct and separate from that introduced the other evening.

**Mr. May:** You said it was identical with that one.

**The PREMIER:** Yes.

**Mr. May:** It cannot be.

**The PREMIER:** This Bill does not impose the tax.

**Hon. A. R. G. Hawke:** Is not the position that this Bill does impose the tax?

**The PREMIER:** No, there is a separate measure for that purpose. This has become necessary because the President in another place ruled that the former Bill was objectionable as it contravened Sub-section (7) of Section 6 of the Constitution Act Amendment Act.

**Mr. Graham:** It was objectionable for many other reasons.

**The PREMIER:** The former Bill enabled authorised persons to inspect books and documents and to call for information and the furnishing of returns, including duplicate betting sheets. As I have said, the President in another place ruled against the measure. I do not know that I can say anything more about the Bill than I said the other evening.

**Mr. Graham:** Have you thought about that 20 per cent.

**The PREMIER:** Yes, that will still apply; it is in this Bill. The methods of collecting the 20 per cent. that goes to the clubs are all mentioned in the measure and what I said about it the other evening still stands.

**Mr. May:** Who actually gets that 20 per cent.?

**The PREMIER:** The racing and trotting clubs as was provided in the previous Bill.

**Mr. May:** And are the country clubs included?

**The PREMIER:** Yes, certainly; all country racing clubs.

**Mr. May:** Who gives it to them?

**The PREMIER:** They collect it themselves if they hold racing or trotting meetings. If they held a trotting meeting at Collie they would collect the tax there.

**Mr. May:** And keep it?

**The PREMIER:** Yes, 20 per cent. of it.

**Mr. May:** And the racing clubs are the same?

**The PREMIER:** Yes, that is the position. It is the same Bill in principle as I introduced the other evening. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**HON. A. R. G. HAWKE** (Northam) [6.91: I oppose this Bill, as I opposed the No. 1 measure when it was first introduced, mainly, if not entirely, on the ground that it would be giving, out of the total tax collected, £40,000 a year to racing and trotting clubs in Western Australia. I worked it out roughly that of the £40,000 a year £15,000 would go to the W.A. Trotting Association and £15,000 to the W.A. Turf Club. That would have been bad enough because at this period there is no justification for putting a special tax upon any section of our community as all sections are over-taxed, unless the whole of such special tax is to be devoted to urgent and vital purposes. No one could argue successfully that the Turf Club or the Trotting Association each urgently require for vital purposes £15,000 from a special tax.

The Bill as originally introduced was bad enough when it was introduced, but the Treasurer, with the support of members on the Government side, made it 100 times worse in Committee because they succeeded in having an amendment put into the Bill which is most undesirable and unjust. That amendment means that three-quarters of the 20 per cent. to be collected by the racing and trotting clubs will be paid to the owners of racehorses and trotting-horses which, during the year, run first, second and third. In other words, of the £40,000 to be given, unjustifiably in my opinion, from this tax to racing and trotting clubs, those clubs are to be bound by this legislation, if it is passed, to hand over 75 per cent. of the total they receive to the owners of racehorses and trotting-horses where those horses run first, second or third in races during the year.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Does the hon. member wish to ask for leave to continue his speech tomorrow?

**Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE:** Yes.

Leave granted.

**ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.**

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 2 p.m. tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 6.12 p.m.*