

# Legislative Council

Wednesday, 23rd November, 1955.

## CONTENTS.

	Page
Question : Timber, future supplies .....	1955
Bills : Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment, 2r. ....	1955
Loan, £11,604,000, 2r. ....	1958
Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment, 2r., remaining stages ....	1962
Licensing Act Amendment (No. 4), 1r., 2r. ....	1963
Government Railways Act Amendment, 1r. ....	1964
Members of Parliament Reimbursement of Expenses Act Amendment, 1r. ....	1964
Reserves, 2r. ....	1964
2r., remaining stages ....	1971
State Electricity Commission Act Amendment, 2r. ....	1967
2r., remaining stages ....	1973
Road Closure, 2r., remaining stages ....	1968
Trustees Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r., remaining stages ....	1971
Retailing of Motor Spirits, 2r. ....	1973
Licensing Act Amendment (No. 1), 1r. ....	1964
Public Works Act Amendment, 1r. ....	1964
Supply Bill (No. 2), £16,000,000, 2r., remaining stages ....	1964
Acts Amendment (Allowances and Salaries Adjustment), 2r., remaining stages ....	1990

(2) The Government has taken active steps to provide for the expected increased demand by means of—

- increasing the area of dedicated State forest. Approximately 420,000 acres of hardwood forest have been so dedicated during the life of this Government, and further areas are under consideration;
- increasing the areas of pine planting on land capable of carrying the faster growing *pinus radiata*, as well as continuing previous planting programmes using *pinus pinaster* for which a further 150,000 acres have recently been reserved;
- better utilisation of timber already available in the forest, including such species as *marri*;
- increasing the annual yield of the natural forests through protection and silvicultural improvement work.

As a result of a series of actions taken by the present Government toward reorganising forestry in this State, considerably increased funds are now being devoted to forestry development.

## BILL—MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT.

*Second Reading.*

**THE MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST** (Hon. H. C. Strickland—North) [4.36] in moving the second reading said: The Marketing of Eggs Act expires on the 22nd March next year, and the purpose of this Bill is to extend the Act for another term of five years and to give the board power to fix the maximum retail price in order to assist producers.

From Press publicity, members will be aware that a Royal Commission recently inquired into the marketing of eggs, but the commissioner's report has not long been completed, and there has been insufficient time to enable all matters raised to be fully considered, although many important items can be dealt with administratively. I would remind members that the commissioner's report was tabled yesterday.

Two major recommendations have emerged from the Royal Commission. One is that the board should be continued, and the other is that it should have statutory power to fix the retail price of eggs.

During the Royal Commission no evidence was forthcoming to suggest that the board should not continue to exist and, after considering all the evidence, the commissioner considered that five years would be a reasonable extension.

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

## QUESTION.

### TIMBER.

#### *Future Supplies.*

Hon. J. MURRAY asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) Was the Conservator of Forests correctly reported in "The West Australian" of the 19th November, when he stated—

"On present trends it appeared that by 1970 Western Australia would not have any timber to export.

By 1985, unless we did something about it, Western Australia would have to import timber?"

(2) If the answer is "yes," what action is the Government taking to rectify this position?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(1) Yes. This position would arise from the demands of the expected rapid increase of population and not from any diminution in the permissible cut from the forests.

Parliament originally passed the parent Act in 1945 to deal with the surplus egg problem and to stabilise prices for all in the industry. The commissioner has found that the poultry industry is a poor one and, due to the collapse of prices for imported eggs on the United Kingdom market and the present parlous state of the industry, there has never been a greater need for orderly marketing.

For the year 1954-55, a total of 7,537,843 dozen eggs passed through the board, and direct sales by producers and storekeepers under permit amounted to 1,255,923 dozen, making a total production of 8,793,766 dozen. Of this, 4,776,991 dozen eggs were sold locally, leaving approximately 3,000,000 dozen to be exported to the United Kingdom, Malaya, Arabia, Italy, Ceylon and the Cocos Islands. The proceeds from these export sales have more or less governed the price paid to producers, and their net return for the year under review was 3s. 4.9d. per dozen. To provide this amount the board had to fix wholesale prices to retailers ranging from 4s. to 5s. per dozen.

It is considered that if the producer is to be assisted, the board must have power to fix the maximum retail margins at which eggs may be sold. According to evidence presented to the commission, the Retail Grocers' Association of W.A. (Inc.) has agreed to a margin of 15 per cent. of the board floor price; and while most retailers adhere to this figure, many do not.

I am advised that the retail margin in this State is the highest in the Commonwealth. In New South Wales when the board price was 5s. 8d. per dozen, the retail margin was 5½d. plus 1½d. for cartage, while in Western Australia when the board price was 5s. 3d. the retail margin was 10d. The board takes 3½d. per dozen and for this it candles, grades, packs and distributes the eggs while the retailers receive between 7d. and 10d. per dozen for a service that will not bear comparison in respect to the value of the work performed. It has been claimed that a high margin is necessary to cover breakages but this State should not be more prone to breakages than elsewhere where a smaller margin operates satisfactorily.

When eggs are short and the wholesale price is consequently high, the retailer increases his price accordingly and naturally local sales fall. On the other hand, if the retail margin could be fixed at a reasonable amount, the local price would not be quite so high and increased sales would result. The more eggs that can be disposed of locally, the fewer that have to be exported at a loss.

The commissioner found that the board is in a very difficult position, because if it gives the producer the price he ought to receive, the retailer increases his margin accordingly until the price is so high that sales are affected.

By board control on wholesale prices the producer is not permitted to exploit consumers in times of shortage, yet this power is nullified to a certain extent by the ability of retailers to exploit the shortage.

The board's duty is to try to stabilise the egg industry, and it can do this only if it is able to fix all margins and make an equitable distribution of the price amongst all who handle the eggs. Such power is already contained in the Milk Act, and many manufacturers and wholesalers fix the price at which retailers may sell their products.

As mentioned before, the poultry farmers are in a precarious position and this measure is of vital importance to the industry generally. The commissioner's report, which is now available to members, contains quite a lot of information. What I have just said expresses the main points and disabilities mentioned by the commissioner.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Why is the Government agreeing to only portion of the commissioner's report and not all of it?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: The report arrived only within the last few days and the Government has only recently been in receipt of it. There has not been time to give full and lengthy consideration to all the recommendations. But the principal ones are as outlined—namely, that the life of the board shall be extended for a further five years, and the board shall be able to fix the retail price of eggs. The Bill has been introduced at a very late hour and what I have just said is the reason why. The findings of the Royal Commissioner have only recently been typed and made available. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. MURRAY (South-West) [4.46]: Like the general public, I fully approve the Government's action in setting up a Royal Commission to investigate the marketing and distribution of eggs. I believe it also set up Royal Commissions on potato marketing and the marketing of onions. I was very pleased, too, to learn who had been chosen to be the Royal Commissioner, because I felt certain that when he submitted his report it would be a full and comprehensive one, and that from it the Government could bring down suitable legislation.

But I regret to say—the Minister has admitted this—that after the tabling of the report, which contains 93 pages of typewritten matter plus two pages of index, and which was tabled last night—we are faced with the position of having to agree to the Bill while knowing that it picks out only some items from the report—items that the Government is in agreement with—and the rest have been left to go by the board.

The Minister for the North-West: No.

Hon. J. MURRAY: I admit that the Royal Commissioner has recommended an extension of life of the board for five years; the board itself wanted 10 to 15. Considering the matter contained in the report and the extensive nature of it, I would have thought that any Government with a full recognition of its responsibility to the people of the State would continue the board for 12 months and no longer, despite the marketing problems with which it is faced.

On page 82 of the report—I am going to read this because I think it is one of the most important things the Royal Commissioner had to say—we find this—

Any business which has an annual turnover of approximately £2,000,000 is a very large organisation, and it is essential that it be run according to sound economic and businesslike principles. The Western Australian Egg Marketing Board is such a business and it is therefore necessary that the board, which, after all, is a board of directors, should be composed of the best brains that can be obtained in the State.

At the present time any commercial producer, that is, a man who has 150 adult female birds, is entitled to be elected as a producer representative to the board. This is the only qualification necessary and undoubtedly in the past many men with little business acumen, who have successfully wooed the electors, have obtained a seat on the board. Half the board can be constituted in this way and it is hardly the most efficient method of selecting men to carry on a very large business undertaking. The producer members may be excellent poultry farmers but have they the qualifications necessary to make them successful businessmen? I am not saying there are no competent men within the industry; undoubtedly there are many able men associated with the industry, but, if as board members, they display the type of business acumen which does not result in an increased return to the producer, they are not on the board after the next election. Only one man has ever survived two successive elections. It is more than obvious that many producers do not understand the problems of the industry or the difficulties confronting the board.

At page 83 he goes on to say—

Many producers are asking for an all producer board. If this were brought about, it would be a bad thing for the industry and the people of the State and would lead to nothing but confusion. Mr. K. M. Cowin, a pilot farmer and a man of considerable perception, does not think producers

should be represented on the board at all and that the selling of eggs should be left to men of proved administrative skill and business ability.

The commissioner continues—

Mr. Cowin is thinking along the right lines, but I would go a step further and say there should be no sectional interest on the board at all.

I shall not quote any more of the report; but what I have read is fully in line with my views on egg marketing and on the board in control of it. I, too, believe that the board should be free of sectional interest. There should be neither producer nor consumer representation; and if we had a board modelled on the lines of the Milk Board, we would have a more efficient marketing organisation.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: You do not say that they did a good job in the last 12 months?

Hon. J. MURRAY: In view of the serious nature of the suggestion put forward by the Royal Commissioner I think the Government has acted hastily in bringing down legislation which provides for a continuation of the present board for a further period of five years. I would say that it becomes even more difficult to understand in view of the fact that next year there is to be a general election, and there is no guarantee that the present Government will be returned to power.

The Minister for the North-West: It is almost certain.

Hon. J. MURRAY: We do not know, at this stage, which party will be in power; and as this Government thought the marketing and distribution of eggs was of such importance that it was necessary to appoint a Royal Commissioner to inquire into it, and as the commissioner has done such an excellent job and given us so many pages of reports and recommendations, I think further consideration should be given to the question.

The report shows balanced judgement in its summing up and, in the light of the Commissioner's recommendations, we ought to hesitate about continuing the life of the board for a more or less indefinite period—the Bill states five years.

The Minister for the North-West: The commissioner recommended that period.

Hon. J. MURRAY: I know he did; but only as an alternative to the 15-year period that the board wanted.

The Minister for the North-West: He recommended a five-year period.

Hon. J. MURRAY: I realise that; but the Government has shut its eyes to many of his other recommendations.

The Minister for the North-West: No, not necessarily. You know that there is not time to consider them.

Hon. J. MURRAY: I realise that the board will go out of existence unless some continuance measure is introduced. But a simple Bill could have been brought down to give the board a further life of 12 months until some consideration could be given to the question.

The Minister for the North-West: Who wants to hang in the air for 12 months?

Hon. J. MURRAY: I would like to hang someone else for a longer period than that! At this stage I disagree with the commissioner's recommendation that the board should fix the retail price of eggs, unless we specifically state in the Act that the retailer shall be permitted to charge a percentage over and above the wholesale price. At this stage I oppose the second reading.

On motion by Hon. A. R. Jones, debate adjourned.

### **BILL—LOAN, £11,604,000.**

#### *Second Reading.*

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. G. Fraser—West) [4.55] in moving the second reading said: This is the Bill which is brought down each year once the Loan Estimates have been passed in another place. This year the Bill authorises the Government to raise the sum of £11,604,000 for the works and services which are detailed in the First Schedule on pages three and four of the Bill. I would like to stress the point that the loan position of Western Australia is extremely serious.

It is easy for any person irresponsibly to criticise the loan expenditure by the Government these days; to criticise the fact that the total loan funds available are found not to be sufficient for urgent and vital purposes; and, following that, to criticise the steps taken by the Government to try to meet, if not adequately, at least to some reasonable degree, the more urgent and essential requirements of the people.

The total loan programmes of the departments for this financial year amounted to £28,500,000. The total loan money available to the Government with which to finance those programmes is approximately only half of that sum. Even when the requirements of the various departments had been very considerably pruned, the total amount still exceeded the loan money available to the Government. The situation of urgent works—including schools, hospitals and some housing—has been assisted to an extent by the adoption of the deferred payment system.

As members know, the borrowing programmes of the Commonwealth and State Governments for this financial year have been fixed by the Loan Council at a total of £193,500,000. Of this amount, a sum of

£3,500,000 has been allotted to the Commonwealth for the provision of emergency wheat storage facilities in the current year, leaving £190,000,000 for distribution between the States. Western Australia's share of the £190,000,000 is £17,900,000, and of this sum £5,000,000 has been allocated for Commonwealth-State housing projects, leaving a balance of £12,900,000 for other works.

Loan repayments are expected to amount to £1,625,000 in the current year which, together with the allocation of £12,900,000 through the Loan Council, will permit of a general works programme of £14,525,000 for 1955-56. The Loan Council has also given approval to the State Electricity Commission to borrow £2,100,000 in this financial year. Members may recall that the Loan Estimates for last year were based upon our share of an anticipated borrowing programme for all States of £200,000,000.

Unfortunately, the loan raisings in Australia during the last financial year fell below the total estimated programme by £20,000,000, and each State's allocation was reduced by 10 per cent. As a result, Western Australia suffered a reduction in loan funds of £1,900,000. Because of that reduction, about which we did not receive notification until towards the end of last financial year, expenditure on loan account last year exceeded receipts by £1,200,000.

Last year, funds available to the State for the general works programme amounted to £15,300,000, comprising an allocation through the Loan Council of £13,600,000 and loan repayments amounting to £1,700,000. However, loan expenditure recorded for the year amounted to £16,500,000, which was £1,200,000 in excess of moneys received in the year. The excess expenditure of £1,200,000 was due entirely to a reduction in the total loan allocation for 1954-55.

Last year's expenditure of £16,500,000 was £2,000,000 above the anticipated expenditure for this current year. The difference is largely accounted for by last year's excess expenditure of £1,200,000, to which I have already referred, and a reduction of £700,000 in the allocation of funds for the general works programme in 1955-56. Although the funds to be provided for the general works programme have been reduced from £13,600,000 in 1954-55 to £12,900,000 in 1955-56, the allocation for Commonwealth-State housing projects has been increased from £3,500,000 to £5,000,000, which represents an overall increase of £800,000.

On the other hand, the approved borrowing programme of the State Electricity Commission for this year has been reduced to £2,100,000, which is £860,000 less than the amount raised in 1954-55. This restriction on semi-governmental borrowing has required an increased allotment of

loan funds to the State Electricity Commission to compensate for the reduction in the commission's own borrowing programme. The amount to be allocated from General Loan Fund this financial year to the commission is approximately £900,000.

Of the additional £1,500,000 being provided in this financial year for Commonwealth-State housing projects, £1,185,000 is required to clear an overdraft on this account at the 30th June last, which had been financed temporarily from trust funds.

The total expenditure of the Railway Department for 1954-55 was £5,882,000, which is £706,000 less than the amount expended during the preceding year. Of last year's expenditure, £1,465,000 was for overseas contracts—mainly locomotives and rollingstock; £1,080,000 for Australian contracts—largely wagon construction; and £3,337,000 for local works in all categories.

For the current year, £4,000,000 has been allocated to the Railway Department, including the following commitments already made:—

	£
Locomotives and diesel railcars .....	1,412,000
Traffic cranes and lifting equipment .....	29,000
Rails and fastenings .....	200,000
Collie roundhouse contract .....	110,000
Housing contracts .....	247,000

Expenditure for new wagonstock during 1954-55 is £1,376,000, and new wagons placed in service totalled 611 four-wheelers and 163 bogie wagons.

An expenditure of £1,300,000 was incurred last year in the purchase of steam, diesel-electric, diesel locomotives and diesel railcars. Of the 112 road and railcars ordered, 68 have already been delivered and are in operation, leaving 44 still to be delivered. Expenditure for the current year on these contracts will be £1,412,000.

Expenditure on housing for railway employees last year amounted to £232,000. During the year, 45 new houses of conventional type were completed for occupation; six houses were purchased; and, at the 30th June, 1955, 50 were in course of erection, or the subject of contracts about to commence.

During last financial year, an amount of £864,000 was expended on relaying, ballasting, and bank widening, mainly on the Eastern Goldfields and south-western railways. These works will proceed during the current year. A total of 598,000 new sleepers was placed in the track during last year at a cost of £829,000. Provision for the current year is for an expenditure of £818,000.

In accordance with Government policy to improve the working, living and social conditions of railway employees—especially

those obliged to reside in remote areas—funds have been allocated to the commission for the implementation of a comprehensive programme. Last year £60,000 was spent on improvements. For the current financial year £100,000 has been allowed for completion of the programme in hand at the 30th June last.

During last year, expenditure from the General Loan Fund by the State Electricity Commission was £705,000, including £140,000 spent on the conversion of the metropolitan system from a frequency of 40 cycles to a frequency of 50 cycles. In addition, the commission raised the sum of £2,961,000 under its own borrowing powers for expenditure on capital works.

The commission's loan borrowings during the current year will consist of £900,000 to be obtained from the General Loan Fund and £2,100,000 to be raised by the commission under its own borrowing powers, making a total of £3,000,000. In addition, a further sum of £100,000 will be expended from the General Loan Fund on the change of frequency in the metropolitan area.

The commission will proceed with the installation of new plant at the East Perth power station and at the Bunbury station. The policy of providing services to new consumers both in the country and in the city will continue where such extensions are economically justified and to the limit of the funds available for this purpose.

During the past financial year the fourth turbo-alternator and the last two boilers at the South Fremantle power station were commissioned, and only minor works remain to be done. The station now has a capacity of 100,000 kilowatts of modern 50-cycle plant.

At the East Perth power station one new boiler has been commissioned and work is in progress on a second boiler. One 30,000 kilowatt turbo-alternator is being installed, and construction work on a new coal handling plant has commenced.

Good progress has been made at the Bunbury power station, the work being chiefly confined to foundations, the main building framework, general earthworks and boiler construction. Foundations, building and penstock pipes were completed on the 2,000 kilowatt hydro-electric plant which is being erected at Wellington Dam. A transmission line from Northam to Cunderdin and Kellerberrin is under construction.

A transmission line was erected from Northam to Toodyay, and the electricity undertaking in Toodyay was taken over by the commission. The construction of a 132,000-volt line from Bunbury to Perth was commenced, which will inter-connect the Bunbury power station with those in the metropolitan area.

The main headings of expenditure for the Public Works Department are Cockburn Sound harbour works, country areas and town water supplies, drainage and irrigation, and public buildings.

Expenditure at Cockburn Sound in the last financial year amounted to £380,000, of which £328,000 was expended on dredging and the remainder on the navigational side. Provision of £248,000 has been made in this year's Estimates which should meet remaining expenditure in connection with the development of the Parmelia and Success Bank channels to fully open up shipping access to Cockburn Sound.

Total expenditure on country areas and town water supplies during 1954-55 was £1,006,000, compared with the estimate for the year of £955,000. Provision has been made in the current year's Estimates for a total expenditure of £986,000.

Expenditure on the comprehensive scheme last year was £468,000, and it is proposed to spend £570,000 on this work in the current year. Broadly, the allocations for the comprehensive scheme amount to £330,000 for the northern section and £240,000 for the southern section. In the northern section there is a provision of £66,000 for work in connection with pumping stations at Mundaring, Cunderdin and Kellerberrin, together with a sum of £67,000 for enlargement of the Goldfields Water Supply main conduit, and £128,000 for the Narembeen-Kondinin pipeline. In addition, £20,000 is provided for the North Kellerberrin main and £20,000 for reticulation south of Merredin.

On the southern section of the scheme, provision of £217,000 is made for the pipeline from Wellington Dam to Narrogin, as well as funds for the Narrogin pumping station. The programme provides for completion of the pipeline to give a supply to Narrogin and also to Kondinin.

Provision is also made for the expenditure of £164,000 on the existing Goldfields system, the major item of expenditure being £50,000 for No. 3 reservoir at Kalgoorlie which was recently completed.

An amount of £252,000 has been provided for water supplies for towns, including £37,000 for Bridgetown, £30,000 for Geraldton, £29,000 for raising the height of the dam at Manjimup, £60,000 for the Mt. Barker water supply, £27,000 for the Tambellup water supply, and £12,000 for the Albany water supply. An amount of £105,000 was expended last year on drainage and irrigation, and it is proposed to expend £185,000 this financial year. The main item will be £135,000 in connection with raising the wall of Wellington Dam.

Provision has been made in this year's Estimates for an expenditure of £1,561,000 on buildings, compared with £1,880,000 last year. Of this year's allotment of

funds, £931,000 is for school buildings, including works in progress at the 30th June last.

Hospital works are estimated to cost £483,000, the main items being the completion of the second section of Royal Perth Hospital, additions to Goomalling, and Mt. Barker hospitals, a new maternity block at Collie and the new hospital at Calista.

Expenditure on water supplies, public buildings and additions to jetties and similar works in the North-West amounted to £112,000 in 1954-55, and provision is made to spend £187,000 on those works in this financial year.

An amount of £721,000 was spent last year by the State Shipping Service in meeting a final payment of £200,000 due to the Commonwealth on the "Kabarli", and progress payments of £521,000 on the "Koojarra", "Dorrigo" and "Dulverton". In the current year's Estimates, provision has been made to meet further payments of £282,000 on the "Koojarra", a first payment of £100,000 on the new ship under construction, and an instalment of £30,000 on the "Dulverton" and "Dorrigo". It is also proposed to spend a sum of £170,000 on the electrification of and structural alterations to the "Dulverton" and "Dorrigo".

Provision has been made in this year's Estimates for expenditure of £953,000 on metropolitan water supplies, not including the Kwinana area, compared with an actual expenditure of £964,000 during the last financial year. Expenditure in the current year for the trunk main and pipe head dam on Serpentine River, which was commenced last year, will amount to £460,000, which is nearly one-half of the total money to be spent on metropolitan water supplies.

A commencement will be made during the current year with the laying of the Hamilton Hill section of the Lake Thompson-Fremantle trunk main and £37,000 is the amount set aside for that work. A sum of £116,000 was expended last year on the completion of the 30 in. trunk main from Mundaring to Guildford. This main now feeds 10,000,000 gallons of water a day from Mundaring Reservoir into the Perth system.

The largest single metropolitan water work carried out last year was the laying of a supply main from Mt. Yokine to the coast. Expenditure totalled £186,000, and provision is made to complete the work this year at a cost of £12,000.

Reticulation mains to serve new homes and areas and for improvements to existing reticulation mains resulted in an expenditure of £370,000, and an amount of £42,000 was also spent in the purchasing and fixing of new meters. A sum of £227,000 is included in this year's Estimates for further water main extensions and improvements and £50,000 for the purchase and fixing of new meters.

An amount of £57,000 is to be spent this year on a feeder main to provide a water supply for the Morley Park area.

Last year the expenditure on sewerage and drainage works totalled £325,000. For the current year, an expenditure of £237,000 is anticipated, comprising £90,000 for recurring works and services, £73,000 for the completion of works in progress and £54,000 for the Guildford-Bayswater rising main. An amount of £20,000 has been provided for stormwater drainage at Bayswater.

An expenditure last year of £277,000 practically completed the necessary work at Kwinana. Only £2,400 will be required this financial year to complete the programme. I may mention that the State has expended more than £5,000,000 during the last 2½ years on public works undertakings at Kwinana.

Expenditure last year on development of mining totalled £164,000. This year provision has been made for an expenditure of £162,000. The drilling organisation of the Mines Department has been expended by the addition of two new drills, and these are now in operation in the North-West and on the Murchison goldfields. The department is also drilling at Day Dawn on the Great Pingal mine for an extension of the ore body at depth, and on the Yilgarn goldfield. Drilling at Koolyanobbing has been successfully completed and good deposits of iron and pyrites have been located. In all, a total of £110,000 has been provided for this year's deep drilling programme.

During last financial year, approval was given for a loan of £100,000 to the Sons of Gwalla mine to enable the company to modernise its plant, provide amenities and further develop the mine. A sum of £76,000 was advanced to the company in 1954-55 and a further £24,000 will be provided during the current year.

During the year, 798 housing units were erected under the provisions of the State Housing Act, and at the close of the year the commission had under construction or contract a further 474 units, all of which will be completed during the current financial year. In addition, contracts will be let during the year for a further 423 houses under the group building scheme and approximately 40 individual homes.

An amount of £50,000 has been provided for assistance to home-builders by way of second mortgages under the amending legislation passed last session, and £30,000 to assist self-helpers who have made considerable progress with the erection of homes but who, through lack of finance, have been unable to complete them.

Provision has been made for an expenditure of £550,000 for land acquisition and development. The bulk of this money will represent payment of compensation claims for land acquired by resumption for housing purposes last year.

The demand on, or request to, the State to provide housing has increased much more than it would have had the private financial institutions not applied—at least in respect of finance for housing—what is known in many quarters as a credit freeze or a credit squeeze. There are, in this State, quite a number of people who, in the normal course of events, would have obtained their housing finance from private financial institutions.

However, for at least a year, those institutions seem to have closed down almost entirely on making money available to assist people to build houses. Consequently, all the people concerned have approached the State Housing Commission and registered as applicants, either for Commonwealth-State rental homes or for homes under the State Housing Act.

The Kwinana area housing project has now been completed to the stage where the oil company's present requirements have been fully satisfied. The building of any further homes in the Kwinana area, under the oil refinery agreement, has been deferred. As members know, the original agreement provided for the building by the State at Kwinana of 999 houses at the rate of 333 a year. After the first 500 or 600 houses had been built, the company found that the demand for houses in the area was not as great as had been originally anticipated. Therefore, the representatives of the oil company approached the Government and asked that the building of the additional 300 or so houses be deferred until such time as the needs of the oil industry at Kwinana might require the erection of the balance of the homes.

Hon. H. K. Watson: It has not been completely cancelled?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No; deferred until such time as the oil company makes representations for more homes. A supplementary agreement has been made between the Government and the company which provides that the balance of the houses will be built by the Government, at the request of the company, during the next 15 years or so, and only then if the company, in the meantime, makes some substantial expansion to the industry at Kwinana. We were successful in getting that phase adjusted. It was not to be a matter of the Government's dancing to the tune of the company; the company will have to do something to improve the existing works, as we considered it only fair that there should be some action on its part before more homes were built.

Under the terms of the original agreement, and following the postponement of the building of some 300 houses, which was agreed to as between the Government and the company, the arrangement would have had a sort of Kathleen Mavourneen existence. Therefore, the making of this

supplementary agreement is most satisfactory to the Government, and the company has been quite willing and satisfied to agree to what was proposed. This gives an indication that negotiations took place. The agreement provided for another 50 years, but we did not feel disposed to adopt that period.

The Government has decided to build a block of research laboratories on an area of land in South Perth as the initial and major step in the re-housing of the Department of Agriculture. It is estimated that the total cost of the project, including fittings and services, will be in the vicinity of £300,000. Provision is made in the current Loan Estimates to meet the cost of the work that can be undertaken in 1955-56, which amounts to £33,000.

A sum of £160,000 will be spent this financial year on the development of pine plantations. Of this amount, £100,000 will be provided from loan funds and the balance of £60,000 from the reforestation fund. This year, it is proposed to plant 1,310 acres of pines and to clear 2,740 acres for future planting. Last year, 1,058 acres were planted.

In 1954-55, an amount of £553,000 was expended, through the Fremantle Harbour Trust, on the construction of No. 10 berth, on the provision of electric cranes and other equipment, and the reconstruction of the north and south quays. The continuation of these works in this financial year, at a cost of £500,000, is allowed for in the Estimates.

An amount of £136,000 was spent by the State Saw Mills in 1954-55 on the installation of a sawdust-burning boiler at Dean-mill; the erection of cottages at Pemberton and Shannon River; provision of pre-cutting plant at Carlisle; and the purchase of Buckingham's and Kent River saw mills. Additional working capital of £20,000 was also provided from loan funds. Included in the Estimates for this year is provision for additional housing at southern mills, kiln seasoning and machining plant at Manjimup, and the reconstruction of Holyoake mill at Dwellingup. A total expenditure of £70,000 has been allowed for in the Estimates.

The loan programme for this year has been worked out on a basis of meeting what are considered to be the more urgent and essential needs of the State. They have been decided upon in an effort to make a substantial contribution to Western Australia's further development and progress. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to devote as much of the loan funds to developmental undertakings for the purpose of increasing wealth production as the Government would have liked.

I appreciate that it is very difficult for members to absorb all these figures, particularly when millions are being thrown around; but they must admit that we have endeavoured to give them a picture of

what has occurred during the last 12 months, and have indicated how the money was so wisely spent and how we propose so wisely to expend it in future.

Some members may feel aggrieved that more money has not been provided for some of the projects in their districts; but if they study what has been done and what we propose to do, they must admit that we have done the best possible with the limited amount of money that will be available. Perhaps I should not refer to a sum of £14,500,000 as a "limited amount"; but when members consider that this is all we shall have for a programme of £28,000,000 submitted as the bare minimum, they will probably refrain from making comparisons.

The minimum amount with which the departments considered that they could carry on necessary and urgent works was £28,000,000. After the amount of loan funds that would be available became known, the departments were told that £14,500,000 was all that would be available.

Hon. H. Hearn: The departments, then, did not submit their minimum requirements?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: They sheared down the amount considered necessary for urgent requirements to £28,000,000, and then it had to be cut to £14,500,000. If members bear that in mind when making complaints about the allocation of the loan funds, I shall not expect their criticism to be caustic. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. C. H. Simpson, debate adjourned.

## BILL—PARLIAMENTARY SUPER-ANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Second Reading.*

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West) [5.28] in moving the second reading said: Among the alterations to the principal Act proposed by the Bill is one to enable members who have been in either House of Parliament, no matter for what length of time, to date their membership of the superannuation fund back to the 1st January of the year in which they first commenced to make contributions to the fund.

With most members, that will mean that they will, if they take advantage of the offer, exercise the option which the Bill will provide of paying contributions back to the 1st January in the year in which they first started to contribute to the fund. The option must be exercised within three months from the date on which this Bill becomes law. I think members will agree that it would not be advisable to allow this option to have too much of a retrospective



effect. It is considered, therefore, that the option should be exercised within a period of three months.

The next amendment relates to a member who dies leaving no dependant. Under the existing law, the fund obtains all the benefit of that member's contributions, and no payment is made by the fund to anybody in respect of the subscriptions to the fund paid by the member. This Bill seeks to place an obligation upon the trustees to pay to the estate of the deceased member the amount of contributions paid into the fund by the member, plus an amount of interest at a rate determined by the trustees.

A further amendment proposes to bring this legislation into line with that which recently granted a supplementation of £26 per annum to pensioners of other Government superannuation funds. The total amount of money required to finance the supplementary payments will be made from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and no proportion of the total payment will be made from the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund itself.

The Bill proposes to amend the pension rates now set out in the principal Act in relation to future beneficiaries under the Act. These proposed adjusted pension rates will not, of course, be retrospective to apply to people already receiving pensions under this legislation. The new pension rates will come into operation after this Bill becomes law and will apply only to those members who after that date become pensioners.

The new scale is first of all in relation to members who have paid contributions to the fund for a period of not less than 13 years. In such cases the pension payable will be at the rate of £11 per week for ten years, and thereafter at the rate of £5 10s. for a further ten years.

Where a member has paid contributions into the fund for less than 13 years, but not less than 11 years, the pension is to be at the rate of £9 10s. per week for ten years and thereafter at the rate of £4 15s. per week for a further ten years.

Where a member has been contributing to the fund for less than 11 years but not less than nine years, the pension is to be at the rate of £7 per week for ten years; and if a member has been contributing for less than nine years but not less than seven years, the pension payable will be at the rate of £4 10s. per week for ten years. Where a member has been contributing to the fund for less than seven years, his contributions will be payable to him, plus interest at a rate determined by the trustees.

Among other amendments in the Bill is one seeking to repeal Section 12 of the parent Act. This section specifies, among other things, that a member who resigns from office before the expiration of his

term in Parliament shall not be entitled to any benefit of pension or other payment under the Act unless he satisfies the trustees that there are good and sufficient reasons why he should resign and should not seek re-election.

As a result of the operation of the Act, it has been thought by an increasing number of members that this section is bad in principle. It is considered that members should not have placed upon them an obligation of having to ask the trustees to grant approval for them to obtain the payment of their pension simply because a member for some usually very good reason, decides to resign or retire and not seek re-election.

I think members generally now consider that where a member of Parliament is qualified to receive a pension or some other payment from the fund he should be entitled, legally, without question, to receive that payment without having to be beholden to the trustees of the fund and to obtain from them approval for his reasons for resigning or retiring. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

Hon. W. R. Hall in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Section 10 amended:

Hon. H. K. WATSON: Would the Chief Secretary clarify the point in regard to a member being entitled to make back contributions to a certain date? I was under the impression that it was compulsory for a member to make his contributions as from the date when he joined.

The Chief Secretary: This is merely to take it back to the 1st January of that year.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: Then it is a matter of months only, and not of years?

The Chief Secretary: That is so.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 6, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

#### *Third Reading.*

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

### **BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT (No. 4).**

#### *First Reading.*

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

*Second Reading.*

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. G. Fraser—West) [5.38] in moving the second reading said: The object of this Bill is to delete the restriction against granting a wayside house licence where the premises are within ten miles from any municipal district or townsite in which the population exceeds 100 persons, and to remove the provision giving the Licensing Court the power to, if it thinks fit, prohibit the taking away of liquor from the premises except by bona fide travellers.

It is considered that the court should have the power to permit wayside licences in situations where it is considered they can provide a genuine service to the public, irrespective of whether or not the situation is within ten miles of a municipal district or townsite. Cases have occurred where a wayside licence in such circumstances would be quite appropriate, but under the Act the court would only be able to grant a publican's general licence.

The Licensing Court agrees that it should have the discretion to grant wayside licences in certain cases, and not be subject to the restriction in the Act. It must be realised that the amendments in the Bill will not affect the provisions in the parent Act which require wayside houses to have at least two bedrooms and two sitting rooms ready and fit for public use. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir Charles Latham, debate adjourned.

**BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.**

1. Government Railways Act Amendment.
  2. Members of Parliament Reimbursement of Expenses Act Amendment.
- Received from the Assembly.

**BILL—RESERVES.***Second Reading.*

**THE MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST** (Hon. H. C. Strickland—North) [5.41] in moving the second reading said: This is the usual type of Reserves Bill that is brought forward every year. In this measure, there are 15 separate reserves that have been amended in one form or another and for the information of members I will now proceed to deal with each one in turn.

**Reserve. No. A.17863—Blcton:** This reserve is set apart for the purpose of recreation and is vested in the Melville Road Board. Portion was excised from the reserve by the operation of Section 10 of the Reserves Act, No. 4 of 1939, and was surveyed as Cockburn Sound Location 873

of 34, 3/10ths perches, which was set apart as Reserve No. 22098 for the purpose of an infant health clinic. Reserve No. 22098 was subsequently found to be unsuitable for the purpose and a better site for the clinic was located further north in the recreation reserve. The new site has been surveyed as Cockburn Sound Location 1726, which it is desired to excise from Reserve No. 17863 and it is proposed to reinstate Location 873. Reserve No. 22098 will then be amended to comprise Location 1726 in lieu of Location 873.

**Reserve No. A20165—Byford:** In the year 1914, freehold land at Byford was subdivided to an attractive design, evidently for residential purposes but its distance from the city rendered the subdivision unsuitable for those purposes. A central area of six acres was provided for recreation and the land was surrendered to the Crown and was set apart as Reserve No. 20165 for recreation and classified as of Class "A". Surveyed roads were provided around the circular reserve, but when the main road to the State Brick Works was constructed, it was taken straight through the reserve, separating it into two equal portions neither of which has been developed for recreational purposes. All the south-western portion is low-lying land and is more suitable for gardening than as a recreation ground. It is proposed that the land required to provide a surveyed road one chain wide to include the existing formation, be excised from the reserve and that the portion on the south-western side of the proposed road be excised also, with the intention that the land be subdivided and sold. Provision has been made in the Road Closure Bill for the closure of certain roads and rights-of-way. The land in the road on the south-western side of the reserve will be included in the proposed subdivision of that portion of the reserve.

**Reserve No. A.1203—Cottesloe:** The Cottesloe Municipal Council constructed a bituminised road through the south-eastern corner of this reserve to connect up Hamersley and Hawkestone-sts., which previously dead-ended at the reserve. For the purpose of dedicating the connecting road under the Municipal Corporations Act, 1906, it is necessary to excise the land from the reserve. The area of the proposed excision is one rood 27, 9/10ths perches, which exceeds 1/20th of the total area of the reserve referred to in Section 31, Subsection (4) of the Land Act, which prevents the amendment of the reserve to provide a road in the ordinary way.

**Reserve No. 10925—Greenbushes:** In 1914 the land comprised in Reserve No. 10925—Greenbushes Lot 181 of one quarter acre, was leased to certain trustees of the General Workers' Union of Western Australia, for a term of 999 years in trust for the purpose of a hall site for the union.

The reserve was created in 1907, but has not been used for its purpose and is still undeveloped. The General Workers' Union no longer exists and the Australian Workers' Union has no objection to the cancellation of both the reserve and the lease. It is proposed to revest the land in Her Majesty as of Her former estate, with a view to its disposal, if it is not required for any other public purpose.

**Reserve No. A.7276—Greenough:** For the purpose of creating a separate reserve for camping and recreation near the mouth of the Greenough River, it is necessary to excise an area of about 30 acres from Reserve A.7276, which is set apart for parklands. The new reserve will be placed under the control of the Geraldton-Greenough Roads Board. It is also proposed to excise from Reserve A.7276 a further small area of about one half acre, which is isolated by a road from the remainder of the reserve, and is of no value to it. It is intended that the small area will be made available to the holder of the adjoining Location 2466 to square up his boundaries.

**Reserve No. A. 5324 at Kalgoorlie:** This reserve comprises five separate lots which do not adjoin and is situated partly within the Kalgoorlie Municipal District and partly within the Kalgoorlie Road District. The reserve is set apart for the purpose of recreation, but the Kalgoorlie Municipal Council has utilised the portion comprising Kalgoorlie Lot 2967 as a kindergarten site. It is proposed to excise this lot from the main reserve and set it apart as a separate reserve for the purpose of a kindergarten site.

**Reserve No. A. 15593 at Kellerberrin:** This reserve is at present set apart for the purpose of recreation and picnic ground and is under the control of the Kellerberrin Road Board. The board has not yet developed the reserve for recreation purposes and considers it unsuitable for a picnic ground, but desires to lease the land to the local golf club for use as a golf course. It is proposed that the purpose of the reserve be altered accordingly and that the reserve be vested in the Kellerberrin Road Board with power to lease for any term not exceeding 21 years, subject to the approval of the Minister for Lands being obtained to any proposed lease.

**Reserve No. 13736 at Kojonup:** This reserve is set apart for the purposes of show-ground, racecourse and recreation and is held in fee simple in trust for those purposes by the Kojonup Road Board. Portion of the reserve was utilised for the purpose of a water supply, comprising a dam and catchment area. It is now desired that a separate reserve be created for that purpose. An area of 3 acres 8 perches used for the water supply has been surveyed as Kojonup Location No. 9076, which it is intended shall be excised from the main reserve.

**Reserve No. 15309 at Kumminin:** This reserve comprising Avon Location 20498 of 4 acres 3 roods 14 perches, was set apart in 1916 for the purposes of a hallsite and a Crown grant was later issued to certain trustees recommended by the Kumminin branch of the Farmers and Settlers' Association of W.A. The three trustees, Messrs. R. A. Allen, S. Bourne and R. J. P. Clarke are reported to be deceased, and no new trustees have been registered. The hall building was demolished in 1947, and the reserve is no longer required for its purpose. The local authority—the Bruce Rock Road Board—desires that the land be reserved for another purpose.

**Reserve No. A.20838 at Nedlands:** This reserve is set apart for the purpose of recreation, and is vested in the Nedlands Road Board which has developed the reserve accordingly. It is imperative that the adjoining schoolsite, Reserve No. 21498 be increased, as its present area of four acres is inadequate. It is proposed to excise from Reserve No. A.20838 an area of 2 acres 2 roods 30 perches, which will be included in Reserve No. 21498. Agreement has been reached between the Public Works Department and the Nedlands Road Board regarding payment of compensation to the board for the cost of improvements effected on the portion of the reserve required for the schoolsite.

**Reserve No. A.21116 at Pemberton:** This reserve is set apart for the purpose of park lands and is classified as Class "A". By the operation of Section 9 of the Reserves Act, 1948 (No. 50 of 1948), portion of the reserve was excised with the intention that the portion so excised should be subdivided into sites for public and institutional buildings with the necessary road access thereto. Portions of the excised land have been surveyed as Pemberton Lots 204 and 205 and reserved for the respective purposes of a hallsite for the Returned Sailors, Soldiers and Airman's Imperial League of Australia, and for an infant health centre. Other portions have been applied for by the Country Women's Association, the Ex-Imperial Servicemen's Association and the Royal Antedeluvian Order of Buffaloes, and there is doubt as to whether the purposes for which the land is required would come within the intentions expressed in Section 9 of the 1948 Act. It is desired to clarify the position by authorising the Governor to reserve any of the land excised from Reserve No. 21116 for any of the purposes mentioned in Section 29 of the Land Act, 1933, which would permit the present applications to receive further consideration.

**Reserve No. A.1720, King's Park, Perth:** Authority is sought to enable the King's Park Board to lease portions of Reserve No. A.1720 to certain sporting bodies, which have been in possession for many years and have already carried out extensive improvements, which have added much to the beauty and amenities of the park.

The first board to control King's Park was appointed in January, 1896, and, in 1899, this board, under the chairmanship of Sir John Forrest (later Lord Forrest) authorised the Mount Tennis Club to occupy portion of the reserve, to establish a tennis club and work on the project commenced forthwith. The club later changed its name to King's Park Tennis Club and was subsequently permitted to adopt the name of Royal King's Park Tennis Club.

The area occupied by the club has been extended from time to time with the permission of the board of control without any established legal tenure, and has been improved at considerable expense to the club, which is regarded by many as the finest club in the southern hemisphere. For many years past the club's courts have been used for all international matches, exhibitions and State championships, and the club has recently been adopted as the headquarters of the Western Australian Lawn Tennis Association by arrangement with Royal King's Park Tennis Club Incorporated, both of which propose to collaborate in a very extensive scheme for further improvements to comprise mainly, new stands and incidental buildings and additional seating accommodation around the main exhibition courts.

The ultimate aim is to provide seating for 14,000 spectators at an estimated total cost of about £70,000 the first stage of the programme which it is desired to commence at an early date will entail an expenditure of £7,000 to £8,000. The Western Australian Lawn Tennis Association is hopeful of obtaining the right to conduct the interzone final of the 1956 Davis Cup competition on Royal King's Park Club's courts, and it is important that work on the proposed improvements be facilitated. The obtaining of legal tenure to the site now surveyed as Perth Lot 784 will give general satisfaction to both the club and the association and stimulate them in efforts to foster good tennis for the benefit of the Western Australian public. The King's Park Bowling Club Incorporated has been occupying portion of the park reserve since 1904, and has well established bowling facilities thereon. It is desired that the board of control be empowered to also lease to the bowling club the area surveyed as Perth Lot 785. This will place the bowling club on an equal footing with the tennis club in the matter of tenure.

Reserve No. A. 1720, King's Park, Perth: By the operation of Section 22 of the Reserves Act, 1952, portion of Class "A" Reserve No. 1720, King's Park, Perth, being the portion surveyed as Perth Lot 722, was vested under the provisions of Section 33 of the Land Act, 1933, in the members for the time being of the board appointed under the provisions of the Parks and Reserves Act, 1895, to control and manage Reserve A.1720, with power to lease the

portion for the purpose of a tearoom site for any term not exceeding 21 years and under such terms and conditions as the Governor may approve.

The King's Park Board now desires to call applications for a lease of the tearoom site under conditions that will require the lessee to erect new tearoom buildings and it may be necessary for the new buildings to be placed off the surveyed position of Perth Lot 772 in order to retain the existing buildings in their present position to carry on business during the erection of the new premises. The extra land needed for the purpose has now been surveyed as Perth Lot 786, containing 1 rood 14.4 perches, and it is proposed that this lot be vested also in the members for the time being of the King's Park Board under the provisions of Section 33 of the Land Act with power to lease for the same purpose and on the same terms as Lot 772.

Reserve No. A.20833 at South Perth: This reserve is at present set apart for the purpose of park lands and recreation, but has not been used for those purposes. The land has been planted with pine trees as part of the Collier Pine Plantation by authority given to the Conservator of Forests in 1925. It was intended that, when the first crop of pines matured, the reserve would be vested in the South Perth Road Board in trust for the original purposes. Present-day circumstances require that some of this land be utilised for Government buildings and departmental purposes and a tentative plan has been prepared for a town planning scheme for the available Crown land in this area. The plan provides for portions of the reserve to be utilised for public and Government establishments, State housing and for public open spaces. To facilitate the replanning of the area, it is desirable that the reserve be cancelled, so that the land may be utilised in such manner as the Governor may approve.

Reserve No. 1859 at Swanbourne: This reserve comprising Swan Location 1063 containing 9 acres and 32 perches has a frontage to Servetus-st., Swanbourne. It was set apart in the year 1891 as a reserve for recreation and park lands, and in 1900 was vested in the Municipality of Claremont in trust for those purposes under the provisions of Section 42 of the Land Act, 1898. No development of the reserve was commenced until 1950 when the municipality provided a children's playground comprising an area of 1 acre 3 roods 15.5 perches for the benefit of the children of the Swanbourne school where the playing area was restricted.

The municipality regards the balance of the reserve as more suitable for residential purposes than for recreation and desires to concentrate its resources in the development of the area acquired for recreation purposes at Lake Claremont (formerly Butler's Swamp). The municipality has

requested that the land in the reserve be granted to it free of trust with authority to subdivide and sell the majority of the area with the object of using the proceeds in the development of the Lake Claremont recreation centre. It is proposed to authorise the Governor to grant the land to the municipality as an endowment with authority to sell, subject to certain provisions regarding the surrender of the portion used for the children's playground which will be proclaimed a Class "A" reserve and to the dedication of certain road widenings and extensions. It is also specified that the net proceeds of any sale of the land will be used by the municipality in the development of another reserve vested in or under the control of the municipality.

Those notes explain the purpose of the Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. L. A. Logan, debate adjourned till a later stage of the sitting.

(Continued on page 1971.)

### **BILL—STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT.**

#### *Second Reading.*

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. G. Fraser—West) [6.2] in moving the second reading said: The principal object of this Bill is to provide increased benefits to people who are now drawing, or who may become entitled to draw, pensions under the State Electricity Commission superannuation scheme. This scheme was created when the City of Perth electricity and gas undertaking was purchased by the State Electricity Commission. At that time a number of employees of the City of Perth Electricity and Gas Department were contributors to a superannuation fund, and it was desired that the same opportunity should be afforded those men to continue receiving the benefits of the scheme when the department was taken over by the State Electricity Commission. Accordingly, the necessary provision was incorporated in Section 9 of the City of Perth Electricity and Gas Purchase Act of 1948.

Although there has been a considerable amount of inflation since the scheme was first established in that year, no alteration has taken place in the benefits payable under that Act, and so the contributors under this scheme have lagged behind most contributors to other schemes in the matter of benefits. It was originally intended that the State Electricity Commission scheme should be similar to the City of Perth superannuation scheme, so that there would be no loss of benefits upon changing over, and this Bill is to bring the

payments under the State Electricity Commission scheme into line with those being made under the City of Perth superannuation scheme.

The Bill proposes that the part of the pension which does not exceed £4 shall be increased by 50 per cent., and that that part of it which exceeds £4 will be increased by 25 per cent. Widows of former contributors will be paid half those additional allowances, which are referred to in the Bill as supplementary allowances. Under the existing scheme, contributors have the option of also joining the State scheme.

It is not intended that contributors to both schemes shall be entitled to draw the 50 per cent. supplementary allowance which is available under the State scheme and also the 50 per cent. supplementary allowance under the State Electricity Commission scheme, and the Bill embodies a safeguard in that respect. It provides, also, against any person being a member of both schemes, drawing a pension which, in the aggregate, would exceed the maximum amount for which a contributor could subscribe under the State scheme.

As I mentioned earlier, the State Electricity Commission scheme is designed to meet the needs of employees of the City of Perth Electricity and Gas Department who were taken over by the State Electricity Commission, and so no new members are admitted to that scheme, it being argued that any employee of the State Electricity Commission who is not a member of the commission's scheme has the right to become a member of the State scheme. As ultimately there will be no members left in the State Electricity Commission scheme, it is provided that any balance in the fund after all liabilities have been met shall revert to the funds of the commission. That is considered equitable, because the commission pays more than half the contributions to the scheme.

There is provision under the City of Perth superannuation scheme for a supplementary allowance of £1 per week. In this scheme no such provision is being made because it is considered that the employees of the State Electricity Commission can obtain that additional benefit by contributing to the State superannuation scheme. It is regarded as necessary only to bring the payments into line with the City of Perth scheme because, on the original basis they were equal, and as the City of Perth scheme has been established in the interim, no alteration has been made in regard to the payments to the State Electricity Commission scheme.

The payments are retrospective to March, 1955, because attention was first given to this matter early in the year. It became necessary to get an actuarial examination of the scheme and as it took a considerable time to arrive at a decision

it is considered fair and equitable that the members of the scheme should have their payments dated back. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. A. F. Griffith, debate adjourned till a later stage of the sitting.

(Continued on page 1973).

## **BILL—ROAD CLOSURE.**

### *Second Reading.*

**THE MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST** (Hon. H. C. Strickland—North) [6.7] in moving the second reading said: This is another Bill that has annual application to this House and affects road closures. I must apologise for the length of some of the explanations of the clauses, both of this and the previous Bill. But it is much better to take a little time over this matter and let every member know what is happening in his own district than to skimp the discussion and have complaints afterwards.

Closure of a private road at Albany: In a private subdivision of Albany Suburban Lot 38 a road was provided in the centre of the subdivision and shown on the plan as Hope-st. Its only access to the public road system is by a 25-links right-of-way. Large rock formations make it entirely unsuitable for a road. The Municipality of Albany has recommended that, if the road is closed, the majority of the land therein be made available to adjoining holders after provision is made for an extension of an abutting right-of-way. The section provides for the revestment of the land in Her Majesty as of Her former estate with the intention that the land be disposed of in such manner as the Governor may approve. It is necessary that further investigation be made and certain survey work be carried out before final recommendation can be submitted regarding the ultimate disposal of the land.

Closure of Peter-st., Albany: This small road 2 chains 76 links long was provided in a private subdivision, but was dedicated as a public road in October, 1954. A re-subdivision of the land at the south-western end of the road provides access to Denham-rd., rendering Peter-st. unnecessary. The Albany Municipal Council has recommended closure of Peter-st. and the sale of the contained land in equal shares to the two abutting owners. It is proposed to revest the land in Her Majesty as of Her former estate with the intention that it be disposed of in such manner as the Governor may approve after certain necessary survey work has been completed.

Closure of certain roads and rights-of-way at Byford: In the year 1914, freehold land at Byford was subdivided to an attractive design, evidently for residential purposes, but its distance from the city rendered the subdivision unsuitable for those purposes. Provision was made for

various road and rights-of-way, some of which are now considered unnecessary because many of the adjoining lots are in one ownership, and the registered proprietors are desirous of consolidating their holdings by acquiring the land contained in the dividing roads or rights-of-way. The road mentioned in Clause 5 is to be closed and the land revested in Her Majesty as of Her former estate with the intention that it be added to the land, which the Reserves Bill provides shall be excised from Recreation Reserve No. A.20165 for subsequent subdivision into four lots to be made available for selection. The portion of Blythewood Avenue mentioned in Clause 4 will be vested in the owners of the contiguous lots in equal shares. The land in the right-of-way, for which closure is provided in Clause 6, will be vested in the owners of the contiguous lots.

Closure of portion of a road at Margaret River: To connect up Town View Terrace and Forrest-rd. at Margaret River, an area of 1 rood 2-1/10th perches was excised from the adjoining freehold land and was dedicated as a public road. As the result of the straightening of Forrest-rd. and its direct extension to Bussell Highway, the connecting road is no longer required, and the Augusta-Margaret River Road Board has requested its closure. The road board desires to use the land as a public park and gardens. It is proposed to revest the land in Her Majesty with the intention that it be so reserved.

Closure of Road No. 9943 at Margaret River: This road was originally part of a right-of-way in a private subdivision of freehold land on Land Titles Office plan No. 4977. It provided legal road access along the southern side of Lot 65, which is held by the Augusta-Margaret River road board and is used for a children's play centre. Forrest-rd. has since been extended from Town View Terrace to Bussell Highway, and the new road is contiguous to Road No. 9943, which is no longer necessary. It is proposed to dispose of the land in the road, when closed, by including it in the adjoining Lot 65 and vesting it in the owner of that lot.

Closure of portion of Hamilton-st., Bassendean: For the purpose of extending Hamilton-st. from Bridson to Watson-sts. the Bassendean Road Board acquired Lots 155 and 156 in a private subdivision on Land Titles Plan 2789. The lots were subsequently resumed by the Crown for road extension. Only portion of the land was required for the road and the board desires that the balance be made available for sale. The surplus area has now been surveyed as Swan Location No. 5623 on Lands and Surveys diagram No. 63853. It is intended that the land be sold either to the adjoining holder or by public auction at the Governor's discretion, and that the net proceeds be paid to the Bassendean Road Board.

Closure of a certain right-of-way at Bayswater: The Bayswater Road Board and all the appurtenant owners have consented to the closure of a right-of-way in a private subdivision of freehold land at Bayswater. The holders of the lots to the south-eastern side of the right-of-way have substantial fences erected on their boundaries and have signified that they are not interested in acquiring any portion of the land in the right-of-way. The Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department has a sewer up the centre of the right-of-way and agreed to the closure provided all the land was included in the one holding and not divided up the centre-line. The holder of Lot 47 on the north-western side of the right-of-way desires to acquire the whole of the land therein. It is proposed to revest the contained land in Her Majesty as of Her former estate and dispose of it to the holder of Lot 47 under the provisions of the Closed Roads Alienation Act, 1932.

Closure of portions of Coolgardie and Dumond-sts. at Bentley: These two streets in the Canning Road District were provided in a subdivision for the State Housing Commission known as Bentley, but portions of them are required no longer. It is not intended to use for housing purposes two sections of lots numbered as Lots 557 to 580 inclusive on Land Titles Office plan 6419 and Lots 613 to 637 inclusive on plan 6421, but the commission proposes to obliterate the survey of these lots and re-subdivide the land into larger lots for other purposes. Private land in this vicinity is being used as sand pits by two companies, viz. Dunbriks Pty. Ltd., and F. A. Moore Pty. Ltd., supplying sand to the building industry. The State Housing Commission desires to make available additional land for the purpose by disposing of lots in the new subdivisions to the two companies concerned. To consolidate the area for re-subdivision it is necessary to close the portions of Coolgardie and Dumond-sts. and to vest the land contained therein in the State Housing Commission.

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

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: Further details of closure are as follows:—

Closure of portion of Wood-st., Claremont: The Swanbourne schoolsite reserve No. 9111, comprises land on either side of the eastern extremity of Wood-st., which dead-ends at this point. To consolidate the schoolsite it is desired to close the intervening portion of Wood-st., and include the land in the school reserve.

Closure of road No. 4161 and certain rights-of-way at Hamilton Hill: The State Housing Commission acquired an extensive area of freehold land at Hamilton Hill known as Baker Estate. The area had been the subject of an old private subdivision which is not acceptable from

a modern town-planning viewpoint. A re-subdivision was made of the land to an approved design, and a considerable number of homes have been built on the new lots. So that the new subdivisional plan may be approved, it is essential that the road and various rights-of-way on the old plan be closed and the contained land vested in the State Housing Commission. A reserve one link wide down the western side of the old subdivision has been regarded as portion of the contiguous right-of-way for the purpose of closure.

Closure of Raymond-st., Geraldton: The Christian Brothers of St. Patrick's College, Geraldton, have requested the closure of Raymond-st., Geraldton, with a view to consolidating their property, which extends on either side of the road. The Municipality of Geraldton and the Town Planning Board have approved of the proposed closure. The street was originally known as Rowe-st., but is known locally as Raymond-st. It is not dedicated as a public road but was provided in a private subdivision of freehold land. Provision is made for the vesting of the contained land in the trustees of the Christian Brothers as owners for the time being of the adjoining land.

Closure of portion of road No. 9768 at Lake Preston: The Harvey Road Board holds in fee simple portion of Wellington Location 698 and in 1937 the board provided a road through the property for public access to Myalup Beach. A subdivision of portion of the board's land was made and involves a slight alteration to the position of the existing road. Closure of portion of the road is required and it is desired to vest the land comprised in the portion in the Harvey Road Board as the owner of the contiguous land. The new portion of the road has recently been included as a road widening under the provision of the Road Districts Act.

Closure of portion of Holly-st. and certain rights-of-way at Katanning: The State Housing Commission acquired certain areas at Katanning which had been subdivided to a design providing for rights-of-way at the rear of the lots. The commission re-subdivided the land to better advantage providing new roads and dispensing with the rights-of-way. Approval to the closure of portion of Holly-st. is required and similar approval to the closure of the various rights-of-way is requested. The new roads have already been constructed by the Katanning Road Board at the expense of the State Housing Commission. The land in the road and rights-of-way is to be vested in the commission so that it will hold all the land, the subject of the new plans.

Closure of certain private roads at North Dandalup: In a subdivision of freehold land at North Dandalup, 80 lots of half an acre each were surveyed with necessary roadways, named on the plan as

Lovett, Humphreys, Shenton, Pollards and Menzies Avenues. Seventy-four of the lots have been revested in Her Majesty for non-payment of rates under the provisions of Section 286 E.A. of the Road Districts Act. The land cannot be made reavailable for sale, either as surveyed or as a composite area, because the land has no legal access. The holders of the six lots, not revested for non-payment of rates, have surrendered their certificates of title to the Crown so that the land can be included in a composite area which can then be made available for selection by adjoining holders. It is necessary to close the various roads on the plan and to revest the contained land in Her Majesty as of Her former estate so that it can also be included in the composite area.

Closure of a certain right-of-way at Nedlands: In a private subdivision of freehold land at Nedlands a right-of-way was provided for the use of appurtenant owners but is no longer required. The Nedlands Road Board has no objection to the closure of the right-of-way, but if the right-of-way were to be closed under the Road Districts Act, it would be necessary to resume the land therein and declare it a public way. Then upon closure the land would revert to the holders of the contiguous lots and would be divided at the centre line. All the contiguous lots are held by members of the Oliver family, but the holder of the lot adjoining the eastern side of the right-of-way has notified in writing that he is not interested in acquiring any portion of the land in the right-of-way.

The Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department has a pipeline down the centre of the right-of-way and was opposed to the division of the land at the centre line. The holder of the lots on the western side of the right-of-way has entered into an agreement with the Minister for Water Supplies regarding access to the pipeline when the land in the right-of-way is included in those lots. The section provides for the closure of the right-of-way and the revesting of the contained land in Her Majesty as of Her former estate with the intention that it be disposed of to the owner of Lots 264, 265 and 266 on Land Titles Office Plan 2668 under the provisions of the Closed Roads Alienation Act, 1932, in such manner as the Governor may approve.

Closure of a right-of-way at Swanbourne: In a private subdivision of freehold land at Swanbourne a right-of-way was provided down the western side of the land, which is now considered unnecessary. The appurtenant owners have requested its closure and the Nedlands Road Board has no objection. The land on the Western side of the right-of-way is held by the trustees of the Public Education Endowment Trust and leased by them to the

Cottesloe Golf Club Incorporated, neither of which body has any rights-of-carriage-way over the right-of-way. It is proposed to dispose of the land comprising the right-of-way by vesting it in the holders of the adjoining lots in the subdivision.

Closure of portion of Bishopsgate-st., Victoria Park: The portion of Bishopsgate-st., between Cohn and Briggs-sts., separates Lots 7 and 8 on Land Titles Office plan 6101, which are part of a subdivision of land acquired under the Industrial Development (Resumption of Land) Act, 1945. Lot 8 has already been sold under the provisions of the Act to Hearn Bros & Stead Pty. Ltd., the Hearn Manufacturing Co. Pty. Ltd. and the Dale Manufacturing Co. Pty. Ltd. Arrangements have been made to sell Lot 7 also to the same three companies and to include in the sale the land comprised in the intervening portion of Bishopsgate-st. in order that the whole area may be consolidated.

Closure of portions of Letchworth Centre Avenue and portions of certain rights-of-way in the South Perth Road District: The State Housing Commission acquired certain land at Salter Point, which the commission desires to re-subdivide to better advantage and to provide a shopping centre. The subdivision provides for a reduction in width of Letchworth Centre Avenue from one chain fifty links to one chain, excepting the portion adjoining the shopping centre which will be one chain twenty-five links wide. It is also necessary to close two rights-of-way in the existing subdivision and to vest the land comprised therein in the State Housing Commission. A new right-of-way is being provided at the rear and side of the shopping area, but no right-of-way is considered necessary for the residential sites.

Closure of portions of Bowler and Watson-sts., Wagin: To consolidate Reserve 23829 at Wagin it is desired to close portions of Bowler and Watson-sts., which are undeveloped and are not required for public use. The reserve is set apart for the use of natives and it is desirable that it comprise one compact area and that public access through the reserve be discontinued. It is proposed that the land in the roads when closed be added to the reserve.

A copy of these notes and the plans containing a description of the roads proposed to be closed have been handed to the Leader of the Opposition. The same applies to the Reserves Bill. I forgot to mention that previously. If any members are interested, I have an extra file here which they are welcome to peruse. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.



*In Committee, etc.*

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

Bill read a third time and passed.

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

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**HON. H. K. WATSON** (Metropolitan) [7.51]: The Bill is one to amend the Act by increasing by a further addition the prescribed securities in which a trustee may invest. In the list of prescribed securities it is proposed to include debentures or other securities which are charged upon the property or the revenue of the Fire Brigades Board, provided they are certified by the Treasurer as being debentures or securities in which trustees may invest. I see no reason why the Bill should not pass, and I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Assembly.

**BILL—RESERVES.***Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

**HON. L. CRAIG** (South-West) [7.51]: The Bill deals with reserves, including King's Park. Last session we took away from the King's Park Board the powers of alienation—foolishly, in my opinion.

**Hon. N. E. Baxter**: You supported the Bill, did you not?

**Hon. L. CRAIG**: I did not support that portion, but spoke against it. I think an outside board should have that power. King's Park is looked upon as a great treasure by the people of Western Australia, and rightly so. It is a rare jewel belonging to the people. For that reason, the power to alienate any of it for any purpose at all was taken from the board and given to Parliament. The board was constituted of sensible people who were in a position to inform themselves, and now it is in the hands of people who are not so well informed.

**Hon. H. Hearn**: And not so sensible.

**Hon. L. CRAIG**: I would not say that. Certain lands are being vested in the King's Park Bowling Club and the King's Park Tennis Club. The point I

make is that this valuable asset, right in the heart of the city, belongs to the people and should be made available to them. In other words, we should treat it for what it is—a place that people should be encouraged to visit. But we are not doing that. We have removed from the board the power which would enable it to do that.

We have there the best part of 1,000 acres, most of which a person cannot walk through in the summer-time unless he wants to get his clothes covered in charcoal or grass seeds, or have them torn. No public vehicles go through King's Park, only private vehicles. I live right alongside it in King's Park-rd., and it is very nice for me. I take my grandchildren there where they play on the swings and horses which people would say are for the privileged few. King's Park is for the people and it should be thrown wide open, and some buses taken there.

**Hon. E. M. Heenan**: Would not that spoil it?

**Hon. L. CRAIG**: What is the point of having a thousand acres of bush for the magpies? People do not see it because they do not walk through it. They see it only when they drive along the road there. The place should be made available to the people. There should be a few King's Park tennis clubs dotted around the edge so that people living in the vicinity could at least make some use of the park. Has anybody ever been in the bush side of the King's Park tennis courts? It is hardly possible to walk there. I have been there myself.

I was at Hale School in the early days when the school grounds were covered in orchids and kangaroo paws. Today a person cannot walk there in the winter-time for fear of getting drenched; or in the summer-time, except on the roads. It is time that this gem which is rare in the world, and which belongs to the people, should be made available to them. Buses should be encouraged to take school-children through the middle of it so that it is not left only to those people who have their own motor-cars.

**Hon. A. R. Jones**: Buses go through it.

**Hon. L. CRAIG**: No.

**Hon. A. R. Jones**: The tourists do.

**Hon. F. R. H. Lavery**: Tourist buses do.

**Hon. L. CRAIG**: Those are special tourist buses for people who pay 7s. 6d. I would open the place up; I would appoint a board. This place really belongs to the people but it is not available to them. Had we left the board in charge, with power to do the things I have been mentioning, the position would be different. But no; today it has to come back to Parliament and a vote has to be taken in this House. That is entirely wrong.

I hope that the Government, sometime, will give attention to this valuable site and let it function as it should. We have held

it for over a hundred years now, but very few people can go along the edge that overlooks the river; and the rest of the park is hidden and kept for the magpies. It is a shame that the thousands of people who live around the park cannot go into it, because across from the houses the park is nothing but bush, and the veldt grass has taken possession and is completely ruining it. It is time something was done to clean up the position. I am sorry that nothing can be done unless the matter comes back to a lay body like Parliament.

**HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [7.53]:** I thank the Government for excising the 30 acres from the reserve at Greenough River for use as a camp site. For a considerable time I have endeavoured to have that area set aside for this purpose. I am pleased that the Government has seen fit to do this.

I do not altogether agree with Mr. Craig when he says the King's Park Board cannot do anything unless it comes to Parliament. It needs to come to Parliament only when any land is to be excised from the park. There is nothing to stop the board from improving the thousand acres of the park.

**Hon. L. Craig:** The board cannot lease land to anybody else to improve it.

**Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** Why do that? It has power to improve the park. It can cut out the dead timber and remove the grass.

**Hon. L. Craig:** It has no money.

**Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** Where is it to get money from? If the position is left as it is, it will not make any difference as far as money is concerned. It might be a good idea if we put the elephant from the zoo there; the hon. member does not like the elephant being kept in captivity in the zoo, and if we put it in the park, people could see it when they walked through. Under the Bill, we are putting certain areas of the park under the control of the bowling club and the tennis club.

**Hon. L. Craig:** And have they not made beauty spots of those areas?

**Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** Yes, they are really nice spots. The portion where the Hale School cricket ground is, the tennis and bowling clubs, and the area along the main drive are beauty spots in King's Park. There is no reason why the King's Park Board cannot improve the other areas. I know it is endeavouring to improve them in a certain way, but it is so slow. What Mr. Craig said is quite true: that it is not possible to walk through some areas.

**Hon. Sir Charles Latham:** You can walk through a lot of them because there are footpaths.

**Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** The board does not have to come to Parliament and ask for permission to clean out the rubbish; that

is, the kind of rubbish that Mr. Craig was talking about. I would like to see the park improved and its value brought home to the people of Western Australia. Probably the best way would be to build more drives and by doing so the areas near them would to a certain extent be cleaned up. If the King's Park Board is short of money, there is only one course for it to take—it should approach the Government for assistance or make every car passing through the park pay a toll. I realise that that would not be popular but, after all, the park is something worth seeing. I do not think there is any better view in Australia than that of the city at night from King's Park. Most people would be quite prepared to pay a toll if it would be of assistance in the running of the park.

**Hon. A. R. Jones:** How do you know what the view is like at night-time?

**Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** Somebody with more knowledge than I have said that the mosquitoes are bad in the park at night! However, I am pleased to see that a reserve has been set aside along the banks of the Greenough River for camping purposes. For some considerable time a portion of the foreshore, if it can be classed as such, on the north side, has been used as a camping area, but it has not been entirely suitable. The provision in this Bill will allow a lot of people to erect week-end shacks or camps and enable the area to be utilised as a holiday resort. I support the Bill.

**HON. SIR CHARLES LATHAM (Central) [8.11]:** I think Mr. Craig has grasped the wrong end of the stick. Under the Land Act, all Class "A" reserves are set aside for specific purposes and it is impossible to lease or use the land for any purpose other than that set out in the Act. King's Park is one of the oldest Class "A" reserves in Western Australia. While the late Lord Forrest did not actually reserve the area originally, he did set it aside for the benefit of the City of Perth, and while he was here he gave a tennis club the right—not a legal right—to build tennis courts there.

Really, the tennis club has no legal standing at all, but this Bill will grant that right. The measure will also place the King's Park Bowling Club in the same position. Last session Parliament granted the King's Park Board the right to allow a refreshment room to be built in the reserve. This Bill will allow a larger tea-room to be built. I do not know of any Class "A" reserve in Western Australia which is not being used for the purpose for which it was set aside.

**Hon. L. Craig:** The Crown can lease a Class "A" reserve.

**Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM:** Not until Parliament approves of it. We had the same argument over the grounds of Parliament House.

Hon. H. Hearn: That is quite right.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The hon. member should not forget that. As a matter of fact, I think some action of mine was instrumental in the introduction of the legislation covering that matter because I know something about the Land Act, especially as it relates to Class "A" reserves. One can burn one's fingers very easily in matters of that kind.

I can remember when we wanted to widen the section of Mount's Bay-rd. which passes near the brewery. An Act of Parliament had to be introduced to enable a slice to be taken from the hill because that hill is part of a Class "A" reserve. I can remember going up to have a look at it to see whether it would be necessary to remove an old rotunda when portion of the hill was taken away. The caretaker of the park came out to me and said, "You cannot touch a piece of this land." I said, "We will not touch it at the moment but when we do want to take it away, we will do it legally."

By this Bill we will give legal rights to the King's Park Tennis Club and the King's Park Bowling Club and, in addition, a substantial area of land will be set aside for the King's Park board to have a refreshment room established.

HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [8.51]: I wish to support the Bill, especially that portion of it which relates to the tea-rooms in King's Park. During my address-in-reply speech I mentioned the necessity for decent tea-rooms and the fact that they ought to be enlarged because King's Park is a show-place for visitors to this State. So I am delighted to know that this area of land is to be made available to the proposed tenderers to build a substantial type of tea-rooms.

During his speech Mr. Craig referred to the outer edges of the park, and while what I have to say has nothing to do with the Bill, I would like to state that the portions of the park which border Thomas-st. are, as Mr. Logan said, in poor condition. The Act we passed last year does not prevent the King's Park Board from cleaning up that area and improving it.

Hon. L. Craig: What would they use for money?

Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: That is one part of the park which needs attention; and if Mr. Craig is so keen about money, I think he should arrange for a deputation to see if money can be made available for the purpose. I think the portion of the park to which I refer has been neglected and, although I am not worried about the grass generally, I am worried about that grass which will in all probability appear in Paul Rigby's cartoon tomorrow night.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

Bill read a third time and passed.

### BILL—STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT.

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban) [8.11]: I see no reason to delay the passage of this Bill because, since asking for an adjournment earlier in the sitting, I have had an opportunity of looking at it with respect to the Act. I also discussed the matter with the previous Minister for Works, Hon. D. Brand. He commended the Bill to another place and, as the Minister introducing it said, it is purely a machinery measure to provide for increased benefits to people who are now drawing pensions under the State Electricity Commission Superannuation Fund. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

Bill read a third time and passed.

### BILL—RETAILING OF MOTOR SPIRITS.

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. C. H. SIMPSON (Midland) [8.15]: This is a private member's Bill which was introduced into this House by Mr. Diver. I think for the first time I find myself on the opposite side of the Chamber in regard to any motion that he has proposed or supported. We listened very attentively to what Mr. Diver had to say when introducing the Bill last night and because I have always found him a very fair-minded man, I hope that when he is able to digest the replies to the various statements he made, which I shall put forward, I will persuade him to a different way of thinking than he has at present.

In the first place this is a private member's Bill. While I would be the last to deprecate a private member bringing a Bill into Parliament, I think there ought to be recognised rules in regard to the nature of the Bills that private members introduce. In my early days in the House, I

remember that all Bills submitted by private members, unless they conformed to certain recognised rules, were frowned upon. They were examined by the Government or the Opposition as the case may be, and if it were felt there was some merit in the Bill, the Government would generally introduce a measure of its own which would supersede that which the private member was attempting to bring in.

I think we all agree that a private member has a perfect right to introduce any legislation of a local nature affecting his own constituency. He is quite in order if he is an expert in some matter, or a technical man, to introduce a measure dealing with his specialty. I feel that sort of approach would be welcomed. But when it comes to a matter which is on the borderline of being an item of policy either on the part of the Government or the Opposition, then I think that such legislation should be sponsored officially either by the Government of the day, or by the Leader of the Opposition, and that the Government of the day should take a very firm stand, and define its attitude in regard to that particular Bill. We would then know exactly where we stood.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: How did they vote?

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I think I have explained that. I am trying to outline what was the recognised procedure when I first came into the House.

The Chief Secretary: You try to take privileges away from members and see how you get on!

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I am not suggesting that at all. I merely suggest that there are certain factors which affect the introduction of legislation by private members. Speaking generally, and before actually speaking on the Bill, I think that in a young country like ours where the emphasis is on development, and where we are faced at every turn with opportunity, if we interfere with the normal flow of trade we might easily dissuade capital from being invested in this country. That is the last thing we would wish to do.

We want capital here in order to develop our resources, and we should be very careful before we attempt to introduce legislation which could exercise a restraint in regard to the operations of any company that has capital to invest. The rule we adopted in regard to the mining industry was very good. In the early days of the industry, our goldmining laws were looked upon as models for the rest of the world, and they were far less repressive, and offered far more encouragement to the investor, than mining legislation in other parts of the world.

To my mind this Bill, which is only a small one, having two operative clauses, would represent a retrograde step as far as this particular industry is concerned.

In a sense we are buying into a family argument, into an argument between one section of the trade and another. I am sure that goodwill and understanding on both sides should be able to solve the difficulty to the mutual satisfaction of the parties concerned. The figures will show that a great percentage of the trade is quite satisfied and quite happy with the present set-up.

This measure affects the wholesalers in the petrol industry, the consumers and the resellers. The ones that we should be concerned about primarily and above all others are the customers, the consumers of motor spirit, because after all, the wholesalers or resellers are the agencies by which the needs of those people are met. Consequently, it is their interests that we should always have in mind when we attempt to interfere with the ordinary flow of trade.

As I said, the Bill contains two operative clauses and they are both designed to break down the one-brand system of marketing. In another place it was claimed that the object of the Bill was to combat the overbuilding of service stations. But there is nothing in the measure which actually prevents the building or establishment of service stations. It does attempt, however, to re-establish the system of multiple pump marketing at individual stations.

If the object of the Bill, as declared, is to stop the overbuilding of petrol stations, then I would claim that the by-law recently challenged and debated in this House which leaves the power in the hands of the Minister and the local government concerned to determine the locality of the site of any petrol station, having regard to the site of an existing one, is a far better means of regulating this question than the attempt to put multiple pumps at the different selling points. Without question, in my opinion, this Bill would increase the cost of petrol to the consumer; I do not see how it could possibly do otherwise.

In 1951 the question of one-brand marketing was discussed between the wholesalers and the vendors. I might explain here that there are six wholesalers in this State. In Melbourne and Sydney there are nine. I would say that in the course of time it is quite possible that as this State develops, as we hope it will, we may then have nine wholesalers operating here. That, however, is something for the future. Roughly, we have about 1,200 resellers. Approximately half of those are situated in the metropolitan area and rather more than half are in the country. There are estimated to be about 100,000 consumers. As I said before, the consumer should be our prime consideration.

When the proposal for one-brand marketing was introduced here the wholesalers interviewed each reseller and pointed

out the advantages to be gained by this system of marketing; they mentioned that it was in operation in many other countries, and had, in fact, been in operation in America for over 20 years. They also stressed the economies that could be achieved and pointed out that it would undoubtedly reduce the price of petrol; that if it did not do so immediately, it would certainly prevent any increase. I think that undertaking was faithfully honoured. There were some increases and there have been some decreases, but the fact remains that in the last four years the price of petrol has not been increased.

There was a 1d. increase in the price but that was imposed by the resellers and not by the wholesalers. The point is that the system was explained, the obligations and the advantages were pointed out and those agreements were entered into by all parties of their own free will. I would like to read a resume of the system of one-brand marketing which I think is set out more briefly and comprehensively than I could do myself. It is written by Mr. C. W. Harland, the general manager of the Shell Oil Company. He said—

One-brand stations best. In spite of the move by Mr. Oldfield (L.C.L. Maylands) to abolish one-brand service stations, the oil industry in this State can show that this system has proved itself to be the most efficient method of distribution to the reseller and the public.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: For the oil companies, yes.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: Continuing—

The motorist is naturally—from the cost viewpoint—most interested in how he is affected in any changes in oil companies' policy. Facts and figures can show that he has benefited considerably since the solo selling plan was inaugurated on August 15th, 1951. There have been price fluctuations since that time—four rises and five decreases. But today we still sell standard grade motor spirit to the service station proprietors in the metropolitan area at the same price a gallon as we did in 1951—in spite of the fact that the motorist is getting a higher grade standard motor spirit. Arbitrarily, the reseller has increased his margin of profit by 1d. a gallon, so increasing the price of standard grade motor spirit to the public by 1d. Five years ago the Arbitration Court set the State basic wage at £7 3s. 6d. a week; recently it was readjusted to £12 12s. 5d., a percentage increase of more than 75 per cent. and yet the price of motor spirit is the same to the retailer in 1955 as it was in 1951. It is true that the oil companies have increased their number of retail outlets of all types in Western Australia by 35.53 per cent.

But take these points into account; vehicle registrations have risen by 55.84 per cent. since 1955 and up to the end of last year there was one vehicle to every four persons in Western Australia as opposed to every 5.5 in 1950.

The annual consumption of motor spirit through retail sites has risen from 368 gallons a vehicle to 381 today—in those four years. The average site was selling 30.5 per cent. more gallons in 1954 than in 1950—in spite of the increased number of sites.

Most motorists, too, will recall the untidy service stations of the pre-1951 days, with their congested driveways, dirty lubritoriums, lack of rest-room facilities, and the lines of multi-companies' pumps and lubricating oil equipment strewn about the station. It was almost a hazard to refuel a motorcar on some of those stations.

Today the industry has remodelled many service stations to provide spacious driveways with pumps away from the kerbs. Cars can be lubricated under conditions comparable with the best in the world.

Something, too, about the reseller—your service station proprietor. It's been said that oil companies are building too many service stations. But these are the simple facts: Do you know that the oil industry owns only 10.5 per cent. of the service stations in Western Australia? The remaining 89.5 per cent. are either owned or rented by the proprietor from private owners. Generally, the proprietor appreciates the solo-brand system, because he has an opportunity to promote his trade with as few interruptions as possible. In the past, he has had to deal with four or five different oil companies, whose petrol he marketed.

He had four or five representatives calling on him; four or five delivery wagons; four or five companies' accounts to keep; for or five companies' equipment on his site; and four or five records to maintain. Yet figures show that the average sales of motor spirit by resellers in the metropolitan area are now at a higher level per station than before the solo outlet scheme was initiated.

To us, in the oil industry, the scheme has resulted in increased competition for presentation of our products and services to the motorist. And competition is the foundation on which all progress is built.

You, the public, are paying only a penny more a gallon for a higher grade standard motor spirit than you were in 1951. You have vastly better facilities at service stations than you had in 1951. And you have a service

station proprietor who is interested in giving you his best, because everything has been done—through the initiation of the solo-brand system of selling—to give him incentive to do so.

Now a word about the reseller. Most of us who buy petrol become attached to the man who supplies our needs. Going to the service station often, we get to know the man and find that he is a good fellow. When I go to the station for a fill up, the men look at the oil, check the tyres, see if there is plenty of water in the radiator, check the battery, supply free air and often clean the windscreen.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Have they done that only since one-brand stations came in?

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I am speaking of resellers irrespective of one-brand stations.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: So am I.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: So we come to realise that the reseller is an ordinary human being and, in the great majority of instances, a thoroughly decent chap.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: They do not do those things for me.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: I am not surprised at that.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: When one takes one's car in after 1,000 miles for a greasing and a change of oil, my experience has been that they always give one the hint of any little fault needing attention—a shackle needing a little tightening, a shock absorber needing renewing, though it might last another 5,000 or 10,000 miles, tyres needing retreading—little things which a busy man doing short runs from time to time might or might not have noticed. I am not referring to Mr. Lavery, because he has had such long experience of the intimate details of motorcars that it is only natural for him to notice these things.

It is very desirable that the best relationship should exist between the reseller and the wholesaler, because the reseller is the public contact man. He is the man who comes into contact with the people, and it is important for the wholesaler to be in his good books, and at least give him a fair deal; otherwise a bad reputation would be established with the public generally. I am quite sure that this is not desired, and that the wholesaler is very careful to avoid any treatment of the reseller which would hamper him in any way; in fact, the reverse is generally true. The wholesaler helps the reseller with advice on selling points, and sometimes with cash to establish his station and, generally speaking, there is a very good relationship existing between the two.

A little later I shall give some interesting statistics bearing on the attitude of resellers to the wholesalers that members will find very interesting. During the week-end I was curious to ascertain what

attitude the men in the country were adopting and I contacted three points fairly widely separated by distance and obtained opinions that I value, from men who can be trusted to give a candid account of their reactions.

I asked what they thought: whether they were in favour of the Bill and were satisfied with the one-brand stations; or whether they desired a change. They were hostile to the idea of multi-brand stations. They said that as the Bill did not provide for an automatic supply of pumps, they would have to install pumps at their own expense in order to meet the public demand.

In a reasonably small centre where there might be three or four or half a dozen stations, it is a case of each man keeping up with the other; and if Smith put in three or four pumps, as this Bill would permit, Brown and Robinson would have to follow suit. These pumps cost money, and an additional outlay of a considerable sum would be necessary. Various amounts have been mentioned, and I have some figures to show the actual cost of a pump installation. I thought I had the figures by me, but members may take my word that it is correct to say that the installation of tanks and the necessary equipment costs £490.

That is a fear that the reseller would have in mind, namely, that he would have to find a considerable sum for the pumps he would have to put in. He would have to carry increased stock in order to service the pumps. He would have increased book work, because, if the same system of marketing petrol is as it was when I was running a station for some years, he would have to keep separate returns and accounts for each supplier, and that would mean a lot of book work.

There would be increased loss by evaporation in hot spots throughout the country, and that is a considerable item. At one pump that I looked after to allow the proprietor to go into the services for three years, I could not get more than 37 gallons out of a 44-gallon drum. That was not all due to evaporation—it was afterwards found that there was a leak in the tank—but an allowance of 2½ per cent. is made for evaporation; and where there is a small turnover, it is generally estimated that in hot weather the loss is greater than that. So the reaction of the man in the country is, "Why should I increase my points of evaporation when my total turnover would be no greater?" That is his reaction, and he dreads the possibility of being forced into a position of that sort.

I think there is also a dread of other stations coming in. That man recognises that this is likely to happen in any form of business whether it be that of a butcher, a baker or a man who sells sweets or boots. There is always a possibility of someone

coming along in the belief that there is enough business for two. It is not logical to think we can prevent that sort of thing from happening in the petrol business any more than in connection with the bread, meat or any other trade.

This Bill would not prevent competition as between stations, although the sponsor of the Bill claimed that competition would be stimulated. In a sense it would be; but it is a question of the extra cost, which I think must inevitably be passed on to the consumer if the more economical method of marketing in practice at the moment is disturbed.

Let me dwell for a moment upon the increased cost factor. The Bill sets out to legalise multi-brand marketing. The reseller must have his pumps to do this. The pumps must be installed by the reseller, and the oil companies would not be compelled in any way under the measure to provide those pumps. I believe that in another place an attempt was made to insert an amendment to make it mandatory on the oil companies to supply pumps, but it was not carried, and so we are not concerned with that.

Now we come to the point of what has happened with the city reseller. The majority of metropolitan resellers prefer one-brand marketing. A survey was taken by a recognised company—the Commercial Service of Australia—on the 5th and 6th November, 1955, on the lines of the Gallup poll. Quite a number of questions were asked, but as I do not wish to occupy the time of the House unduly, I shall quote only three or four of those which I consider will be of the greatest interest. Those who preferred the one-brand marketing represented 71.29 per cent.; those who favoured the multi-brand represented 17.4 per cent. or less than one-fourth; those who expressed no opinion represented 8.57 per cent. and those who thought it would make no difference represented 2.86 per cent.

The next question was whether the one-brand system was good for business. Fifty-seven per cent. said "Yes" and 40 per cent. said "No." I have not taken the others into account. There were 31.4 per cent. who said they wanted the one-brand system abolished; 54.29 per cent. said they did not; and 11 per cent. said they would like the option.

Hon. L. C. Diver: How many in favour of one-brand stations were tied houses?

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I think any marketeer of any brand of motor spirit or anything else who enters into an agreement to sell a company's products is a tied house, and that is an ordinary business arrangement which works very well. If there are two sweet-shops in a town, and one gets the contract to sell Peters' ice-cream, he has a monopoly of it in that town; and if the other shop wishes to sell ice-cream, it must sell some other brand.

Hon. H. L. Roche: But if he is tied he has to be careful of the opinions he expresses.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I do not think so, as the reseller is absolutely free on the question of sales. I will deal with that point in a moment. When asked whether the station was run at a profit 86.71 per cent. said it was, and there is no evidence there of the spate of failures of which we have heard. Then 11.43 per cent. said they made a loss; while 2.86 per cent. broke even.

When asked whether they feared an increase in the number of service stations, there was some unanimity of opinion, and 77.14 per cent. said they feared an increase in the number of competitive stations; while 22.86 per cent. said they did not. As I said earlier, the Bill would not affect that question at all.

Of the operators, 94 per cent. regarded their relationship with the oil companies as good. They ranged from "very good" to "good" and "satisfactory." Only 5 per cent. said they were dissatisfied. So much for the attitude of the resellers. If they felt they were being exploited by the oil companies, they would excite public sympathy because they are the contact men with the public in this business.

The consumer is only mildly interested in what he must recognise is purely a difference of opinion or an internal row in the industry. I think it was clearly shown by what I read out that the consumer gets better service today than previously. The competitive service stations are clean and attractive, and the motorist is better off now than he was before. I repeat that the survey showed 71 per cent. of the resellers to prefer one-brand marketing, while 87 per cent. of the service stations ran at a profit and 94 per cent. were satisfied with the oil company-reseller relationship.

The survey also disclosed that 77 per cent. of the resellers received help from the oil companies. I realise that that figure might be misinterpreted. It often happens that an employee of an oil company or someone recommended to it comes along and advises that there is an operational site on which he would like to operate, and he receives financial help from the company in establishing himself in business.

Many people have done that, have become the owners of their sites and have made a good living out of them and are quite happy and grateful to those who helped them establish themselves. The logical attitude of the wholesaler would be to remain friendly with these people and keep them satisfied, as it is through them that the sales are made. A satisfied reseller is naturally happier and probably more alive to the necessity for getting business, and so is a better man for the supplier.

Of course there is a minority of unprofitable service stations, as we must admit. The competitive trading developed when the controls ended, particularly in the case of one-brand marketing, because there was less pressure from the resellers' organisations; and the returned soldiers, in particular, who had been waiting for years to go into the business were enabled to establish stations at strategic centres.

I do not doubt—this is only supposition—that some of those stations came into competition with older but less attractive service stations, and possibly those newer stations got the bulk of the business. There is always a small percentage in any business where the management is inferior and where, for some reason, the personality of the individual does not appeal and he makes enemies quickly, with the result that his trade falls off. It seems to me that the 5 per cent. in that category is not an unduly high percentage.

The idea has developed in some quarters that the oil companies are big bad wolves; but, they are extremely vulnerable if they adopt any practice which is open to criticism. Therefore they are careful to keep out of anything that will land them in bother. Mr. Diver mentioned one case but did not give the name. He referred to a service station being completely tied and said, "When I say 'will be' and not 'may be' I mean it, because there have been marketed in this State by a wholesale oil company tyres, and batteries of the trade-mark of the company."

He gave me his notes and I was able to contact the company and get the facts. It was the Vacuum Oil Company. I will not name the reseller unless Mr. Diver is agreeable. As members know, the Vacuum Oil Company has the trade-mark "Mobil", and sells a number of "Mobil" products under that distinguishing mark. In some of its service stations in America—it owns extremely few—it markets "Mobil" brand tyres and batteries.

To maintain its trade-mark rights it has to sell six tyres and 10 batteries per year, which is the minimum under the Act; and it sends them out to one service station which, I do not doubt, fully understands the significance of what is being done and realises that the company has no desire to go into that other business or tread on any other company's corns.

I know that the sale of oil, grease, petrol and so on is its primary concern, and that it is not interested in tyres, batteries and accessories. I know of no reseller who has been influenced to market those products on behalf of an oil company. I might mention that the Vacuum Oil Company supplies 40,000 operational points in America, but owns only 40.

Hon. L. C. Diver: What do you mean by "owns"?

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: It has the lease, management and everything. I take it they are the same as that company's two stations in Australia—one at Fremantle and one at Sydney—which are training stations. A person wishing to enter the trade is taken to either of those stations to be trained in the technique of selling the company's products and is tutored by men competent in that business. I see nothing wrong with that. It realises the fallacy of trying to market products other than its own and thus stepping on some other industry's corns. Oil companies—particularly in Australia—steer clear of that.

I will throw some light on certain claims made regarding the tied industry. A letter sent out by the Automobile Chamber of Commerce states—

Many of the evils at present associated with petrol marketing such as small throughput, industrial installations, excessive drum trading, hawking of drums, overbuilding of service stations, restrictive trade agreements, short-term leases, excessive rentals and long trading hours are directly responsible to the fact that wholesalers in this country can dominate and pressurise without fear of effective retaliation by the service station proprietor.

I might say that 94 or 96 per cent. of the drums are used by the farmer and primary producer. It will be remembered that some years ago this association tried to deprive the primary producer of the special concession given by the oil companies for bulk deliveries, which he secured by having his deliveries made to him in drums. With regard to excessive drum trading and hawking of drums, that is just the natural flow of drums from the depot to the delivery point and to the farmer, and coming back again—

Hon. L. C. Diver: Whose drums are they?

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: The petrol company owns the drums and makes a charge for them.

Hon. L. C. Diver: How much?

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: It used to be £2 per drum.

Hon. L. C. Diver: But they still own them.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: It costs more than £2 to make and supply a drum. The talk of dominating and pressurising is absolute nonsense. Who can point to any attempt by a wholesaler to dominate or pressurise the industry? Why should they? They are vulnerable, and anything they do is advertised to high heaven, so they must be careful in their treatment of retailers, customers and so on. I do not think that claim has any substance.



Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Does not the drum delivery sales question apply to the attempt by the oil companies to spread the drums around the metropolitan area and not to the farming industry?

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I do not know much about the trade in the metropolitan area. I believe deliveries to reselling points in the metropolitan area are mostly made by tank wagons, as I have not seen drums delivered. I have no doubt that in special cases they would be delivered by arrangement between the wholesaler and reseller.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: What about drums being supplied to private people?

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I would not know about that.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I do.

Hon. H. Hearn: Then tell us later.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I am telling you now.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: Many petrol resellers have heard the case for the removal of restraint of trade outlined at recent meetings. This is from a circular by the Chamber of Commerce, a copy of which has found its way to the company. It says—

At this meeting, where members of Parliament were present some surprise was expressed that such a state of affairs did exist in the industry.

If they believed it, they probably would be surprised; but I have received the assurance—and I am prepared to accept it—that these claims are not correct.

I am disturbed about the reference to the threat by resellers to discipline the wholesalers; and such a threat was definitely put into operation from 1946 to 1951. Each of the service stations was fitted with multiple pumps. That was the system of servicing; and it was the practice, in fact, for wholesalers to establish a selling point in a certain area, following possibly a response or an urgent appeal by a man who was regarded as being reliable. Nevertheless, an oil company had to consult resellers at other selling points in that area before it could make an installation.

Oil companies do not establish selling points for the fun of it. They do not install pumps simply because somebody asks for them. In their experience, they know the traffic that is offering in any area and the extent of the population, and they work out the trade potential. If they are satisfied that the trade potential warrants the building of a service station, and that the reseller has a good chance of succeeding in business, they are quite prepared to help him; but only under those conditions.

Many a time they have dissuaded a would-be applicant from trying to enter business because they thought the prospects were not good. If that is the position in their expert opinion, they do not advise him to carry on. One wholesaler

at present has over 100 applications from men who are anxious to set up in selling points if and when they can be made available. So there are numerous people who are satisfied with the wholesalers and the trade which they give.

Hon. L. C. Diver: Another crop of suckers!

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I am sorry; I did not quite hear that interjection.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: The hon. member said, "Another crop of suckers!"

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I have here the trade agreements entered into by all the principal companies, and I have examined them. They are normal trade agreements. I signed one myself years ago and I saw the one that was in operation between the company and the man for whom I was acting as agent while he was at the war. They vary from agreement to agreement; but generally speaking they contain the usual protection clauses for both the customer and the seller; and it is the normal agreement, which is fair to each party. Time and again I have known that the companies have gone out of their way to help anyone over a stile if he was experiencing a bad time. That is their normal attitude. If they are satisfied with the character of a customer then, like a bank, they are prepared to help him when and where necessary.

There is one statement in Mr. Diver's speech to which I wish to draw attention. I would like to say that he gave me his notes which referred to a circular that was sent around, to the effect that—

there are at least 200,000 service stations in the United States, one-third each year fail in business, quit business or are forced out of business.

This appears to be a preposterously absurd statement, and no doubt the source of his information will be challenged. And the challenge will embrace not only the source of his information but a request for specific definitions of what he means.

In actual fact, he is leaving the impression that 67,000 operators of service stations go out of business each year in the United States. To continue the extract—

We quote from the Statistical Abstract of the United States—1954 (page 518).

This should be available at the American Consulate in Perth.

In the Retail Trade Automotive Group, Dunn & Bradstreet Inc. report business failures—1951: 310; 1952: 302; 1953: 520.

The Automotive Group, as we understand it, includes car dealers, car part stores, car parts and accessory retailers, as well as service stations.

Quoting now from "Oil Prices and Conversion," by Harold Fleming, copyright 1953 by the American Petroleum Institute.

There are 200,000 service stations in the United States, but another 200,000 retail establishments, such as garages, selling gasolines—thus giving a total of 400,000 retail outlets selling gasoline in the U.S.

If we then take the 520 retail trade Automotive Group failures and express that as a percentage of 400,000 retail outlets selling gasoline, the percentage of failures is .13 per cent.

That, I think, is an effective answer to the rather loose claim that one-third of the operators in the reselling business were going out of business each year.

I have mentioned that there was exercise of pressure by members of the reselling industry on the wholesalers between 1946 and 1951. One of the most effective forms of disciplining the oil companies—if one can call it that—was by exercising the boycott. The boycott is a powerful weapon; and at the first suggestion that an individual was about to open a new service station and had arranged for an oil company to supply petrol pumps, the retail organisation took action to close down the company's pumps on all multi-brand stations within the district involved and to divert the business which normally came the way of those pumps to the other brands stocked on each station. All the oil companies, at one time or another, both in this State and other States, felt the impact of the boycott; and, as a result, they were virtually intimidated into refraining from lending support to any new petrol retailing enterprise. Members may recall that individuals who felt the impact of these tactics included considerable numbers of ex-servicemen who, on discharge, were endeavouring to establish themselves in this type of business.

The boycott took various forms. Sometimes it was a complete close-down of offending wholesalers' pumps. At other times, purchasing from that wholesaler was rationed; and it was not uncommon to see notices such as, "This pump, please" on a retail outlet. In fact, I have seen that myself. Such a notice indicated, in the majority of cases, not that the retailer had temporarily run out of supplies of another brand, but that he was deliberately restricting the sale of a company's product through his station.

I think I have covered the ground fairly well, but there may be several points I have missed. However, I am quite sure that my colleagues will be able to deal with much of the data I have not time to deal with now. In conclusion I say to members: If they do not want to disrupt

orderly marketing; if they do not want to disorganise country service stations; if they do not want to run the risk of rising prices; if they do not want to buy into what is an internal wrangle in the industry; if they do not want to restore dictatorial powers to one section of the community which has exercised such powers in the past, they will vote against the bill.

Members will recall that three or four years ago there was pressure from a section of resellers of motor spirit to have restricted trading hours, particularly on Saturday and Sunday. This House, in its wisdom, decided that the needs of the motorist who, in many cases, was the working man having his bit of pleasure on a Saturday or a Sunday demanded that that section of industry should meet them as and when required. So I ask members present to oppose the Bill.

I have prepared some amendments, but I am hoping that there will be no need to ask the Committee to accept them. Nevertheless, if the Bill goes into Committee, all I can say at this juncture is that those amendments will not necessarily interfere with the purpose of the Bill as outlined—if it is carried through the second reading by the House—but will tidy up some of the points which are not clearly phrased. I oppose the second reading.

**HON. H. L. ROCHE** (South) [9.12]: I listened with considerable interest to Mr. Simpson and I cannot, for the life of me, understand from his speech why there should be any concern by anyone connected with the reselling of petrol in regard to the contents of this Bill if he is entirely satisfied with the present set-up. I heard no argument advanced by Mr. Simpson which would lead me to suppose that any man who wished to retain a one-brand service station need concern himself one iota about the provisions of this measure. Yet we know there are many resellers in Western Australia who are not satisfied to be restricted to a one-brand service station.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Very many.

**Hon. H. L. ROCHE:** Although this particular issue is being deliberately obscured to some extent, I think it is generally understood that the oil companies do not have to own these premises in order to exercise an overall control because, among themselves, they have agreed on certain conditions relating to the supply of motor spirit.

Even if a service station is the freehold property of a reseller, if he cannot get the supplies with which he intends to cater for the public, automatically he goes out of business. That is so obvious that I consider that many of the arguments put

forward against this Bill introduced by Mr. Diver are only advanced to obscure the real issue.

It seems to me that the debate on this measure, so far as it has gone, and having regard to what has transpired in another place, has highlighted the monopolistic tendencies that are becoming manifest in this State—and doubtless throughout Australia—by certain of these big corporations with huge aggregations of capital. If it has done nothing else, if it has only awakened some members of this Parliament to that tendency which seems to be developing and which is not entirely confined to petrol reselling, in that respect alone it has been well worth the effort made.

The reseller is tied hand and foot to the company that is supplying him. If conditions are not satisfactory, the reseller cannot change to another supplier. The other companies will not make their products available to him. If that is not a limitation of free enterprise and free competition—something about which we have heard a lot and which I honestly believe in when it is really applied—then I do not know what it is.

Resellers are tied, and any question of competition amongst the suppliers is only lip service. They have cast-iron agreements or understandings, which place the resellers entirely in their hands, whilst the present method of marketing is allowed to continue without some protection for those people who want to deal in more than one brand or transfer to the products of another company.

Some of the big organisations in this country may find that public opinion will develop along such lines that they will have something more drastic than price control to contend with before we have finished. In Australia the tendency seems to be to outdo the United States, which is generally regarded as the stronghold of trusts and cartels, like the oil companies. The United States are many years ahead of us. They have legislation to deal with such things.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: The price of petrol has gone up only 16 per cent in 10 years, compared with 100 per cent. for other commodities.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: I am not concerned with what amount it has gone up. I am concerned about the method by which it is retailed to the public. In an informative speech, Mr. Simpson gave certain figures; but he seemed to set out to tell many of the resellers who approached members of Parliament and expressed themselves as entirely dissatisfied with the present set-up, just how little they knew about their own business. Whilst I have every regard for Mr. Simpson's opinion, I must confess that I think the resellers know best where the shoe pinches.

I do not wish to delay the House very long, beyond emphasising that no satisfied reseller need concern himself one iota with the provisions of this Bill. If he wants to maintain a one-brand station, this Bill will do nothing to stop him. I do think that in some cases of which I have heard there is little principle and no scruple in the way some of the oil companies are dealing with the resellers.

I mentioned a moment ago what could develop in this State, and the difference between us and the United States. I would like to quote portion of a statement made by Mr. James Roosevelt. This has been forwarded to me, and I take it that other members have also received a copy. It can very well go on record in "Hansard". The quotation is as follows:—

Statement of Hon. James Roosevelt, Chairman of Subcommittee No. 5 of the Select Committee of small business of the House of Representatives on the subcommittee's hearings on alleged coercive and discriminatory practices by oil company suppliers against retail gasoline operators.

Price Discrimination: Oil company suppliers, for the avowed purpose of having their dealers reduce their retail prices at particular locations "to meet the competition" of a dealer selling at a lower price, including off-brand gasoline, have held the level of their prices generally while at the same time cutting their prices to one or more dealers at a particular location. In such situations the lower price has prevailed until the low-price off-brand dealer saw fit to increase his price.

There is a good deal more of this but I do not wish to weary the House with quotations. That quotation is illuminating. It shows that the development in Western Australia is following the pattern that has been set in the United States. Apparently there is legislation in that country to enable the Government to take action.

There is another danger of which members should be aware and be prepared to counter by giving their support to this Bill: that is, the position which would develop in this State as it has developed in the United States. The oil companies are insisting that the resellers who are tied to them shall sell only a particular brand of the other products, such as tyres, batteries and accessories. If that is not restraint of trade, limitation of competition, and a negation of what we have been told free enterprise stood for, then I do not know what it is.

If this Bill is agreed to in its entirety, I cannot see that any harm will be done to anyone in the community. It will certainly restrict what appears to be undesirable practices of the major oil companies. Beyond that no one else need have any concern, and I hope the House will pass the second reading.

**HON. J. G. HISLOP** (Metropolitan) [9.24]: I have listened with a great deal of interest to this debate. This history of solo petrol-selling stations is a very illuminating one. So far as I can gather, after a twelve months' survey of the position in Australia, the Shell Oil Company suddenly, with a considerable amount of financial backing, approached service stations and offered them premiums for going solo. These premiums were offered in different ways.

The company made offers to purchase and finance the business of resellers at a price beyond what the business was worth, the premium being the inducement to sell only Shell products. Other petrol stations were reconverted. We have all seen the converted petrol stations in the metropolitan area and beyond it. We have seen the new concrete driveways, and we have seen the stations painted and extended in many other directions.

Other petrol-station owners received a straight-out monetary payment for turning solo. I made some inquiries about that, and I found that the sums offered were very considerable. The other day in the Eastern States I learned that a sum of £20,000 for a 20-year contract was not unusual.

**Hon. L. C. Diver:** Does that apply in Western Australia?

**Hon. J. G. HISLOP:** That sum has not, so far as I could find out, been offered in this State. It might have been without my knowledge. I do know that stations here have been offered as much as £17,000, and other stations have been purchased for amounts approximating that figure.

In order to verify this, I made inquiries from a person whom I cannot name but who is known to almost every member of this House. He was associated with some of the deals, and he verifies the figures. He said he was staggered at some of the amounts which were paid over in cash or kind for improvements to service stations in order that the resellers would sell only one brand.

Within a few days of the Shell Company making these offers, the Vacuum Oil Company followed suit. It was a race between the two companies, and there was a good deal of competition to acquire stations to sell solo products. I also understand that, following that, the C.O.R. had great difficulty in finding service stations for its purpose. That company built a number of service stations within the city. Whether it has done so in other States I do not know.

When I first saw this Bill, which proposed to cancel all existing agreements, I was horrified to think that people who had taken large sums of money from the oil companies in order to improve their service stations, or who had received monetary benefits, should be ready to accept a Bill which provided that, having accepted

the sums of money, they could sell all the brands of petrol they desired. Frankly, I thought that resellers of petrol were more honest men. I was glad to see that that clause was deleted from the Bill before it reached this House.

**Hon. H. K. Watson:** That did indicate the irresponsible authorship of the Bill.

**Hon. J. G. HISLOP:** It was a sheer disgrace to see that clause in the Bill, knowing the facts as I did. We in this House are not called upon to consider the clause which has been deleted. If we had been, I would have been most caustic in my remarks. There are certain features in the Bill which must be considered.

Firstly, one clause provides that a wholesaler commits an offence if he refuses to sell or supply to a dealer because that dealer does not intend to do certain things or to deal exclusively with that company's petrol. Take the case of the service station which has been built by a petrol company and is on a lease-lend contract to a reseller. If the reseller is allowed to terminate his contract, or if at the termination of the present contract he can say to the company, "I am going to sell multiple brands of petrol", what will be the position?

Will the company be forced to erect petrol pumps to enable opposing companies to sell their products through them, or will the reseller who is on a lease-lend contract be entitled to make additions to the service station by installing petrol pumps to sell the products of other companies? It is not easy to decide that these things can be done and to wash away ordinary business dealings.

I therefore feel there is a moral aspect about this matter of which we must be careful. We must see that people who have invested their money, solely for the purpose of protecting themselves—and certainly one company was forced to do that—will not be placed at a disadvantage. Let us look at this aspect for a moment. What use would there be in a company putting in a pump to sell its products at a station which already had an agreement with another company?

How much of that company's petrol would be sold at that station? Very little indeed. Therefore, if the individual were going to do it, he would have to face the cost of erecting the pumps—and many of those individuals who have taken leases of stations had not the capital to do that. They were only too glad to get a start in business on their own and worked hard to make the station a success.

I am convinced that since this solo-petrol-station type of business came to Western Australia, the service received by the motorist has, on the whole, been better than it was previously. I believe that the stations are cleaner and are generally in a better condition altogether.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: Does not that apply to a lot of businesses today?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Quite. But a lot of the money required to make these stations better was supplied by the oil companies, and these people took it with the idea of going solo. If they had not accepted money from the companies, many of them would not have been able to improve the appearance and conditions of their stations and we might have been in a very much worse position than we are.

I was in the United States some seven years ago, and I saw many stations that were then selling single-brand petrol. I was struck at once by the service that one received—and, by the way, we still have not reached that standard yet, though I think it is coming. Those stations were in an excellent condition, and I noted with great interest that the majority were fitted with rest rooms and toilet rooms that were kept immaculately clean.

Prior to this type of business coming to Western Australia, many of the garages and petrol-selling stations here were not so fitted, and I was horrified with the condition of the toilets of those that were. Today, with one-brand stations, a company can determine the standard to be maintained; and I think that, in the main, the standard is better.

I, for one, have no feeling of bitterness towards either the companies or the resellers; but I feel that when there is a moral aspect involved in a Bill, it should be given very careful consideration.

It appeared to me from interjections made by the sponsor of the Bill—and I was sorry to hear them—that he seems to have a completely bitter attitude towards the companies concerned. But I think that we have to realise that the companies, by the methods they have introduced in the last few years have, on the whole, considerably improved the standards of the stations.

If I undertake some agreement with someone, and it does not turn out to be a success, I have only myself to blame. But I think we must go back to the early days of this business and realise that there were many people only too glad to accept the assistance of these companies; and I am glad to see that, according to the Bill, there is no possibility of their breaking the contracts that were made.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: There would be only about 40 per cent, involved.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I would say that a lot of stations must have accepted oil company money. I have not the exact figures with me; but if one wanders around the metropolitan area, one realises that quite a number of these stations were suddenly improved overnight with the introduction of solo selling. From what I know, they were offered three alternatives: Either to improve their stations, sell straight out, or accept a monetary payment for going

solo. The vast majority must have accepted one of those conditions before becoming one-brand sellers.

I will look very carefully at this measure before I give it my blessing, because I want to be certain that honesty is maintained in business dealings before I agree to a measure such as this.

*Sitting suspended from 9.36 to 10.20 p.m.*

HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [10.20]: Before you left the Chair, Mr. President, I was about to point out that Mr. Simpson had gone to a great deal of trouble to ascertain a large number of facts in connection with the petrol-selling business. He gave us quite a lot of figures covering Australia and the United States. He really gave us no real reason, however, why the Bill should not take effect in this State. I say that because he never dealt with what the Bill aimed at; namely, to stop cartels interfering with the retail trade. That is what has been happening in this State.

When Dr. Hislop was speaking, he referred to a provision contained in the original Bill to nullify contracts that exist. I understand from good authority that this is not so. The original Bill contains words which provide that contracts would not be nullified and words were added in another place to clarify the position.

Let us look at the overall position and go back to the start of the one-brand petrol stations. Prior to the full establishment of one-brand petrol stations—when the attempt was first made in the city—some retailers came into the scheme and quite a number did not; they were not in favour of it. About that time, I was approached by a gentleman interested in having pumps installed at his garage. I went to three oil companies in the city and every one of them refused to install pumps. They said it was too costly.

Yet in a very short time, as soon as they got their cartel going and established their one-brand stations, not only did they put in pumps but they also erected stations everywhere, one after the other. It was too costly to install pumps, but they did not find the cost too great when it came to establishing stations and pumps. Does that look as though they were trying to help the small reseller; or were they attempting to start a petrol-selling war, one against the other to the detriment of the reseller and the consumer?

This Bill does not force an oil company to supply every reseller with its pumps and petrol. There is no provision in the measure to say that the oil companies must supply resellers with pumps; and until they supply a reseller with pumps, naturally, they cannot under the provisions of the Bill, supply him with petrol. Dr. Hislop talked about service, but I would say that one of the biggest factors in this is oil.

For instance, if one takes a motor vehicle to a garage to have it serviced efficiently, what does one find on arriving there? The men employed are capable of giving effective service but they cannot supply the oil one requires because they are tied to one company under the one-brand system. Let us take as an example A Shell brand station. A motorist might prefer Caltex or Vacuum oil, but he cannot get that oil put in at that Shell brand station. He can, however, have his vehicle greased there, and the garage will certainly polish his windscreen and that sort of thing. As Dr. Hislop said, a lot of garages are, perhaps, cleaner. But competition will cover that.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Does not the petrol all come out of one tank at Kwinana?

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I believe it does. There does not appear to be much difference between petrols; they all come out of one tank, although one brand is supposed to have one thing in it and another is supposed to have something else. The day will probably come, however, when we have different grades of petrol, as we did before the war. The reseller should have the right to sell as many different brands of petrol as he feels he can get custom for.

The garage proprietor's business is like any other. The goodwill he creates is due to the service he gives. It is only by this means that he is able to build up his business. If he is confined to one-brand petrol and oil, he has no chance of building up extra goodwill or making a real success of his business. With those few remarks, I support the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Hon. H. Hearn, debate adjourned.

## **BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.**

1, Licensing Act Amendment (No. 1).  
(Hon. A. F. Griffith in charge).

2, Public Works Act Amendment.

Received from the Assembly.

## **BILL—SUPPLY (No. 2), £16,000,000.**

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. C. H. SIMPSON (Midland) [10.28]: I secured the adjournment of the debate to examine the Bill, and give members an opportunity, if they desire, to speak on any matter, because the Supply Bill covers the manifold activities of the Government. Accordingly, a member may speak on any matter which he desires to bring before the Chamber. This is the second Supply Bill of the session, and it must be passed to keep essential services going. There is no question of the House not passing the measure.

I wish to mention a few matters which relate to the development of the province I represent. Firstly, I would like to see the Government make provision for more spending on light land development in the area west of the Midland line. That has been found to be a promising project, but unfortunately it requires the expenditure of substantial capital before a holding can be made self-supporting, and some of the men who have gone on to that land have had to face reduced returns for their efforts and have found the going rather hard. I am hoping that the Government will be able to give this matter some attention.

Another matter that should receive urgent attention is the necessary work to deepen the approaches to the Geraldton harbour. This is something that was examined when the party I represent was in office, and it was recognised that certain extensive work would have to be done, and it was ear-marked, as it were, for early attention. I am sorry that more progress in that direction has not been made during the term of the present Government.

*[The Deputy President took the Chair.]*

Speaking in general terms, a report appeared in the Press recently indicating that the function of the State Parliament was of comparatively minor importance now that, under uniform taxation, the State was relieved to a great extent of the burden of collecting taxation. I agree up to a point that where an authority which spends money has also the task of collecting it, there is a more immediate connection between the two responsibilities, whereas under the present system the Federal Government has to accept the odium for imposing the taxes while the State collects the reimbursement, as set out by formula, from the Federal Government and then cries to high Heaven because the Federal Government does not give it enough. So there is a lack of responsibility in this way.

At the same time, I think everyone will agree that the task of budgeting for the revenue that comes our way is of very great importance. The taxation that is levied by the State must cover a field not touched by the Federal taxing authority, but even if taxing powers were returned to the State, there would still be the need for a Federal tax to meet Federal obligations and a separate system of taxing levied by the State in other fields in order to meet the necessities of State finance. However, I do not agree that the job of spending the money is unimportant. On the other hand, it is very important, and if I have a criticism to offer the present Government, it is that there is not sufficient spending in the country as compared with the metropolitan area. I support the second reading.

**HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [10.34]:** I do not intend to say much on this Bill, but I should like to draw the attention of the Government to necessary works that ought to be proceeded with in the Midland province.

Firstly, I would refer to the water catchment at Morawa and the need for the further bituminising of the catchment area of the Morawa dam. A dam with a capacity of 7,000,000 gallons was provided at this town at fairly large expense and completed two years ago, but it has never been filled, with the result that although the town has been reticulated, the people are still on water rationing. Even so early in the summer, they are already rationed to an allowance of 15 gallons per head.

The old dam has a capacity of 1,500,000 gallons and the two dams between them at present contain only 3,000,000 gallons of water, so from those facts it should not be difficult to understand that something is wrong with the catchment area. The catchment has an area of 95 acres, 80 acres of which is roaded and the remaining 15 acres bituminised. Therefore it must be obvious that the roaded portion is not doing the job. I hope and trust the Government will give consideration to the need for further bituminising the catchment, because it is useless to have all that catchment area and dams of that capacity and not have the water run in.

Morawa did not miss winter rains as has been stated. I admit that it did not get the heavy falls, but it received almost 14 inches between January and October, so it cannot be said that the district missed the rain entirely. This district is one of the most important wheat-growing areas in the State, and on more than one occasion it has topped the deliveries of wheat to the bin for all the State. I hope that consideration will be given to improving the position in this area.

There is one other matter with which I have dealt in this House on quite a few occasions.

**The Chief Secretary:** The Geraldton regional hospital?

**Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** I could mention that, but this is not the time or opportunity to do so. I wish to refer to the supply of water for the area of light land between Mullewa and Mingenew. The Government did make available the services of a geologist who was seconded from the Mines Department for the purpose of finding water, but his experience has been associated with minerals, and it did not necessarily mean that his ability pertained to water.

**Hon. C. H. Simpson:** Who was the officer?

**Hon. L. A. LOGAN:** I cannot give his name. He fixed four or five sites, and on the strength of his recommendations, some farmers hired boring plants in the hope of getting water. One went down to 354 ft. at a cost of 30s. per ft. and got no water. Another went down to 90 ft. and still there was no water. I suggested that the Government should put in a boring plant capable of going down to depth in order to prove the presence of water or otherwise. That was not done and we are still waiting. If water is not provided, then the farms will be useless. When farmers have spent £1,500 or £2,000 in boring for water without getting any result, it is more than they can afford.

I wish to make a suggestion in the hope that the Minister will give it reasonable consideration, namely, that the Water Supply Department should appoint a geologist for the particular purpose of studying the position and finding water. I am perfectly sure that such an endeavour to find water would entail four or five years of constant work, but it would be worth while. We want a man who is entirely divorced from the Mines Department so that he can concentrate his attention on the finding of water. With the knowledge that would be gained from the Mines Department and the boring contractors, I believe that the Government could do something that would be of great service to the country. Therefore I hope that my suggestion will not fall on deaf ears.

I am not going to touch on the question of the Geraldton hospital, but I wish to speak about the harbour. I have perused the Loan Bill in an endeavour to find whether any loan money is to be made available for this harbour, but not one penny has been provided and not a penny was provided last year either. This, despite the fact that the Geraldton wharf is falling into a very poor condition, not as regards the outside appearance, but in the under structure. The time is coming when it will be a very costly job to rehabilitate that wharf to the safety standard. Why provision has not been made for this work, I cannot understand.

In respect to the harbour itself, I have endeavoured to get something done, but without result. No provision is made for the deepening of the channel, and this port cannot carry on for long under the present restrictions. If it is necessary to bring more pressure to bear, I shall do it. Geraldton is what may be termed an isolated area. The people have to help themselves, and they will be able to do that only if port and handling facilities are provided for them. Those are the only points I desired to mention, and I trust that the Government will give them consideration.

**HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [10.43]:** I rise to support the second reading and also the remarks of Mr. Simpson regarding

the people in the light land areas west of the Midland railway. It is a fairly well-established fact that great development is going on in that area, but so far it is not sufficiently advanced for the farmers who have taken up land there, particularly as there has been an easing off in the price of grain, particularly, wheat and also oats and barley. As a consequence, those settlers are finding themselves in a difficult position and some assistance should be made available.

To my mind, there are many ways in which those localities can be assisted and one would be by the provision of good roads. The Main Roads Department has done a fair amount of useful work to date, but there remains much more that should be done. We can readily understand that unless good roads are provided, particularly in the light land country where there are many miles of sand track, the cartage to and fro can become very costly, not only in the way of providing petrol, oil, tyres, etc., but also in the maintenance of the vehicles. Consequently, good roads are definitely essential.

There is another way in which the people could be helped, and that is in regard to water supplies. Although some of that country has a rainfall of from 20 to 32 inches subterranean water is deep down and costly to find and Mr. Logan's suggestion could well be applied to that area also. If a geologist were supplied to advise farmers where to bore for water the Government could put down the bores on the understanding that if water was found on the property the owner would repay the cost to the Government over a period of years.

Unless such assistance is forthcoming, many of the men who have put perhaps thousands of pounds into developing their properties will have to walk off them, as this land cannot be brought under payable production within a considerable period. Until the owners can grow the necessary legumes and grasses to form pastures for stock, they cannot obtain a profitable income from this land.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Is there any poison on it?

Hon. A. R. JONES: Yes, and that also mitigates against the quick development of pastures. No matter whether the present Government is in office next year when the budget is being prepared, or whether there is a change of Government, I hope notice will be taken of the views expressed here tonight, because we must assist these men if that portion of the State is to be properly developed. They have the right spirit, and we should not force them to walk off the land through lack of assistance.

I have already taken up the matter of water supplies with Mr. Ellis, the Government Geologist. He has always believed that water is one of the most important

factors in the development of this State and realises that a population of any great size will be dependent on water supplies. He agrees that one or more geologists should be attached to the Works and Water Supply Department in order to make a full-time job of finding underground water supplies. To that end we would need to secure the right men, and we have some very successful men in certain localities of the State who would be able to pass on information that would be of great help to anyone studying the various types of formation of the country in certain districts. After a probationary period of perhaps 12 months or two years such a geologist would be of great value to the State as a whole.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: They might use seismographic methods of finding water.

Hon. A. R. JONES: Such equipment might play a big part in the search for water. It is well known that unless the readings of such equipment can be correctly interpreted, they are of little use; and so it is essential to have properly trained men engaged on that work.

Although the comprehensive water scheme is in the embryo stage so far as the North Midland district is concerned, it is only reasonable to expect that money will be made available in the not too distant future so that a start on the scheme can be made in that area. In answer to a deputation three or four months ago we received an assurance from the Minister that all sources of water which could serve the area would be investigated and a plan drawn up so that the whole question could be gone into and a file started for the comprehensive scheme in the Midland and northern areas. I hope the Minister will bring my remarks to notice in the right quarter so that the question will not be forgotten.

It is known that water can be found in the Gingin Brook and possibly in other places between there and the coast. Those possibilities should not be investigated during the period of flush flow but towards the end of February, so that an estimate of the dependability of the supply could be made. I trust the Minister will see that the subject is not simply pigeon-holed, and that the plan suggested some months ago will be proceeded with. I support the Bill.

HON. H. HEARN (Metropolitan) [10.50]: I wish to congratulate the Government on the attention it has paid—with its limited loan funds—to the planting of pine forests. I take this opportunity almost every year of reminding members of the great importance of restoring the wastage of our forests. The present Conservator of Forests is well aware of the position that exists; and, coming from South Australia, he knows the wonderful work done there in the planting of pines and realises that, in view of the depletion of our jarrah and



karri forests we should, in the interests of posterity, never miss a single year as regards our pine planting.

That necessity is particularly obvious, as we find we can use this timber in an ever greater variety of ways. There are products manufactured here today, even from pine thinnings, which would do credit not only to Australia but also to any other part of the world. I am glad to know that this matter has not been lost sight of; and I happen to know that the Conservator of Forests, like the Minister, is keen on seeing that our pine planting should go ahead as far as possible within the limited finances available.

**HON. SIR CHARLES LATHAM** (Central) [10.53]: I will not compliment the Minister on this measure, as it is time someone drew attention to the fact that while we are asking for £15,000,000 we already have a deficit of £1,500,000 since the 1st July. That is a substantial sum; and from the figures available, I believe that even the trust funds of the Government are in a precarious position.

Like any other institution, the Government must pay its way; and so the money must be obtained from some source.

I am disturbed at some of the Acts we are passing. Nobody reading this morning's Press could fail to be astounded at the amount of money being expended on starting-price betting, particularly in view of the fact that our livelihood in this State comes principally from primary and not secondary industries.

Today our storage capacity is being loaded with wheat, the prospects for sale of which become more distant daily. We now have difficulty in selling even the coarse grains for which there was a ready market last year. If members of another place cannot do it, I think members here should take all possible action to see that the future of the State is safeguarded.

In recent years we have had an orgy of spending the great amount of money received from wheat and wool cheques from overseas, as well as the return from our other exports; but once that source of revenue dries up, the amount of money circulating in this State will be very limited. I repeat that it would be worth while members reading the article in this morning's Press, which states that close on £2,000,000 has been spent in starting-price betting shops in three months—this being the result of legislation we passed.

**Hon. F. R. H. Lavery**: It took place just the same before the measure was passed.

**Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM**: The hon. member speaks with authority, and I will accept what he says; but now we have legalised betting. By Act of Parliament we have made it an industry.

**Hon. F. R. H. Lavery**: It has been the same all along.

**Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM**: I have been creditably informed that there is still a lot of starting-price betting being done outside betting shops.

Not long ago I raised the question of the difficulty of getting hotel accommodation, owing to the drink trade. Clubs are allowed to remain open until 11 p.m. and in such places we encourage the installation of poker machines. I notice that the Licensing Court stated it would deal with them but I venture to say it has done nothing. I would like to know whether the Government instructed the court to leave those machines alone. I am convinced that the police have been instructed on this matter in the past.

I do not blame any particular Government, but I feel we should be more careful not to develop a reputation as a nation of gamblers, as that would be a serious charge to be made against any country. It is time that the Government—or its successor if there is a change—did something for the welfare of the community rather than something towards its degradation. I repeat that £2,000,000 is a great deal for a population of 650,000 to spend on betting, and I do not think the State can carry such a burden. Members of this House should take on themselves the responsibility to see that something is done to correct this evil.

The world outlook is not encouraging at present, and I think it is a terrible thing if we are again to be forced into war to use up our surplus products—as was the case last time—because that would be a dangerous existence for any nation.

I hope members will not treat lightly legislation which passes through this House. I have no right to cast aspersions on members because they are just as capable as I am; but we should not go blithely along and say, "We can have all the money we want." Where do we get this money? We get it from the industry of the people. If we say to them, "We can throw your money in this direction or in that direction—"

**Hon. C. W. D. Barker**: Do you not believe in further development and expansion?

**Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM**: I believe in more work and that is the only thing that counts. We have discussed Bills in this House which propose to give the people more leisure, which means that they will have more money to spend; and those measures have been supported by the members who are interjecting.

**Hon. C. W. D. Barker**: You have to create wealth.

**Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM**: Yes; and we have to provide the wealth that the people are spending in their spare time. The migrants coming into this country have probably shown Australians how to

work. They not only work their normal five days a week, but also toil on Saturdays and Sundays from early morning until late at night. It is about time that the Trades Hall became acquainted with the position. These migrants go out renovating and painting houses and make quite a lot of money. If we are not very careful, they will probably be running this country in their own way very shortly.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: They will be dinkum Aussies, shortly.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: That is all very well; but I want to draw attention to the problems that are not very far ahead of us. We should not pass this legislation lightly and we should give more consideration to the serious side of it instead of to the frivolous side.

HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban) [11.2]: When he was introducing the Bill, I think the Chief Secretary said that the amount to be borrowed was well in excess of £1,000,000; and he used the expression "temporarily borrowed from trust funds." Such an expression takes my mind back to about three years ago when some present members of the Government, who were then in Opposition, proceeded to criticise at great length the Government of the day for doing the very self-same thing that the present Government now proposes. Whilst I am not one who would do anything but praise any Government which was attempting to do everything it possibly could to solve the housing problem, the attitude of the present Government seems to be, "Don't do as I do, but do as I say."

Members must realise that one of the greatest problems in this State at present, particularly in the province I represent, is that of drainage. Not so very long ago we had before us a Bill dealing with drainage which had for its object the implementing of a programme to alleviate the situation in the metropolitan area. However, this most pressing problem seems to be getting worse instead of better; and three years have elapsed since 1952, when a comprehensive drainage survey of the metropolitan area was completed, before any definite step forward has been taken to solve the problem.

Therefore, I want to offer a word of warning to the Government by pointing out that the position is not going to improve. Whether houses are built by the Government or by private individuals, the drainage problem throughout the metropolitan area, particularly in those suburbs south of the river where houses have been built on low-lying land, is becoming greater and greater each year; and I would like to see something done about it.

If the Government can blatantly admit that it has borrowed £1,500,000 of trust funds to lend to the Housing Commission, surely it can borrow money to give relief

to some of these people who are still flooded out and who have to wade through water almost up to their knees in order to enter their houses! The Government must do something to tackle this problem. If something is not done, it will become greater and greater as the years go by. Not only that, but the expense and magnitude of the task will increase correspondingly.

In 1952 the estimated cost of implementing the comprehensive drainage scheme was approximately £500,000. It is reasonable to assume that today the cost would be much more than that; and every month that goes by, it will continue to increase. In the meantime, the people who are occupying houses of all kinds that are being built in low-lying areas are continuing to suffer.

Daily we see in the Press photographs of these people who are suffering the disadvantage of living in flooded areas. I know that some attempt has been made by the Government to alleviate the position, but I hope it will make greater attempts in the future because it is most necessary that the problem be solved as soon as possible.

HON. N. E. BAXTER (Central) [11.7]: I would like to make a few remarks on the Bill and in regard to Government finance in particular. Mr. Griffith has just mentioned the drainage problem, but there are many other matters that require the urgent attention of the Government. But when requests are made to the Government, invariably the answer given is that no money is available.

However, let us look back over the years and roughly estimate the amount of money the Government has granted to various organisations in various sums, totalling £5,000 here and £10,000 there, for matters that cannot be regarded as of an important public nature. I can assure members that the total of these amounts is considerable and this money could be used for other urgent public works. I do not say that many of the organisations to which these sums have been granted are not deserving.

We have in this State a Lotteries Commission which Parliament decided would supply money for hospitals and other organisations badly in need of finance. Unfortunately, however, we still have street appeals being conducted every week in aid of those organisations which, years ago, we believed would cease if the Lotteries Commission were established.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: That is one of the reasons why the Lotteries Commission was introduced.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Of course it was! These matters should be aired because, despite the fact that the Government always says that insufficient money is available to carry out this or that project,

apparently money can be found for these other undertakings. Not so very long ago a request was made to the Minister for Water Supplies that the pipeline from York to Beverley be increased from a 4-inch to a 6-inch main, and the answer was that there was not sufficient money available.

Yet the Government has agreed to grant £24,000 to put a bar across the Carnarvon river to supply water to the banana growers. I do not deny the right of those growers to obtain some assistance for a water supply; but when one considers the cost of that scheme aimed at providing a few banana growers with an adequate water supply, and then view the plight of the people who are living in flooded places throughout the metropolitan area, one cannot understand the attitude of the Government. And that, incidentally, is only one urgent problem that requires attention.

Many people in outer suburban districts who have struggled to develop their properties for many years have received no assistance from the Government; and when a request is made for some financial help to provide bulldozers to clear the land, the only response they get is a visit from a representative of the Rural & Industries Bank who then informs them: "Yes, you can borrow money from the bank"; and that is as far as they get. Yet the Government can freely make available £24,000 to the Carnarvon banana growers for an extra water supply.

It is definitely unfair that the Government should turn down one urgent request for financial assistance but accede to another to assist a small section of producers. The way the Government has handled its affairs does not constitute good finance.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: And you talk about decentralisation!

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I believe in decentralisation just as much as the hon. member does.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: And yet you object to the expenditure of £24,000 in Carnarvon.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I object very strongly to it.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: The hon. member does not adopt a very State-wide attitude.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: My attitude is just as State-wide as the hon. member's. I support the Bill, but I strongly object to the way the finances of the State are being handled.

HON. H. K. WATSON (Metropolitan)  
[11.12]: I support the remarks of Sir Charles Latham and other members who have drawn attention to what one might describe as a certain amount of irresponsibility by the Government in handling the

finances of the State. I want to refer to one or two points, and particularly to transport.

Reading from the last report by the Railway Department, as tabled in this House, I find that the loss for the year ended 30th June, 1955, was £3,800,000. In May and June, 1955, certain marginal increases were granted to the railway professional officers, the estimated cost of which was £35,000 per annum. Also, the Railway Reclassification Board issued new awards which represented a further increase in expenditure to the department of £150,000 per annum. In May, the Arbitration Court ratified a consent agreement granting wage increases to the members of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Employees under the  $2\frac{1}{2}$  times formula, and the estimated cost of those increases was £96,000. Therefore, the aggregate increased cost amounts to approximately £250,000 per annum.

In private enterprise, when the costs of a business increase, if that business is to remain solvent an endeavour must be made to cover those costs. We had an illustration of that recently when the two Bills dealing with the trustee companies were introduced. They found that their costs had increased, and therefore they were forced to take steps to increase their revenue.

However, what do we find in the railways? What effort has the Government made to bring railway freights, and particularly passenger fares, more in keeping with the cost of running the railways? It made no attempt at all. Take the items I have mentioned. No effort has been made to cover the extra expenditure. One would have thought that some unavoidable increase would have been imposed promptly on passenger fares. An increase has occurred in all the other States. I was in Victoria three weeks ago and very substantial increases were effected at that time in rail, tram and Government bus fares.

I see no reason why the Government in this State should have so long delayed increasing the fares of public transport. This delay has had a serious effect in two ways. Directly it has had the effect of seriously disorganising the transport system in the metropolitan area. On inquiry, the Chief Secretary will find that the Transport Board is very embarrassed by the action of the Government in refusing to increase passenger fares for public transport in the metropolitan area.

There may be two reasons for this refusal. One is that the fares are being kept down to an uneconomic level in order to attract passengers travelling on privately-owned buses. It is well and good to attract passengers from privately-owned buses by legitimate competition, but it is very stupid and costly to attract passengers from privately-owned buses by keeping the fares at an uneconomic level.

Furthermore, this has had the effect of disorganising the finances of the private bus companies. In an attempt to retain their passengers, in some cases they were unable to increase the fares to the amount agreed on by the Transport Board because the difference between what they would then charge and what is charged on Government transport would be so great, that they hesitate to make the increases.

The other angle to this question is that when I raised the matter not so long ago of reducing probate duties by exempting the family home, the answer given was that such an exemption would effect the grant to this State recommended by the Grants Commission. It was said that the Grants Commission would take into account the probate duty collected in Western Australia and compare it with the amount collected in the Eastern States, and to the extent that it is lower here than in the Eastern States, we would be penalised.

The application of the same principle would be extremely severe when the Grants Commission compares the railway fares charged in Western Australia with those charged in the Eastern States. It may well transpire that this State will be penalised seriously by the Grants Commission for the failure of the Government to charge reasonable fares.

Another explanation for refusing to increase the fares is that the Government might consider it good politics and good vote-catching. If that is the reason in the Treasurer's mind when considering the finances of the State, then the outlook is very poor indeed.

In the last report of the Metropolitan Fair Rents Court the number of applications received for a review of rent in the quarter ended the 30th September, 1955, was stated to be three. I would suggest that if the number of applications is so low, the Government might well consider whether or not it is worthwhile to maintain the Fair Rents Court. I support the second reading.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West—in reply)** [11.21]: I can give direct answers to only two of the points that have been raised. The first is in regard to the Fair Rents Court. That matter comes under my jurisdiction. It is quite easy to explain why only three applications were received in that quarter. That was the time when the legislation was up in the air, and no one knew whether there would be a Fair Rents Court or not. So the figures quoted are not a fair indication of what number will be received in the quarters to come.

The other direct answer I can give is in reply to Mr. Jones. He is worried as to which Government will hold office next year. I can say that the Government next year will be the same as the Government

this year. Having that in mind, I say to other members who have laid complaints, and made recommendations and suggestions for improvements, that all those matters will be taken into consideration.

I can also promise that all the matters raised during this debate will be forwarded to the departments concerned, including even the suggestion by Mr. Watson to increase the fares of public transport. During the debate on the Supply Bill next year all these matters will be considered. I thank members for their suggestions; and, if possible, they will be acted on next year.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

# **BILL—ACTS AMENDMENT (ALLOWANCES AND SALARIES ADJUSTMENT).**

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**HON. C. H. SIMPSON (Midland)** [11.27]: I support this Bill in its entirety. For the first time, those responsible for giving consideration to the allowances of members and Ministers have taken a realistic view of the duties which they are called upon to discharge.

Over the years a rather modest assessment has been made of the remuneration due to the Premier and to the Ministers for their services. It is ridiculous that the Premier of the State, with a tremendous burden of duty, should receive in some cases a smaller remuneration than his departmental officers. Such an anomaly has arisen on more than one occasion. It has been the experience of every Minister that an officer under his direction receives a higher remuneration.

Of course, the departmental officers receive the benefit of security of tenure of office; they have a retiring allowance; and they are not subject to the many calls which members of Parliament, particularly Ministers, are subjected to. I say again that at last a realistic view has been taken of the value of the services of parliamentarians, and the opportunity has been taken to arrive at a fair assessment of the emolument for those charged with the responsibilities of State.

In regard to allowances to members of Parliament, we have to remember that a long time ago services in Parliament were always honorary. Later on, allowances were made to ease the burden on the private purses of members. It is nice to recall that in those days we had, on the whole, very good members.

But, with the development of government as we know it today in all countries where social services are playing a big part in the structure of responsibilities that Governments are called upon to direct, more and more responsibility has been thrown on to the shoulders of the rank and file member as well as those of the man who is fortunate to hold administrative office; so that, in a sense, being a member of Parliament in these days is practically a full-time job. In many cases, it is a full-time job. Not only that, but a member of Parliament has to meet many calls in the discharge of his duties. He is faced with heavy expenses; and, such is the uncertainty of political life, that he may well be—as Mr. Calwell said on one occasion—today a rooster and tomorrow a feather duster.

I understand the sponsors of the Bill were guided in the assessment of the allowances by striking an average of those paid to members of Parliament in other States. That is a realistic appraisal. Years ago, a tribunal was appointed to have these matters adjusted outside the ambit of Parliament altogether. In substance, I am in agreement with such a system. The only fault I have to find with it is that I do not think the men concerned in this instance took a realistic view. They selected a certain base figure and compared it with that of a corresponding officer in the Civil Service; and, when the time came to review allowances, they said, "A clerk in, say, Grade 4 receives so much, and the allowance for a member of Parliament will be increased similarly."

There is some merit in the system adopted by the Federal Parliament, which appointed a tribunal separate from the Civil Service entirely to try to appraise a satisfactory figure. It is true that at present members of the Federal Parliament have not taken steps to meet the requests of members for an increase in allowances. But I think those who have read the reports in connection with the matter will have been struck by the assurance that it was not being considered this financial year. I think the inference is obvious.

An extra payment is provided for the Leader of the Legislative Council. While, as one who held that office, I was perfectly happy to be on a level with my colleagues, I do recognise this proposed sum as some recognition of the importance of this House in the parliamentary system, and for that reason consider there is no fault to be found with it. With those observations, I support the second reading.

**HON. H. K. WATSON** (Metropolitan) [11.35]: This Bill does several things. It proposes to grant a fairly substantial increase in the remuneration of Ministers of the Crown. It proposes to increase members' allowances by about £700—which, in

my opinion, is a pretty steep rise. An increase from £1,300 or £1,400 to £2,100 is a fairly big one.

**Hon. C. H. Simpson:** You cannot attract candidates at the present figure.

**Hon. H. K. WATSON:** The Bill also proposes to grant to members a lump-sum allowance in respect of services rendered since December last year; and, by indirection, it does seek to stamp this House as a party House, having a leader of the Government on one side, and a leader of the Opposition on the other. I think they are the four or five outstanding features of the Bill.

So far as the increases in ministerial salaries are concerned, I offer it as my opinion that they are well merited. I do not altogether agree with the reasoning of Mr. Simpson that we find a Minister of the Crown drawing less than his departmental head. After all, it is well recognised that the departmental head is the experienced and professional permanent officer who is charged with the day-to-day administration of his department, and it is on him that the Minister largely relies.

As I have said, I consider that the increase in members' allowances are adequate, or even more than adequate. So far as the proposal to grant members a payment of £228, or whatever it may be, by way of a lump-sum back payment to December of last year is concerned, I do not see how that can be justified at all. I feel that if members' allowances were to be increased from December of last year they should have been increased in December. Assume this Bill was not brought down; assume that the increase in members' salaries was not going to be made until December of next year. Would members say that they should give themselves a two years' back payment? To me, that is illogical, and I do not think it can be justified.

Let us look at it this way: It may be argued that the £228—and this is virtually the argument contained in the Bill—represents the marginal increase that members would have received in December last if their salaries had been increased according to the marginal increases granted to members of the Public Service. But we cannot have it both ways. I suggest that if that argument is valid, and if the £228 is the increase that ought to have been made on the original base of £1,300, that is the only increase to which members should be entitled. We should go from £1,300 to £1,500, and call it a day.

But we are not doing that; we are going from £1,300 to £2,100; and then, by a different process of reasoning altogether, we say we are entitled to another £200 back pay. I am opposed to that principle.

The Minister for the North-West: Two hundred pounds of the £700.

**Hon. H. K. WATSON:** The marginal increase is the only increase the ordinary citizen has had; and I suggest that if it is sought to take advantage of the marginal increase which has been granted to the ordinary citizen, we should put ourselves on that basis and be satisfied with the £228. But that is not being done. We are taking £228 and also reckon that we are entitled to an extra £700 a year. I am not in favour of that proposal. I am not opposed to the increase of £700, taken by and large; but I do not think there should be any increase at all in the salary that has been drawn up to date.

I come now to another point. I notice that the Bill provides that the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council shall receive an extra allowance. I have no objection to that. I think that the Leader of the Government in that House—or, as I prefer to describe him the Leader of the Legislative Council—is entitled to some extra emolument. But we also find for the first time provision for a leader of the Opposition, although while the House has been in existence—for 140 years or thereabouts—it has simply been a House of review.

**Hon. R. F. Hutchison:** What a lie!

**Hon. H. K. WATSON:** I repeat that, in spite of the pain at the back of my neck, This has been a House of review, each member coming here with an independent opinion and will, and voting on a Bill according to his conscience. As I have emphasised time and again, we deal with the Bill and not with the Government.

**Hon. R. F. Hutchison:** Now you are really camouflaging!

**Hon. E. M. Heenan:** Are you not bound to a party platform?

**Hon. H. K. WATSON:** I am elected on certain broad principles.

**Hon. E. M. Heenan:** So are we.

**Hon. H. K. WATSON:** I am elected on certain broad principles, and adhere to them. But in this Chamber—

**Hon. E. M. Heenan:** You are not the only one who does that.

**Hon. H. K. WATSON:** The hon. member can make his speech when I have finished.

**Hon. E. M. Heenan:** What I have said is true. By inference, you insult everyone else by implying that you are the only one who adheres to principles.

**Hon. H. K. WATSON:** There are many members who subscribe to those principles, and act accordingly. There are some perhaps who do not; and if the hon. member who has interjected is one of those, and if the cap fits, I cannot help that. But, in the main, I should say that the principle I have stated is the principle that the majority of members of this House, and not I alone, support. I would be sorry

to see that provision adopted, as the Bill suggests, inasmuch as it provides an extra emolument for what it chooses to describe as the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council.

**Hon. R. F. Hutchison:** It is getting more truthful.

**Hon. H. K. WATSON:** I think it is necessary for us to remember, when considering a question such as this, just what a parliamentarian's character is, and just what our membership of Parliament entails.

**Hon. L. Craig:** And what are our responsibilities.

**Hon. H. K. WATSON:** Yes. I submit that our membership here is a duty to be discharged and not a personal favour to be solicited; and it is certainly not a professional job to be sought for pecuniary advantage. I would submit this proposition: that even if any one particular member had a little more work to do either by reason of his ability or interest, or for any other reason, the question should not always arise: What is it worth to me; how much more am I going to get? There are such things as responsibility, honour and duty. I trust that nothing will be done to put this House into watertight compartments of Government supporters and Opposition.

**Hon. R. F. Hutchison:** Now let us pretend.

**Hon. H. K. WATSON:** If we do that, the House will, in my opinion, cease to justify its existence.

**Hon. F. R. H. Lavery:** It did that years ago.

**Hon. R. F. Hutchison:** This House never justifies its existence.

**Hon. H. K. WATSON:** I think this House, over its long history, has justified its existence as a House of review. If it is not going to be a House of review but simply divided into groups of Government members and Opposition members—

**Hon. R. F. Hutchison:** It has never been anything else.

**Hon. H. K. WATSON:** —I feel there is no justification at all for the members of this House to receive anything like the allowance proposed. Although, as I have said, the majority of those elected to this House treat it as a House of review and act accordingly, I know that some members have been elected on the pledge of abolishing it. Fortunately they are in a majority and I hope they will always remain in a majority.

**Hon. H. Hearn:** A minority, you mean.

**Hon. H. K. WATSON:** Yes.

The Chief Secretary: A slip of the tongue that might come true.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: If this House ceased to be a House of review and to discharge its normal and historic function, where would it be? It would simply become, if its majority were the same as in another place, a rubber stamp and a replica of the other place. If it happened to have a majority here against the Government it would simply be a nuisance and a hostile group the whole time.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That is what you are now.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member is casting a reflection on the honesty and integrity of members of this Chamber by a remark of that kind.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: She usually does.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: As it happens, I am not afraid of the terror that flieth by night or the terror that sitteth behind me.

Hon. H. Hearn: The pestilence that walketh by noonday, you mean.

Hon. H. K. WATSON: I think this particular clause of the Bill indirectly raises a fundamental question as far as this House and parliamentary institutions generally are concerned. Being members of a House of review we have to remember that the people have political rights; not so much that they may be governed but that they shall not be misgoverned—and that is one of the functions of this Chamber.

When the Bill is in Committee I shall be inclined to oppose the proposal for the extra emolument to what is described as the Leader of the Opposition: If some more convenient word could be suggested for the member in the House who, next to the Leader of the House, takes a very active part in its deliberations, I would not be averse to it, but I suggest to members that the proposal to make the appointment in the Bill should not be proceeded with.

HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [11.51]: Mr. Watson, when speaking to the Bill, used the words "responsibility, duty and honour" in a sense which indicated to me that he assumed to himself those qualities and, at the same time, indicated that some of us, apart from a select few—

Hon. H. K. Watson: You appear to have a pretty guilty conscience.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: —were devoid of these qualities. I am going to take this first opportunity of telling him very plainly that in my opinion he has not got any monopoly of them.

Hon. H. K. Watson: I never claimed that.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: He has given us—

Hon. H. K. Watson: A few home truths.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: As the hon. member knows and estimates the truth. But his ideas of truth and fair play certainly do not appeal to me; and I am sure there are others here who, after listening to his speech, will hold similar views to mine.

He has attacked the provision in the Bill which seeks to make an allowance to the member who is regarded as the Leader of the Opposition here. He bases his argument on the futile proposition that this is a non-party House and that this is solely a House of review. But he himself is an espoused member of a political party; and all his life he has been a vigorous proponent of its principles which are, in many respects, directly opposed to the principles of quite a number of members who belong to a different party.

Time and again when Bills dealing with matters of policy come before us, our party ideas conflict and invariably Mr. Watson is one of the leaders of a party group. I think it is puerile of him to propose to attack us learnedly about this just being a House of review and a non-party House. He is not facing up to realities. In my opinion he is not facing the facts.

We all know that the gentleman who holds the position of Leader of the Opposition at the present time, whom we hold in the highest regard, has very onerous duties; and, from time to time, is of great assistance to all members in the lead he gives and the responsibility he takes in dealing with Bills. That, in my experience, applies not only to the present Leader of the Opposition, but to other men of high repute who, on both sides of the political arena have preceded him.

My view is that the holder of that office, whoever he may be, is fully entitled to the extra emolument. If the Leader of the Opposition is entitled to it in another place, he certainly is here, because we deal with Bills and problems in a similar way. Political issues of the same categories arise here as they do in another place, and wise leadership by the Government and by the Opposition is needed.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [11.57]: It is with some distress that I speak on the Bill, because everybody knows that my political life ends here tomorrow or the next day. Members, too, have told me that I am supposed to be not needing any emoluments. That is not true, of course. People talk about me as being a rich man; but I am not and I do not want to be and I have never wanted to be. But that is not the point. I am personally not very greatly concerned about this.

Members, mainly on the other side, are very silent tonight; and that, I feel, is because some of them are somewhat ashamed—and I say that advisedly. They have made no attempt to justify this more than generous proposal for members. In

the past we have associated parliamentary allowances, at least in some way and somehow, with the cost of living. We have associated them with the basic wage increases and so on; but now we have left that all behind.

The metal trades award was based on the 2½ times alteration in money values. This new proposal is not based on anything except the custom in the other States; an average of the lot. It is a terrible thing when people have power, and we have it, to take from the public purse. I think that members of Parliament throughout Australia are taking more than their share. That is because they have the power to take from the public purse. It is more than would be granted to them by an employer.

I have had a lot to do with employees on considerable salaries; and when I consider what they receive for the work they do, and compare it with the emoluments paid to members of Parliament for the work they do—by that I mean the work that they are paid to do; and the main purpose of our being here is to make laws for the peace, order and good government of the people—I consider that members are not badly paid. I do not doubt for one moment that a good deal of hard work is done; and, in many cases, it is necessary in order to hold the seats which we have. It is not for the purpose for which we are appointed—the making of the laws for the peace, good order and government of the State.

There are many members of this House and another place who never open a Bill to read and study it, because they are members of a party in which there is no necessity to do it. They accept whatever the party puts forward; they accept it blindly, and they have no real responsibilities except to write letters and to do the best they can to hold the position which they occupy. Many members talk from time to time about the low wages of people in other jobs. But now, without any relation whatever to the cost of living or anything like that, we are taking, because we have the power to do so, more than I think we are justly entitled to for the good of the nation.

Members of Parliament have a very high office; the office itself is one to be proud of, and it carries a tremendous amount of prestige. It carries a lot of privileges, such as free railway passes and that sort of thing. Some members say that that is nothing; but they can be passed on to members' wives and can be used throughout Australia. They can be used in England; they do not enable a member to obtain free travel there, but at least he is given concessions because of it. He can get free travel in New Zealand, a very great concession. A member with a pass is given free entree to racecourses.

We have concessions in the beautiful place in which we work and play. There is a billiard room and a library, and members can obtain meals at less than half what they would cost elsewhere—a very great concession. It is all aimed at inducing into Parliament men of the highest integrity.

I am leaving the place with some distress, I must admit, because of the fact that we have a power which we are using in this way. If we put this proposition to the people and really asked their opinion, what would they say? I have asked innumerable people, and there is not a happy feeling about these new emoluments for members of Parliament. Some people shrug their shoulders as much as to say, "What do you expect?" That is the worst attitude of all. It is a shocking attitude to take towards the people's representatives—those who are elected to make the laws for the peace, order and good government of the country.

What Mr. Watson said is perfectly true. He made a speech expressing the very highest principles of democracy. Laws passed in one place should come before a tribunal for review. Members can imagine a court in which the judges were biased; they can imagine what would happen to the justice of the country. This Chamber was set up for no other purpose than to review, in an unbiased way, the legislation that is placed before it. If the principle is broken down there is nothing left.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: What did you do to a Bill last night?

Hon. L. CRAIG: The hon. member can have his own views. He is a member of a party and is disciplined.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: You are not a member of a party, of course!

Hon. L. CRAIG: I am a member of a party which says, "You do as you think right and nothing will be said to you." I have been a member of Parliament for 22 years, and I have never yet been chided on any attitude that I have taken in this House. And, believe me, I have given the party many reasons and many causes for displeasure, as members know. Those who have been here for any length of time know how many times I have supported Bills which have been in direct opposition to the views of my party.

If this Chamber is to review legislation with a view to submitting to the people laws which are to their benefit, then surely one must approach the matter with an unbiased mind! If we do not do that, how can we justify this place? What is the good of it if it is a duplication of another Chamber? If that is all it is to be, we are drawing our money under false pretences. There is no value to us.

If a Government can, by its majority, force a Bill through the Legislative Assembly, and then, by a majority in this



Chamber, force it through here, and it becomes law automatically, how can we justify our existence? There is no need for us because members of the Legislative Assembly do all the detailed work in connection with bridges, roads, the transfer of land and so on. We have one purpose and one purpose only; and if we do not carry out that purpose in an unbiased way, I say there is no justification whatever for our existence.

This is perhaps the last speech I shall make in Parliament, and I feel it very keenly. Mr. Watson did not attack the Leader of the Opposition; he attacked the position. He wants to keep this an unbiased House; and if there is to be a declared Leader of the Opposition, it breaks down that unbiased attitude. If the proposal for the payment of a Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber is agreed to, we declare ourselves as a party House. That is Mr. Watson's objection to it. There is some honour in being declared a leader of anything. I think leadership brings with it responsibilities which men of honour must accept with pleasure; they must be glad to accept those responsibilities.

I do not deny that Ministers are entitled to be well paid for the work they do. But there is something much greater than always keeping ahead in one's pay and keeping one's ear to the ground to hear what others are getting in Victoria or somewhere else; and then striking an average, thus taking as much as possible and saying, "I want another £300 a year in allowances."

That is all distasteful; and I wonder what we as employers would say if our employees behaved like that—particularly those appointed to responsible positions. We must place ourselves in the place of the payer—the one who pays the money. Are we justified in doing all these things?

As members know, in New South Wales members of the Legislative Council are not subject to election. In other words, they keep their House free of pressure groups and party pressure. Members are appointed by the two Houses meeting together; and so that they shall not be removed they are appointed for 12 years.

Hon. H. Hearn: You would not call that a House of review, would you?

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes. I have been to the Legislative Council in New South Wales.

Hon. H. Hearn: So have I, often.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I was very pleased with the quality of the people in that Chamber. Their allowances are nil, except that they receive out-of-pocket expenses which are now something like £500. But when one studied the quality of the people in the Legislative Council of New South Wales, one could not be anything but proud of them. When

the majority of the two Houses represented the non-Labour parties, they selected men for their standing in the community, their integrity and everything about them. Men of the highest positions, from a sense of duty, accepted seats in the Legislative Council.

When the majority of members comprised the Labour Party, in order to produce men of quality and men who did not have to depend on the emoluments of their office, they appointed union secretaries, men who had fought their way through the ranks and who were esteemed by their unions and were of great capacity.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Do not you believe that the people here are esteemed by the unions?

Hon. L. CRAIG: I did not say anything about the people here. I said that the people who were selected for the Legislative Council in New South Wales were of the highest integrity and of great capacity. On the average, the people in that House would have a greater mental capacity—I am not talking about integrity or anything like that—business acumen, and administrative capacity than members of this House. By saying that I am not detracting in any way from members here. But the very method of their appointment ensures that that is so. Nobody would disagree with me on that point.

Hon. H. Hearn: Yes.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: I do.

Hon. L. CRAIG: It is a fact.

Hon. H. Hearn: You are saying that no one will disagree with you. I am.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Of course, the hon. member may be a very outstanding man.

Hon. H. Hearn: I am not talking about myself. I am talking about the New South Wales Legislative Council. You are viewing it through rose-coloured spectacles.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I have visited it.

Hon. H. Hearn: So have I, many times.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Perhaps we differ. Members can see that, although the hon. member and I are of the same party, we differ; and that is a good thing. It is a wonderful thing. I regret that this Bill should have been introduced at this time. I will not be affected by it; and I know members will say, "You need not take it. You can give it to charity." That is not the point. It is a question of whether it is right or wrong.

My mother was not clever, but she always said that she lived by one abiding principle—she would never argue with brilliant people, and she met many—that if a thing is right one does it; and if it is not, one does not do it. Nothing would alter her view. She would not listen to any argument at all, and she refused to argue with a brilliant uncle of mine. She

used to say, "It is no good arguing with me because I know you can beat me at that. I know I am right, and therefore I will do it."

That is a very high principle and one that should be adopted by many. By jingo, it stands out in one's life, right through! And if one can carry it out—I am not suggesting that I do—one has attained heaven on earth, because one fears nobody—nothing. I think we are unduly using the power we have to take for ourselves something to which we are not fully entitled.

**HON. L. A. LOGAN** (Midland) [12.13 a.m.]: Mr. Craig endeavoured to make us bow our heads in shame because we are legislating in regard to our own salaries. We in this House are not responsible for that state of affairs. The Bill was introduced in another place and sent to this Chamber for us to discuss. So we have to use the power which Mr. Craig said we have.

Perhaps it is unfortunate that the two members who have spoken somewhat disparagingly about our salaries do not require their parliamentary salaries for their well-being.

**Hon. H. Hearn**: I think that is possibly fortunate.

**Hon. L. A. LOGAN**: It is also fortunate that the two members concerned are not placed in the same position, in which the Country Party members find themselves, of having to keep two homes going. Both these members return home every night of the week and enjoy their family surroundings; but the Country Party members are away from home for five nights of the week.

**Hon. L. Craig**: I lived in the country for 20 years.

**Hon. L. A. LOGAN**: It is apparent that since the hon. member has been in the city he has forgotten what he had to go through during that period.

I agree that £700 might be a bit steep, and it is possible that the retrospective payment is not good in principle. But to break the only argument that Mr. Watson used, if the Bill had been introduced at the beginning of the session and retrospective payment made to the 24th December, we would be getting as much now as we would have with the retrospective pay. So it does not make much difference.

When I entered Parliament, in an endeavour to give service to the people of the State, I sacrificed quite a lot. I would point out to members that over the last five years my bank account has gone into the red, because I have endeavoured to serve the people I represent. I make no secret about the fact that my account is in the red. Mr. Craig suggested that we merely come into the House and sit down

to study a few Bills. Had I done that it is possible that I would have been able to put some money away.

But because I accepted the job of serving the people I represent, and because I endeavoured to do that job to the best of my ability, am I to be denied the eminence of the position I hold? I think it is wrong to ask it of me. I have no hesitation in supporting the Bill.

I agree with Mr. Watson that the payment of an extra amount to what might be termed the Leader of the Opposition in this House is wrong in principle. It would immediately break down the tradition that has existed in this House for 120 odd years. Although he does not occupy an official position as such, the hon. member concerned at present does carry out that work for his party, and goes to a lot of trouble in doing so. He does a lot of research, and I am sure members will agree that he puts in a great amount of work in the preparation of his speeches.

But I doubt that the amount of work he carries out is worth the extra £400 provided in the Bill. I would go so far as to say that a lot of that work could be shared by his fellow members if they were prepared to do it.

If we were to establish the principle of a Leader of the Opposition in this House our status as a House of review, as pointed out by Mr. Watson, would immediately vanish. I do not wish to belong to any party, whether it be the Opposition or the Government, where I have to do what I am told. I did not come into this House for that purpose, and I hope the day will never arrive when it is necessary for me to do that; because when I have to forsake a principle for somebody else's ideas, I will immediately get out.

I think I can honestly say that members of the Country Party in this Chamber look to no one as their leader. Whatever legislation might be introduced is studied, and each one of us decides what his attitude will be. That has always been the case with us, as it was with Mr. Craig. He is elected as an L.C.L. member; and in this House he has the right—and is expected to have it—to vote according to his conscience. That is exactly what we do.

If we make this a party House we will immediately break down that tradition, and I would be sorry to see that happen. That is the effect that the particular amendment in the Bill will have, and I do not propose to support it. Once again I would point out that in the case of those of us who have only our parliamentary salaries to rely on, with no other income, to do the job that is expected of us, surely the people whom we represent expect us to be paid for it. Fortunately the reaction on this occasion to the Press publicity given to the Bill has been entirely different from what it has been in the past.

When I first entered Parliament and the question of salary increases came up, headline news was made. The reaction of the public was rather critical. During my eight years in this House, I have endeavoured to impress on people the necessity for members of Parliament to be paid a fair and just remuneration. On this occasion not one person has criticised the action of members of Parliament. People have had a good-natured gibe at me, but everyone has agreed that I would be foolish not to accept the increase.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: They say it is long overdue.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The answer is simple. If an employer were to offer a person £2,100 a year for his services when he was getting only £1,600 at present, he would be foolish not to take it, if the services he was able to give fitted in with his way of life. Because Parliament as a whole has offered £2,100 a year to members, I see no reason why it should not be accepted. I hope that the Bill will be passed, but that the clause dealing with the payment to the Leader of the Opposition in this House will be withdrawn.

HON. L. C. DIVER (Central) [12.24 a.m.]: It is with a keen sense of responsibility to my fellow-members that I rise to speak on this Bill. Somewhat like Mr. Craig, I am looked upon as one having a reasonable income from outside sources. I would like to assure members that the private income could dry up quick and lively and I would be in no better position than many of the members in this House.

I know of no other institution anywhere where the servants can fix their own remuneration. It grieves me to think that I have to speak in this manner. As I have stated, I am at present a little more fortunate than some of the other members; but at the same time, I consider that some tribunal should be appointed to adjust the salaries of members of Parliament, upwards or downwards, according to the economic condition of the country.

Hon. H. Hearn: The matter would still have to come before Parliament after a recommendation had been made. An enabling Bill must be passed.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: Surely that can be overcome in some other way! When there is an adjustment to the salaries of civil servants, this Parliament does not deal with the matter. We should realise that members of Parliament are servants of the people. So why should not some similar tribunal fix our salaries?

Hon. H. Hearn: That is done in some of the States, but there is still the necessity to pass an enabling Bill.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: If that is the position, the same procedure could be followed here. I feel very keenly at being asked to pass a Bill giving a tremendous rise in

salaries, especially after having heard some members speak about the unfortunate people outside Parliament. I suppose that many members of this House have at some time during their lives been on a very small income and have lived under hard conditions.

A member is elected to Parliament to represent the people. We should not expect to come here and live a life of luxury. We should be prepared to make sacrifices when we are elected. For those reasons I feel that the proposed increased allowances border on excessive lavishness. If the increases had been recommended by some independent tribunal, I might have felt justified in accepting them.

I say candidly that I have pangs of conscience in accepting the increases. I consider that I discharge my duties as well as the average member of this House. But while we deny other members of the community an increase in wages; while the Arbitration Court has refused increases in the basic wage; while old-age pensioners are not getting the consideration they deserve; and while civilian widows are not receiving the treatment they have a right to expect, what right have we to put our hands out for more money? We should not, even at the cost of our own position deteriorating a little. I did not wish to raise my voice for or against this measure without making those remarks. I have made up my mind to do certain things to clear up my conscience.

HON. SIR CHARLES LATHAM (Central) [12.30 a.m.]: I certainly cannot allow members to get away with some of the statements that have been made without being prepared to voice my feelings toward this Bill. I am definitely going to oppose the measure. True, there is something to be said in its favour from the fact that it has been introduced just before a general election. This will give the electors an opportunity, in regard to the members of another place and later one-third of the members of this House, of deciding whether there are people better qualified to represent them. If they can find more highly qualified representatives who can express the views of a majority of their numbers better than those who now represent them, they will have a chance to make a change.

I consider that the salary proposed for members is far too high. It is only a little while since I applauded the Arbitration Court for not increasing the basic wages for the workers, and I did so because I appreciated the effort to place our finances upon a more stable basis. This proposed increase in salary for members, however, will do exactly what I have been anxious to avoid. When I look back, I feel that I am no worse off financially than when I entered Parliament in 1921 and received a salary of £300 a year. Just after that, it was increased to £400, and

now it is proposed to pay me £2,100 and emoluments in addition to that. I think the proposal is out of all proportion to the value of the work I did when I first entered Parliament.

I consider that members will be doing wrong if they increase their salaries by the amount proposed. I know that my opposition will be very unpopular, but members need have no fear because a majority will vote for the Bill. However, I would feel that I was a coward and not honest if I did not express my views in the way I have done. All such increases without additional service given in return must affect the value of money and must have an effect on the financial system.

One point to be borne in mind is that, when the increase is granted, members will pay considerably more by way of income tax and will thus make a larger contribution towards the funds, of which the State is so short. Thus income tax rates will be increased and some of the money will be paid back to the Treasury. I would prefer to receive a small salary free of income tax.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: The same here.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: If I vote against the Bill, will other members do likewise and support the introduction of a measure for that purpose?

Several members interjected.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I am quite aware that we have handed over our income taxation powers to the Commonwealth and that it would still impose a tax, but on a salary of £600 or £700 a year, there would not be a great deal of taxation to pay. However, I set out to express my views, and there is nothing to compel me to accept the increase if I do not want to.

I consider it unwise to make this increase. I am not aware that members are very hard up. If a man is paid £5,000 a year, he can spend it just as easily as he can spend £2,000. There is always an avenue for expenditure, and no trouble whatever in spending one's money. There are lots of things on which I spend money and which I could well do without if I were more careful, and I dare say the same remark applies to other members. I intend to vote against the second reading and call for a division.

HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Surburban) [12.35 a.m.]: The debate on this measure is proving to be very interesting and the remarks of various speakers have reflected their feelings toward this proposal. It has been stated by some members that they do not earn their salaries. Well, I suggest that they are the best judges of that. For the work I do in my province, I believe that I earn my salary, but I cannot see that that has much bearing on the Bill before us.

There has been an unfortunate side to the debate as it has developed this evening in that party politics has once again been introduced. Democracy is a fine thing, and in a Parliament such as ours, we have an assemblage of people gathered from all sections of the community and elected for the purpose of representing the people. The opinions that have been expressed represent the particular point of view of each speaker.

Some members have referred to this place as a house of review. Personally, that is how I regard it, and I think that the various votes I have cast for and against the Government indicate how I feel. Other members have said that this House is an institution that should be abolished, but our bicameral system of government has been tried over a long period of years and has proved to be most successful.

On the question raised by Mr. Diver that some authority should have made a recommendation in regard to a salary increase for members, I should like to inform members that the party to which I belong made a recommendation to the Treasurer—I cannot give the exact words in which it was couched—to the effect that the responsibility for considering the question of members' salaries should be vested in an authority completely divorced from Parliament itself, and that the recommendation should then be referred to the Government.

It appears that the Government has taken the overall position of members throughout Australia and struck an average. I view with some concern the retrospective clause in the Bill, which will result in the payment being dated back for nearly 12 months, but I point out that had this measure been brought down some six months ago, as was first intended, the increase would have been granted then.

I think the defeat of this Bill would be an extreme disappointment to some members on both sides of the House. Whatever the duties of a member of Parliament were when elections were first held for this House, they have changed completely in recent years. If, as we are given to understand, some members have incomes that free them from the necessity of drawing parliamentary salaries, that is their good fortune. But I think that everybody will agree that on being elected to this House or another place, one's first responsibility irrespective of one's outside interests or income, is to the House. I find that the province I represent not only gives me a responsibility to this House but keeps me a very busy man outside of it also.

Very soon after I was elected to another place, a prominent Labour member said to me, "You will do certain work, which it is your duty to perform inside the House, but you will also be called upon

to do a great deal of work in your electorate." I have found that to be the case. Very early in the mornings, sometimes, until late at night, my responsibilities take me from one place to another. I cannot help it if some members feel that the responsibilities they have in their electorates are different from mine. Nevertheless, that is the position.

Some members, particularly those in the country, represent large areas. You, yourself, Mr. President, have a large district to represent. We have to maintain a certain standard, and run motorcars. Every member is a sitting shot for donations of every description. If a member were to introduce a Bill making it illegal for a member of Parliament to make donations, it would, perhaps, alter our salaries position; it would alter mine substantially.

I want to mention the debate that has taken place on the term "Leader of the Opposition," which has been lightly used. I have no desire to see this House tagged as a party House. I do not say this offensively of the Chief Secretary, but I compliment him on the ability he has of having his supporters always finding that he is right.

The Chief Secretary: That will be the day!

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It does appear that they see in the Chief Secretary some sublime righteousness which makes them follow him religiously in most of the things he introduces.

The Chief Secretary: It shows that the Opposition think he is a devil, because they are always against him.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The members of the Opposition are up against the Chief Secretary on the question of principle; and political parties are made up of principles. Nevertheless I do not want to see this House with that branded tag because I feel that on many occasions I was right in agreeing with something that the Government did. Because of the freedom I enjoy as a member of my party, it is my privilege to vote with the Government. But this is not a question concerning Mr. Simpson or any particular member by name, but the member chosen to fill the position of leader of the party or leader of the members—

Hon. H. Hearn: Not in Government.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, the leader of the members not in Government. Members know that a great deal of work has to be done in connection with the Bills that come before the House. We only have to look at those in front of us at the moment to realise that, because 66 Bills have been brought down this session; and, in addition, we have since received other messages, and I know that there will be still others. In his capacity of leader of

the members not in Government, Mr. Simpson puts in a great deal of time and effort in connection with his task.

I would be sorry to see an attempt made—but of course it probably will be made!—as a result of this clause which the Government has included, which recognises his additional efforts, to brand this House as a party House. I see not the slightest necessity for it. We know that in this House there are three parties—the Labour Party, the Liberal and Country League, and the Country and Democratic League. The last two share almost identical principles but the other has almost opposite principles.

If, after the election next year, the Government does happen to change—that is in the hands of the electors, in spite of the Chief Secretary's assurance that it will not change—then those people who are on the other side will immediately come over here. I hope that if that is the case, the legislation that comes to this House can be viewed by the present Chief Secretary and the members who support him in an unbiased manner for the good of the State.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: When your Government was in power, we were its supporters.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: True, in many respects. That, perhaps, will add to the support of the case. I do not think members should fear—I repeat I hope we have no grounds for fear—that as a result of supporting this clause, the House will be branded in any way.

HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) (12.47 a.m.): I support the second reading of the Bill, and I shall state my reasons, because members may recall that last time there was an increase in members' salaries, by a Bill brought before the House, I opposed it. The reason for my opposition at the time was that I thought we were unjustified in seeking to increase our salaries when it was just after an election, and there had been a change of Government; and particularly as the Treasurer of the day was diligent in pointing out how the previous Government had left the Treasury bare and there was insufficient money to do all the jobs that had to be done. I felt that that being the position we could not, after having just come from the electors, increase our salaries.

A good feature of the legislation before us tonight is that it has come here just before the House goes out of session, and just before we go to the electors. It is at least a more honest proposition than the previous one; because if the measure is passed and our salaries are increased, we will be going before the electors, and they can offer whatever criticism they like; and if we have done the wrong thing, they can send someone else here in our place.

On the previous occasion, I stated that even if the increase was made, I would not accept it for that financial year because of the Treasurer's plea that money was wanted and the Treasury was broke. I did not receive any, and I think the only person who got to know about it told me I was a fool, with an adjective in front of the word "fool," for what I did.

That was the only opinion I received, so I will not be a fool again in refusing any increase that might be made, although I believe the suggested rise is a little steep. I feel that if we had increased our salaries by £400, that would have been what we could have justifiably expected. I know that those who have only their parliamentary salaries upon which to keep themselves, raise their families and live as they are expected to live, have been finding it a little difficult to do so, and that is particularly so in the case of a member who works hard and travels considerable distances—as some do—especially in country areas. I have no experience of what is expected of city members, other than to travel around, meet people and do many things for them; and I do not know what are the costs involved.

I know, however, that members who run motorcars and travel considerably in the country find it expensive, if they do the job as it should be done. That is altogether contrary to the view of Mr. Craig, who suggested that we are here only to review legislation and study Bills, finally passing our judgment accordingly; because I feel we are called upon, in addition, to know what the people we represent want, and to know them personally. If we do not move from the metropolitan area, we cannot know the requirements of the people in the country; and so we are obliged to see them at times, meet as many of them as possible, and hear their views, in order to be in a better position to review the legislation which comes before us in the light of the effect it will have on the community as a whole.

Like Mr. Craig, I think much time and study should be given to the legislation that comes before us, as otherwise we would not be able to pass sound judgment on it; and if the consideration of measures is left to one or two members, it becomes an impossible task. I know that in our own little team, we split up the work as far as possible, each taking two or three Bills to investigate and see how they measure up to the standards necessary to suit the community generally.

It has been suggested by some members that the increase is not needed. Mr. Diver may be more fortunate than certain others. Possibly I am also more fortunate than some; but if I continue to be a farmer, and the price of farm produce goes still further down, I may yet be worse off than many others here, and have a hefty overdraft. However, if any member feels he is

receiving money that he does not need, there is nothing to prevent him giving it to some charitable organisation and thus relieving the strain on the Government purse in some respect, while helping a worthy cause.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Like me for instance.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I will remember the hon. member at any time if I feel I have 5s. to spare. I believe that the additional £228, or whatever it is, is not justified; but I will not oppose it.

One clause which I will oppose vigorously is that providing for an allowance for the Leader of the Opposition in this House. I feel it would be a retrograde step to make such a definite division here between the Government side and a distinct Opposition. Like Mr. Craig and other members, if I feel that my judgment is contrary to that of some of my colleagues, I will cross the floor of the House and vote as my conscience directs me. I have seen members on the Government side exercising their judgment in certain matters and crossing the floor of the House.

Unless our party views are at variance or absolutely conflict on some question, I believe we should exercise our judgment in fairness to the community generally; and if we are asked to support legislation that will benefit only a small minority, I think we would be wrong to disregard all other sections of the community.

I would hate to see this Chamber like another place, a House with a definite Government party and a definite Opposition, and so I will vigorously oppose the provision I have mentioned, while recognising, as other members do, the great work Mr. Simpson has done and that done by his predecessors.

HON. H. HEARN (Metropolitan) [12.58 a.m.]: I did not intend to speak to this measure; but, in view of the way the debate has developed, I cannot cast a silent vote. I wish first to congratulate Mr. Watson on his very able speech, and to congratulate Mr. Craig on his swan song. He touched some very high notes; and once or twice I wondered whether I was really in Parliament, or listening to a preacher from the pulpit. I am sure Mr. Craig's speech will go down in the history of this House, seeing that he was able to tell us not to take more money, on the eve of his own retirement from Parliament.

Much has been said about the difference in financial position among members in this Chamber. I assure members that we should never worry about that aspect because, after all, the Taxation Department looks after those of us who are fortunate enough to have incomes apart from our parliamentary salaries.

I wish also to mention the method by which the Government entered into negotiations concerning this increase. I think

it must have been a common practice; but at all events I recall being at one meeting of my own party, where the Treasurer sent down a complete statement of what he then intended to do, and asked us to consider it and give a reply to the Government. The question was debated and we made a suggestion concerning an outside tribunal; but we also said unanimously that if this was all he could offer, we would take it, although we felt it should have been more and granted by an outside tribunal.

I am not revealing any party secrets when I say that. That was the position as far as our party was concerned; and if other members of other parties will reveal tonight what happened in the party room it will be found that, almost unanimously, the various parties both in this and in another place suggested that the increase was long overdue.

I believe that the question of payment must be regarded in the light of pre-war values; that is the measuring rod in industry today. Mr. Craig told us something about the huge salaries that he had to deal with in paying executive officers. That comes within my ambit, too; so I will refer members to 1939 values. Members of Parliament have to pay their election expenses, do their job with all the vigour at their command and, as outlined by Mr. Craig, do the work in their constituencies, and maintain their position in the community—and all for the sum of £700 a year, using 1939 values!

I believe we will be assessed by the public at the rate at which we assess ourselves; and if any member can tell me that his conscience will prick if he has to take the equivalent of £700 a year, 1939 value, and do his job properly, I would like to hear from him and know how he arrives at that conclusion. As I said when I spoke on a similar measure previously, it is immaterial to me whether the Bill goes through or not. But I believe we have to get back to the central point: that before this measure came to the House the parties knew it was coming forward and must have subscribed to it. Let us be fair about it!

Does any member say that £700 a year, on 1939 values, is too much, particularly when we are all stressing, in every political party, the fact that we do not get the right type of man in Parliament and that we want good men? How are we ever going to get them if we do not make it possible for men to enter that career? I feel we should face up to the position; and before I sit down I want to say one word concerning the man who leads those whose party is not in Government.

I recognise that there are two parties in this House which are not in Government; and, session after session, the work done by the man who leads the parties not in power is considerable. If members are

going to say that that work is not worth some extra recognition, then they are being grossly unfair, particularly when we realise that provision is made to pay an extra allowance to the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Country Party and, in certain circumstances, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in another place.

We are only playing with words when we say that this job is one that we should take on cheerfully. Is it not lovely to say that we will take it on cheerfully and then leave it to someone else!

Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is quite right.

Hon. H. HEARN: Let us be fair about it! I believe I take my fair share of the work; but I do not do a half, or even a quarter, of the work that Mr. Simpson does. That is true of every member in the two parties. Let us look at the matter fairly. I say, without any hesitation, that I shall support the Bill.

HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [1.5 a.m.]: Like Mr. Hearn I did not intend to say anything on this measure, but when I was told that the calling of a division would make my vote known I decided to speak. I would like to say here and now that I am not ashamed in any way of the decision I have decided to make in regard to the Bill. I have said many times in this House that a member of Parliament must be established in his true position and I do not see how any man can be established in his true position, and do the work that is necessary in the community, if he does not receive an adequate emolument.

Frankly, I would like to bow my head to many of the men in both Houses who have been able to carry on at the present salary, do their work, travel through their districts, contribute to various organisations and then come here and look respectable individuals. I know quite well that if I had entered Parliament and had been prepared to take the salary offered, without continuing my professional practice, I would have been of much less use than I have been, and I know that my family would have suffered; they would not have had the opportunities that I have been able to give them.

I doubt very much if the public would ask us to come here and allow our families to suffer the injustice that I have mentioned. I know quite well that I would not have been able to do anything like the public work I have been able to do, in the various spheres in which I exert my peculiar activities, had I entered Parliament and accepted only the salary offered.

I have no hesitation in congratulating the Government on bringing down this measure and on establishing for members of Parliament a salary which is adequate. If I remember rightly I said, the last time a similar measure was introduced, that if

the salary of members of Parliament continued to be tied to the basic wage it would eventually bring difficulties which we would have to face. They have now arrived at our door and we are facing a position where some members say that the salary increases are to steep. The rise is only steep because previous rises were totally inadequate.

As everyone knows I am not dependent upon my parliamentary salary. But, as Mr. Hearn said, the Taxation Department will look after it; and, in fact, the additional salary may be a burden to both Mr. Hearn and me for the next 12 months. But I am not going to deprive members of either House of the salary necessary to carry out adequately the tasks they have and to enable them to assume in the community their rightful places as the people who are making the laws of this country.

I have said repeatedly that I believe it is essential that if we are to do our work we should know our State, and we cannot do that unless we can afford to travel. I believe it is even more essential that we should know Australia, and possibly other parts of the world outside Australia, if we are to have a broad enough mind to speak on the debates in this House. So I have no hesitation in saying that I am extremely pleased the Government has introduced a measure which, for a long time to come, will keep the salaries of members of Parliament stable, without witnessing the sorry spectacle that we have witnessed in the past with the granting of small rises which have been attached to the basic wage.

We must face reality, I feel, because I realise that when I first entered this place it was a House of review, but in latter years it has become less a House of review since, when we have an increased number of individuals in the House who are obliged to vote solidly as a phalanx, we lose something the loss of which I deplore. However, I also realise that if measures are to be handled properly we must look to someone in the House to give us a lead.

I, frankly, believe the lead given by one person in this Chamber has been too heavy a duty in the past, and I think a greater sharing of that work could be undertaken. Nevertheless I admire the duties that have been performed by one who has become a leader on the Opposition side of the House; and that while members receive a rise in salary in order to make themselves more adequately fitted for their task, I would not deprive that man from being properly rewarded for the work he has carried out. In view of the volume of work he has performed in the past, I say quite frankly that it would be impossible for him to earn anything in addition from any outside activity, and therefore it would be quite unfair if we did not give him some extra remuneration for his services.

I admit I do not like the title appearing in the Bill, and if someone can suggest a more appropriate title I am sure I will be in agreement with it, but I sincerely believe that the member in question should be rewarded for the work he has done in this House.

**HON. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM** (South-East) [1.13 a.m.]: I think I can nominate now the one speech that has been delivered tonight that will receive some measure of publicity in tomorrow's Press. Unfortunately, this Bill will receive the same type of publicity from the Press that has been given to similar measures in the past. Recently the principal newspaper that is published in my own province ran an editorial—

Hon. L. A. Logan: That is a good paper.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: Yes; it is a good paper in normal circumstances. But in this instance the editorial was run by a man who is the sub-editor, and who probably receives hundreds of pounds more remuneration than a member of Parliament. He labelled this measure a money-grab. He went on to say that members of Parliament would receive £700 back pay, and, since the Bill has been introduced, the usual claptrap has been published. That is the type of publicity which, unfortunately, always occurs when a measure similar to this is introduced in Parliament. I believe the public accepts a member of Parliament at his own valuation.

Members who have spoken against this Bill tonight, in the main, have not only been in the fortunate position of being able to admit that they have no actual need of this increase in salary; but also strangely enough, almost without exception, those members also are in the very happy position of representing a province which practically guarantees them a continued tenure of office. If members will reflect for a moment on the speeches that have already been made they will find that that is quite true. Few of those members have had to fight an election since assuming office. Therefore, they have a definite advantage over other members in the House.

Let me digress a little. As far as I can remember, I have only once, as a member of Parliament, ever been called to order, shall I say, by members of my party, and that was comparatively recently when I missed several sittings in this House. As I am practically a new member for the second time, I felt I had to catch up with the knowledge I needed relating to the requirements of the province I represent. I had been absent from this House for some time.

Unlike some members, I believe that sitting in this House and studying Bills is not our principal duty. Most members who enter this place have qualifications and



qualities that fit them for certain duties, and some of them have a flair for analysing Bills and studying their provisions. They may have some peculiar aptitude for that type of work. On the other hand, some members, like myself, leave such work to others in order to perform duties for which they are more fitted. Therefore, I am of the opinion that the members who give such detailed study to legislation are entitled to some extra emolument for that duty.

By doing so they permit me to give my time to the work I am more qualified to perform, which is to travel round my province and learn something of the problems of the people, so that I may enter this House with a greater knowledge of what is required by them and discuss with some sincerity any Bill which relates to the needs of my province. Also, such knowledge allows me to compare the needs and interests of my district with those of any other district. I consider that the knowledge I have gained in travelling round my province makes me a useful member. I believe I am more suited for that type of work than to sit in this Chamber and try to mull over questions that are strange to me.

I do not apologise for supporting this Bill. I do not think I have to justify my support of it. When I hear—as I did recently—a man admitting in public that an average worker on the Goldfields today can earn £1,000 or £1,500 a year without any trouble, I consider we are not valuing our own services very highly if we feel that, in return for our labours, we are not entitled to a similar reward. Not only do we have to keep our homes up to a normal standard, at least, but also we have many commitments which other people, on similar incomes, do not have.

In addition, many members in this House tonight, if they are returned to office or if they continue in office will, in the future, have a far greater area to cover than they have at present. To carry out those duties properly—and that is part of our job—their travelling costs must, of necessity, be high. I have already said that we have to keep two homes. The reason for that is that many members are absent in the country for a week or a fortnight at a time and they not only have to meet their normal domestic expenditure but also have to meet the cost of travelling and the maintenance of a car.

Roughly my province conforms to about the entire size of Victoria; and with two colleagues, it is my job to become known over the whole length and breadth of that area, so that people can come to me when they are in strife. When that stage is reached, I believe I will have become a useful member of this House; and I cannot do that without spending a great amount of money. That need is a very great one for most members of this House.

Another phase of the argument is that there are expenses involved not only as they apply to the natural need for members to live a normal life, but as they affect the work members must do outside the House. It may be necessary for them to travel many thousands of miles, and it may take many months of research to glean two or three simple facts about which they must be sure before they bring them to this House for advice and information.

After all that time has been spent in research, such matters are brought to the House; and in a few minutes, the result of work that has taken months to complete, has been submitted to the Chamber. The suggestions offered may or may not be used; but the result of those few minutes would cost members many pounds, and they may not get anything out of it. Only a dozen people in the constituency would know the work that was involved; and it is work that must be carried out if members are sincere.

I would like to be in the happy position of some members who have spoken. I would like not to have to worry about whether I would fight an election in three years' time or not, or whether I would win or not. That is a happy position to be in, and I certainly would like to enjoy it, though I do not expect I ever shall.

The Minister for the North-West: It is a costly affair.

Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I admit I enjoy the work I am doing, but I would like to be given what I consider reasonable payment. I believe in a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. I do not apologise to anyone for accepting this increase, because I am sure the people in my district would say that I have earned it as much as members in other districts who, I know, have earned it. I repeat I do not apologise nor will I try to justify my acceptance of it. It is long overdue and I support the measure.

HON. J. McI. THOMSON (South) [1.25 a.m.]: I am afraid the trend of the debate has brought me to my feet, particularly in view of my attitude last session in regard to a similar measure. On that occasion I opposed any increase in the parliamentary allowances for the reason that the basic wage was pegged, and accordingly I did not think the time was opportune for an increase.

From my personal experience of the last 12 months, and on reflecting back over the time I have been in Parliament, I find I have travelled extensively throughout the length and breadth of the province I represent; and were it not for the fact that I have other sources of income, I would definitely have been out of pocket in attempting to carry out the duties which, as a member of Parliament, I claim I am bound to carry out. Accordingly I

would like to make it clear in the early stages of my remarks that I support this Bill to increase the parliamentary allowances and salaries.

I do so because I appreciate what is involved in carrying out parliamentary duties efficiently. As members know, these duties are not confined to attending this Chamber and considering legislation. It is necessary for us to travel and meet our constituents wherever they may be. To do that properly is a costly undertaking. One only has to reflect back over the period one has been in Parliament to appreciate what is entailed in the travelling expenses one incurs, in the hotel expenses involved, and in the other incidental expenses that are inevitable.

With previous speakers, I agree that the public will judge us by the value we place on ourselves. It is the duty of all members of Parliament not only to carry out their functions here, but to do so in all corners of their constituencies. It requires a lot of money to do that. The increase appears to be steep on this occasion—and no doubt it is. I for one consider that we could do without the retrospective payment, and I will be prepared to lend my support to any move against it.

I whole-heartedly agree with the proposal to provide an extra amount for the Leader of the Opposition in this House. I do not think the provision of an extra sum for the Leader of the Opposition is going to make this House any more a party House than it is at present. I regret to say that since I have been here I have seen this House rapidly become a party House. We must continue to endeavour to keep it a House of review; it must be a non-party House as far as possible. The hour is late and I did not intend to rise, but the trend of the debate impelled me to do so. I support the second reading.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. G. Fraser—West—in reply) [1.30 a.m.]: I was surprised to learn of the number of members who had their heads in the sand. By saying this I know I shall offend some members; but their attitude was unrealistic, and they did not face up to facts. They implied that I had powers which I have never possessed, which I do not now possess and which I am not likely to possess.

Members of my political colour are just as free to use their judgment in this House as any other member. In fact, I go further and say they are freer; because, except for some principles, they are at liberty to vote whichever way they desire. I do not think that we can be accused of voting on party lines.

People would not be members of our political organisation if they did not believe in our principles. The mere fact that members opposite have referred to principles implies that this is a House of

party politics. Where there is no principle concerned this becomes a House of review in our case. Where principles are concerned this is definitely a House of party politics. We have to face up to that fact. Having done that, we must ask this question: What sort of a House would it be if there were a Government party without an Opposition? Would that benefit the State?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: The method worked very well in road boards and municipalities.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY:** That is entirely different. Those authorities administer Acts; but here the members make the Acts. It would be futile to have a Government without an Opposition party. In dealing with this question Mr. Watson weakened on this point and said that he was only opposed to the word "Opposition." I do not care what the Opposition is called as long as it is recognised that somebody, apart from the two Ministers here, is looked on as having to do more than the average member. It would suit me if there were no Opposition in this House and if the members opposite were a rabble. But they are not. They have been well and truly led. If that be the case, why should they not have a recognised leader?

There are one or two points I wish to clear up. Some reference has been made to the £228. Should members treat this on a different basis? Has not every wage-earner and salaried officer been paid a marginal increase, irrespective of his position, retrospective to the 24th December, 1954? Having agreed to that, why should members of Parliament not receive retrospectivity to the same date? Why should we agree that because the allowances had not been adjusted six months previously the increases should commence only from this date?

The same principle of retrospectivity was applied in another Bill which will be dealt with shortly. The principle of treating everyone alike should be adopted in the Bill before us. We are entitled to expect the marginal increases to apply from the date they were first granted. In legislation coming before us for consideration, why should we deny ourselves our just rights? I have no hesitation in recommending that the Bill be passed in its present form.

It was mentioned by Mr. Watson that all we should get were the allowances; but everyone whose salary or wage has been adjusted and who received marginal increases has also received another increase on top of that. The hon. member has not, to my knowledge in the last two or three years, raised this point when referring to the salaries of the judiciary. When that measure is dealt with, will he say that the marginal increases should not be applied retrospectively?

Hon. H. K. Watson: I have contended that for years judges have been underpaid in this State.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We, as members, are underpaid.

Hon. H. K. Watson: The positions are not comparable.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: They are the same.

Hon. H. K. Watson: Members of Parliament can run betting shops, but the judges cannot.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That does not alter the position that the treatment for all should be on the same basis. If I were preaching a sermon I would take the text referred to by Mr. Craig when he talked about how his mother looked at things and how she told him to always consider first, "Is it fair and is it right?" That is the very attitude adopted by the Government. Before it got down to figures it considered whether it was right to legislate for increased allowances for members in this State to bring them into line with increases granted in other Parliaments in Australia. The Government decided it was right and introduced a Bill.

I offer no apologies to anyone. As a Government representative I say the Government has endeavoured to do the right and proper thing towards members. The Government has done that not only in regard to retrospectivity but also in regard to the increased allowances. I shall not hold the House up any longer. I feel confident that members will agree to the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

Hon. W. R. Hall in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

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

That the proposed new Subsection (3b) on page 4 be struck out.

This is the provision to grant an allowance to the recognised Leader of the Opposition in the Council. It is quite unnecessary for me to repeat the reasons that I have already given. Neither is it necessary for me to assure Mr. Simpson that my opposition is in no way personal but is based on principle. I am simply concerned with the principle of there being a Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber, and I certainly would not like to be lined up as a member of an Opposition party.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: During the second reading, this subject was referred to by a number of members, and I am very grateful for the kindly references made to me. My asking for this has been not on my own account but for the sake of the Chamber, because I have long believed that it should rank higher as a constituent unit in the parliamentary system than it has done over the years. Perhaps it is unfortunate that, this being a House of review, we do not get the same Press as does the sister Chamber, because for the most part, Bills are initiated in that place and when they reach here they are no longer news.

Whether I occupy the position or whether it be a Labour member or a Country Party member makes no difference. It is the principle of the importance of this Chamber that I have had firmly in mind. Some time ago, it was realised that there was need for some coherence, understanding and consultation between parties. There had to be a point of contact. Members of the Government, under this arrangement, could come to me and ask what I was going to do about some of the business. That has been a practical approach to the problem and has worked very well.

It is nonsense to say that we do not enter this House under a party banner. We all do. However, there is a difference which we regard very jealously, namely, that while we abide by the principles on which we were elected, we still reserve the right on certain questions to exercise our discretion and sometimes to diverge from party lines.

We are fortunate in the system that has developed. In Queensland, there is no Legislative Council so the question does not arise there. In Tasmania, there are 19 members of the Upper House, of whom 15 are Independents, so the question does not arise there. In New South Wales and Victoria, however, provision is made for this position and a statutory allowance is provided for it. In South Australia, the same position may develop because I have the report of a debate in the Upper House there where the accepted Leader of the Liberal Party has for a long time been regarded as Leader of the Opposition.

The Chief Secretary: They have no qualms about calling it Leader of the Opposition there.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: No. He is recognised as Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council and that has been approved by the Premier, and the member in question was awarded the C.M.G. for his services.

At the first party meeting after a change of Government, I was honoured by being asked to accept the leadership of our party in this House. I was proud to accept it. I hold the view that anyone in that position has to sacrifice any idea of being able

to earn emoluments outside. It simply cannot be done. Members who have private interests may place them first and take a different view, but that is not altogether fair to the one called upon to assume the responsibilities and carry out the duties essential to the position.

I feel something like a *de facto* wife, with all the obligations and none of the privileges or entitlements. That describes the position; and naturally, like a *de facto* wife, I should like to have it regularised. Consequently, I believe that in the interests of the prestige of this Chamber, the position should be recognised.

Some time ago Dr. Hislop told us that in South Australia there is a system under which statutory committees have been appointed, and members of all parties in both Houses are elected to those committees to do certain jobs. I believe that his idea is a good one. It has had several beneficial effects. It has enabled ambitious members, by being elected to these committees, to serve an apprenticeship for something better that might come later. It was done to give them something over and above their parliamentary salary; to augment their ordinary income.

I have made this explanation because I feel it is due to me and to the Chamber. I took my colleagues into my confidence and mentioned the matter to Sir Charles Latham and to Mr. Logan. I pointed out that as far as our party numbers were concerned it meant a change of only one for the Leader of one party to become automatically the Leader of the other. That is my approach to the position, and I think it is a sensible and practical one. I hope that the Committee will accept the clause and not the amendment.

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

Ayes	.....	7
Noes	.....	19
Majority against	.....	12

#### Ayes.

Hon. L. Craig	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. Sir Chas. Latham	(Teller.)

#### Noes.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. J. McI. Thomson
Hon. H. Hearn	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. J. G. Hislop
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Hon. H. K. Watson: Is this all one clause?

The CHAIRMAN: The clause has been agreed to.

Hon. H. K. Watson: What about clause 6?

The CHAIRMAN: It is a subclause of Clause 3. The clause numbers in Bills are not shown in brackets.

Hon. H. K. Watson: Then I shall move to recommit the Bill.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment.

#### Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. H. K. Watson, Bill recommitted for the further consideration of Clause 3.

#### In Committee.

Hon. W. R. Hall in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of Bill.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

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

That Subclause (6) on pages 6 and 7 be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN: How far does the hon. member want his amendment to go?

Hon. H. K. WATSON: Down to the word "section" in line 26, page 7. This is the subclause which proposes to grant retrospectively varying amounts, at the rate of £228 for members of this Chamber and another place and proportionate amounts for Ministers and so on. I have already given my reasons for thinking this retrospective payment is unwarranted and I ask the Committee to vote against the subclause.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Bill again reported without amendment and the reports adopted.

#### Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and passed.

House adjourned at 2.3 a.m. (Thursday).