fruit growing centres throughout the State. The realisation of the danger was causing great concern to fruitgrowers, who had found that many fruits, previously thought to be immune or highly resistant to fruit-fly, were subject to infestation.

The Government decided to give effect to the suggestions put forward by this committee, which had advised what action should be taken to control and eradicate the pest. The Department of Agriculture, however, was of the opinion that it should be in a position to know the location where fruit trees were grown, not only for commercial use, but for private household purposes. To ensure the accuracy of this information, provision was made in the Bill for the registration, annually, of all places where one or more fruit trees or vines were growing. The Bill also proposed a nominal registration fee of one shilling, and from the revenue obtained was to be paid into a special fund (The Fruit Fly Eradication Trust Fund) the money which was to be utilised for the purpose of control and eradication of the pest.

This amendment to the Act was passed by Parliament, and in 1952 a further amending Act raised the nominal registration charge to two shillings, which is the fee charged at present. For some time now, there has been considerable pressure from both sides of the House, and a fair amount of public interest shown, in a proposal for the registration of orchards for a five-year period, instead of insistence on annual registration. The relevant Section of the Act specifies that application for registration of an orchard shall be made annually. The Bill now before the House provides for registration as prescribed, and if passed, will allow for registration of orchards in advance, and will also permit payment of an annual fee where the owner wishes to pay annually.

It is pointed out that some saving will be effected in cost of stationery, postage etc., when payments are made in advance for five years. If the Bill becomes law this proposed legislation will become effective as from the 1st July, 1959, as registration for the current year has already been effected on an annual basis. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Hon. F. D. Wilmott, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (the Minister for Railways—North): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 2.15 p.m. tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.11 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 3rd September, 1958.

CONTENTS

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

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Presentation.

The SPEAKER: I desire to announce that, accompanied by the member for Pilbara and the member for Murchison,

I waited upon His Excellency the Lieut.-Governor and presented the Address-in-reply to His Excellency's Speech at the opening of Parliament. His Excellency has been pleased to reply in the following terms:—

> Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly: I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen and for your Address-in-reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT.

Dairy Farms at Narrikup, etc.

1. The Hon. A. F. WATTS asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) How many war service land settlement dairy farms are now occupied in the Narrikup area?

(2) Is the rent of each such farm the same? If so, what is the amount? If not, what are the different amounts?

(3) How is the rent of such a farm calculated?

(4) Is the same system of calculation used in respect of W.S.L.S. dairy farms in other districts? If not, what are the differences?

(5) Is any interest payable on all or any part of the capital cost of each farm in addition to rent? If so, what is the rate of interest?

(6) What number of cows is carried on each of such farms or, alternatively, are any carrying less than 30 cows or more than 35?

(7) What is the estimated return from each cow?

(8) In estimating the figure asked for in No. (7), what price is allowed for butter fat per lb. and what return per cow is used for such calculation?

(9) What is the average annual liability of each farm in respect of—

(a) plant loan;

(b) structural improvements;

(c) stock loans?

(10) What would be the average amount of working expenses for such a dairy farm per year?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Eleven.

(2) No. I would point out that the farms are still under assessment and are paying a concessional rental.

(3) It is based on the productivity of the property.

(4) Yes, where the farm is not finally valued.

(5) On structures only at 3¾ per cent. per annum.

(6) Number of cows carried on the 11 farms concerned are: 47, 35, 34, 35, 35, 26, 40, 38, 26, 34 and 40.

(7) The estimated return is based on 180-200 lb. butterfat per cow.

(8) The estimated average price paid for butterfat during the season multiplied by the answer in No. (7).

(9) Stock and plant loans are varied according to the carrying capacity of the property, the system of management and the finances of the lessee

If the productivity of the farm is such as will enable full commitments to be paid the average loans on which repayments are made are:—Plant loan £2,200 spread over 10 years; structural improvements, £3,000 over 30 years; and stock loan £950 over 10 years, with interest in each case at 3¾ per cent.

Should the productivity be insufficient to pay full commitments, lower sums are fixed according to the assessed carrying capacity.

(10) This ranges from £1,365 to £1,720 per annum according to the number of cow units carried.

COTTON GROWING.

Inquiries for Suitable Land.

2. The Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Have any firm inquiries been received for land following the inspection by Mr. Isadore R. Machado of California of land west of Arrino in connection with the growing of cotton?

(2) If so, what area or areas are concerned?

(3) What other areas of the State were visited by Mr. Machado and with what result?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Mr. Machado inspected land west of Arrino but considered it unsuitable for his purpose.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) At Mullewa and an area between Northampton and Shark Bay. Mr. Machado has advised his intention to return to Western Australia for further investigation.

No. 3. This question was postponed.

RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK.

Soliciting Business.

4. Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON asked the Premier:

(1) Have officers or representatives of the R. & I. Bank entered Government departments during working hours, and interviewed civil servants with a view to soliciting business for their bank?

(2) What departments have received visits so far?

(3) Is this practice still continuing?

(4) If this has occurred, or is still occurring, will he explain whether this method of soliciting bank business was brought about by an instruction or direction issued by the Government?

(5) Are other banks to be given the opportunity of seeking business in a similar manner?

(6) Is there not a general ban or traditional ban on hawking or soliciting of business in Government departments?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) Yes—for savings business. Similar facilities have been extended to the national savings groups organisation.

(2) Most departments in the city since the savings bank has been established.

(3) Not at present.

(4) The Government does not instruct or direct its employees as to where they will bank.

(5) No, except through their interests in national savings groups.

(6) Yes.

School Branches.

5. Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Education:

(1) What steps, if any, have been taken in schools to oust or rival the Commonwealth Bank in the facilities it provides in favour of the Rural & Industries Bank?

(2) Have any attempts been made to set up branches, or branch facilities of the R. & I. Bank in primary, secondary or trade schools?

(3) If so, where have these attempts been made?

(4) In what places throughout the Education Department have—

(a) branches been formed;

(b) branch facilities been arranged?

(5) Is it intended that work done for the bank should be carried out by bank officials or by representatives of the Education Department, and if carried out by the latter, what payment is intended or has been suggested?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) None.

(2) No.

(3) R. & I. Savings Bank facilities have been established in a few technical schools not already serviced by the Commonwealth Bank.

(4) Answered by Nos. (2) and (3).

(5) The practice is that work done for the Commonwealth and the Rural & Industries Banks is carried out by officers of the Education Department and commission is paid to school funds.

DRIVE-IN THEATRES.

Traffic Lanes, Parking Lots, etc.

6. Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

(1) Under whose jurisdiction and control are regulations issued governing the construction of traffic lanes and parking lots for patrons using drive-in theatres?

(2) Who would be responsible for an accident occuring to—

(a) a patron's motor vehicle;

(b) personal injury to himself or members of his or her family?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH replied:

(1) In respect of the land comprising the drive-in theatre, the health authorities under section 178 of the Health Act; and in respect of the road, the Traffic authorities under the Traffic Act.

(2) (a) and (b) The person causing the damage. In the case of (a), the person concerned would probably be covered by a comprehensive insurance policy, and in the case of (b), he would be covered by third party insurance if the accident involved another vehicle.

INFANT HEALTH CENTRE.

Provision at North Innaloo.

7. Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minisetr for Health:

Owing to the urgent need for an infant health centre at North Innaloo, will he give early consideration and co-operation with the Perth Road Board for the provision of the centre as soon as possible?

The MINISTER replied:

Yes.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF.

Amount Paid and Number Receiving Assistance.

8. Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Child Welfare:

(1) What amount, per week, is made payable to individuals in each of the different categories of unemployed receiving assistance from the State?

(2) What amount, per week, do these same persons receive from Federal Social Services Department?

(3) What number of persons in Western Australia, received these payments in the last week in June in each year since State payments commenced?

The MINISTER replied:

(1)

	First Week.		Second and Subsequent Weeks.	
Single Units.	s.	d.	s.	d.
16 years	30	0	5	0
17 years	40	0	10	0
18-20 years	55	0	15	0
21 years	67	6	17	6

	First Week.		Second and Subsequent Weeks.	
Married Units.	s	d.	s.	d.
Married couple no children	97	6	7	6
1 child	112	6	31	6
2 children	127	6	46	6
3 children	142	6	61	6
4 children	157	6	76	6
5 children	172	6	91	6

Scale increases as above by 15s. per week for each additional child.

Paid by Child Welfare Department.

(2)

Single Units.	Per Week. s.	d.
16-17 years	35	0
18-20 years	47	6
21 years and over	65	0

Note:—10s. per week extra paid should there be a dependent child (e.g., unmarried mother).

Married Units.	Per Week. s.	d.
Married couple with no children	112	6
Married couple one or more children	122	6

No payment is made for the first week, following date of application, by the Department of Social Services.

(3)—

No. Persons Married.	Single.	Total.	June.
2	Nil	2	1948
3	Nil	3	1949
8	Nil	8	1950
11	Nil	11	1951
16	Nil	16	1952
6	Nil	6	1953
19	Nil	19	1954
10	Nil	10	1955
65	Nil	65	1956
637	986	1,623	1957
989	1,340	2,329	1958

Figures quoted include persons unemployed on account of sickness.

HIRE PURCHASE.

Premiers' Conference.

9. Mr. JOHNSON asked the Premier:

(1) Has he received, or has he issued, an invitation to attend a Premiers' conference at Northam, or any other city, on the subject of hire-purchase interest rates?

(2) If not, what steps does he propose to take, or has he taken, to stimulate the calling of such conference?

(3) Have any other State Premiers indicated an interest in such conference?

(4) Has the Prime Minister, or the Federal Treasurer, shown any interest in the proposal?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) No, not yet.

(2) I have written to the Prime Minister supporting the request made to him by the Premier of New South Wales for the calling of a Premiers' conference.

(3) According to a Press report, five Premiers out of six have indicated their support for the calling of a conference.

(4) I have no official information.

LEUKAEMIA RESEARCH.

Inquiry and Report.

10. Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Health:

As a result of Professor Wintrobe's recent visit to this State, and his statement that there is urgent need for research here in regard to leukaemia and other blood diseases, together with a lack of opportunity for young graduates to carry out such research, will he institute an inquiry and give a report on the necessity for remedying the situation?

The MINISTER replied:

The problems connected with research in regard to leukaemia and other blood diseases are already receiving the attention of the Faculty of Medicine in the University of Western Australia, which is most anxious to facilitate this and similar projects.

WATER SUPPLIES.

Position at Point Samson.

11. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

In view of the fact that Point Samson is dependent on rain water for a water supply for human consumption purposes, will he consider having a pipe line installed to carry water from Roebourne to Point Samson for human consumption and other purposes?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Minister for Water Supplies) replied:

Some consideration has already been given to the problem of the provision of water at Point Samson. Water suitable for septic tanks, but unsuitable for most household purposes, can be supplied to the population of 45 people at a capital cost of approximately £4,500. It is broadly estimated that the capital cost of providing water from Roebourne would be of the order of £45,000.

COMMISSIONERS FOR DECLARATIONS.

Powers to Witness, etc.

12. Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Justice:

Further to his legal answers on the 27th August, to questions in regard to the powers of Commissioners for Declarations, will he, in the interests of the public and in support of commissioners, make a real attempt to clarify the position, by preparing and publishing a list of legal forms and documents which may be witnessed by a Commissioner for Declarations?

The MINISTER replied:

The preparation of such a list is neither necessary nor practicable as there are probably hundreds of Acts, regulations and by-laws requiring statutory declarations to be made. Crown Law legal officers are not aware of any documents, other than those for Court purposes such as complaints, summonses, warrants, recognisances, etc., and those for the purposes of the State Acts mentioned in my reply on the 27th August, which cannot be attested by a Commissioner for Declarations.

Neither the Commonwealth Crown Solicitor's office nor the Crown Law officers are aware of any other documents required under Commonwealth law, apart from those referred to in my reply of the 27th August, which cannot be attested by a Commissioner for Declarations.

CANNING RIVER.

Clearing of Obstructions, etc.

13. Mr. GAFFY asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What is the distance of the Canning River—by waterway—from the Canning Bridge to where the Serpentine water scheme pipe crosses the Canning River?

(2) How far is the Canning River tidal?

(3) Whose responsibility is it to keep the river clear of obstruction, such as the barge now lying in the river and the line of posts along the waterway?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Minister for Works) replied:

(1) 4¾ miles.

(2) To Kent Street Weir 6¾ miles upstream from Canning Bridge.

(3) Harbour and Light Department.

BUSH FIRES BOARD.

Procedure for Fixing Dates for Burning.

14. Mr. HEARMAN asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) What procedure is adopted by the Bush Fires Board before varying opening and closing dates for burning?

(2) Is any difficulty experienced in reconciling the varying opinions of local authorities in this matter?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) All local authorities are requested, each year, to submit any suggested changes in the dates for prohibited burning times and also to obtain the views of adjoining districts where changes are requested. All requests and views submitted are then considered by the Bush Fires Board.

(2) On occasions, the views of different local authorities are opposed and endeavours are made to reach agreement. The board then makes its recommendation based on consideration of the interests of all districts involved.

COMPANIES ACT.

Proposed Amendments.

15. Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Justice:

Are amendments to the Companies Act proposed during the current session?

The MINISTER replied:

No.

PERTH PARKING.

Survey Results.

16. Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) With reference to the Press releases of the origin and destination survey results, what is the significance of the comment "Perth City Council parking charges will be an important factor affecting the growth of city traffic?"

(2) Will he table the report arising from the origin and destination survey?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The immediate effect of the imposition of parking charges has been to reduce the traffic entering the city, and it is apparent that parking charges can modify traffic flow and hence the growth of traffic.

(2) The full report on the origin and destination survey is not yet completed. A preliminary summary of salient results obtained to date as contained in department files was released to the Press, and a copy of this summary is tabled.

RAILWAY CROSSING.

York-st., Albany.

17. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Works:

(1) As the railway crossing at the foot of York-st., Albany, is considered to be extremely dangerous to motor traffic forced to use the crossing as a means of entry to and from the wharf, would he give consideration to having a foreshore road built, and thus alleviate the danger at the crossing at the bottom of York-st?

(2) If not, would he give consideration to the making of an arterial road to link up with Festing-st. and the foreshore road, following the original survey to come by

Vacuum Oil Co.'s depot so that motor traffic would only have to cross the one set of railway lines?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Minister for Works) replied:

(1) A foreshore road was investigated some years ago. It is not considered at the present time that there is sufficient warrant for such a road to justify the cost.

(2) The alternative proposal to link up with Festing-st. was also examined some years ago. It is proposed that the situation be reviewed in the near future in the light of developments which have taken place in the harbour area.

STATE SHIPPING SERVICE.

Agents and Goldfields Travellers.

18. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Shipping and Supply:

(1) In what towns are agents for the State Shipping Service located?

(2) How many bookings have been made by the State Shipping Service at Fremantle for people on the Eastern Goldfields who were desirous of travelling north by sea?

(3) Are many inquiries handled by this service from Goldfields people?

The MINISTER FOR NATIVE WELFARE replied:

(1) North-West ports and Perth.

(2) One is revealed by State Shipping Service records but there may have been others whose addresses are unknown who were booked through recognised travel agencies.

(3) Records show that a few inquiries were received between April, 1957 and August, 1958.

RAILWAY TRAVEL.

Break of Journey.

19. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

Has the commission given consideration to agreeing to allow passengers from Kalgoorlie to Bunbury, Geraldton, Albany, etc., to break their journey in Perth for a few days, in cases where this practice was hitherto not allowed?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT replied:

The department is at present examining this proposal.

KALGOORLIE FIREWOOD.

Distance from Supplies.

20. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Forests:

(1) What is the minimum distance traversed by professional woodcarters in the Kalgoorlie district from the town to the cutting site?

(2) What is the maximum distance?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) 25 miles.

(2) 56 miles.

These distances are regulated entirely by the availability of supplies and the personal selection of areas by licence holders themselves.

RAILWAYS.

Cost of Special Train on Kalgoorlie-Broad Arrow Run.

21. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister Representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) What would be the cost, to a Sunday school fraternity, for the hire of a special train of six coaches, for the run from Kalgoorlie to Broad Arrow and return at the end of the day, on—

(a) a public holiday

(b) a Saturday?

(2) Has this service for picnics etc., been made available in recent years, from Kalgoorlie?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT replied:

(1) (a) and (b) £76 16s.

(2) No.

NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE.

Powers and Details of Appointment, etc.

22. The Hon. A. F. WATTS asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) What are the powers and duties of the Nomenclature Committee?

(2) By whom is it appointed; and for what period; and what are the names of its present members?

(3) Is it appointed under any statute or regulation; and if so, what statute or regulation?

(4) Are the recommendations or decisions of the committee subject to approval by a Minister?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The Nomenclature Advisory Committee has no statutory powers. It is an advisory committee to advise the hon. Minister for Lands in regard to nomenclature. In 1947, the late Dr. J. S. Battye, who was chairman of the committee from 1936 to 1954, defined its policy as follows:—

(a) To act as an advisory committee to the Lands Department generally upon the naming of new townsites and other features not already named.

(b) To assist municipalities and road boards in the selection of names for streets and roads.

(c) To recommend to the Lands Department names for declared arterial roads, as, for example, Great Eastern Highway, South

Western Highway, Albany Highway, etc. The names should, if possible, indicate direction.

(d) To secure as far as possible suitable aboriginal names for use in naming new features.

(e) To correct duplications of names of land features in the State.

(f) To discountenance as far as possible the naming of streets, etc., after still active members of municipalities and road boards, or persons still living in the locality.

(g) To honour, wherever possible, the names of discoverers or first settlers in any locality under discussion.

(h) To avoid hyphenated or double names for either localities or streets.

(i) To decide upon the spelling of names where two or more forms have been used in the past. This specially applies to native names.

(2) It was appointed by the hon. the Minister for Lands in 1936 for an indefinite period. The names of the members at present are as follows:—

W. V. Fyfe, Surveyor General (Chairman).

J. M. Ryan, Superintendent of Mapping (Surveyor General's Division).

Miss M. F. F. Lukis, State Archivist, also representing W. A. Historical Society.

T. C. Edmondson, representing Education Department.

W. P. Griffiths, representing Local Government authorities.

G. Digby Leach, Commissioner of Main Roads.

Hon. P. M. C. Hasluck, M.H.R., Minister for Territories.

(3) It was appointed under the Land Act for the purpose of assisting in all nomenclature matters arising out of the operation of that Act, and other Acts.

(4) Yes, with delegated authority to the chairman to adopt names of topographical features and new streets. All alteratioons of names must be approved by the Minister.

TEACHERS.

Provision of Quarters and Water Supply.

23. The Hon. A. F. WATTS asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Does the department accept the responsibility for the provision of quarters for headmasters of schools—

(a) in the metropolitan area;

(b) in the country?

(2) In what circumstances (if any) does the department accept responsibility for quarters for teachers in country areas who are not headmasters?

(3) In how many places outside the metropolitan area are quarters in either of the above categories required, and will any of them be provided this financial year, and if so, how many?

(4) Where a reticulated water supply to teachers' quarters is not available, for what quantity of water is provision made?

(5) Where a reticulated water supply is available, is it always laid on to teacher's quarters by the department?

(6) If any, how many teachers in the country are accommodated in Housing Commission rental homes?

(7) What rents are payable for quarters by teachers and how are these rents calculated? To what extent do these rents differ from those payable by teachers occupying State Housing Commission rental homes?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) (a) No.

(b) Yes.

(2) The Department does not accept responsibility for quarters for assistant masters, but assists as far as possible in securing houses for assistants.

(3) (a) Headmasters—approximately 27 places. It is unlikely that any quarters will be provided this financial year.

(b) See answer to No. (2.)

(4) In areas with a rainfall of 15 inches and over—4,000 gallon tankage.

In areas with rainfall of under 15 inches —6,000 gallon tankage.

(5) Yes.

(6) 59.

(7) Under the regulations the rental of departmental quarters shall be assessed at 5 per cent. of the value of the quarters with a maximum of £120 per annum.

DRIVING.

Incidence of Liquor or Drugs, Blood Tests, etc.

24. Mr. CROMMELIN asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) Has the incidence of driving under the influence of liquor or drugs increased during the last 12 months?

(2) How many charges for this offence were laid from the 1st July, 1957, to the 31st December, 1957, and—

(a) what was the amount of fines imposed;

(b) how many licences were suspended?

(3) How many charges for the same offence were laid from the 1st January, 1958 to the 30th June, 1958, and—

(a) what was the amount of fines imposed;

(b) how many licences were suspended?

(4) Have there been any requests for blood tests by people charged with this offence from the 1st January to the 30th June this year?

(5) If so, how many and what were the results of these requests for blood tests?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No. On the contrary there were 151 charges less than in the preceding 12 months.

(2) 111.

(a) £4,760.

(b) 102.

(3) 90.

(a) £3,815.

(b) 82.

(4) Nine.

(5) No records are maintained.

STATE HOUSING COMMISSION.

Allocation of Commonwealth Funds to Building Societies.

25. Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) What was or is to be the total amount received by the State Housing Commission from the Commonwealth Government for distribution to building societies this year?

(2) Will he list the names of the building societies which are to benefit by the allocation of these funds and how much is each such society to receive?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) £900,000.

(2)

Perth Building Society	£200,000
W.A. Starr Bowkett Society	£133,000
Home Building Society	22,000
Bunbury Building Society	20,000
Thornlie No. 3 Building Society	60,000
Metropolitan No. 1 Building Society	60,000
Independent Building Society	60,000
Australian Netherlands No. 1 Building Society	60,000
Avon No. 1 Building Society	30,000
Development of W.A. No. 1 Building Society	30,000
The West Land Building Society	35,000
Beaumont Building Society	35,000
Albany Building Society ..	35,000
W.A. Carpenters Building Society	35,000
Rural & Industries Bank	90,000
	905,000

FISHING REGULATIONS.

Alleged Abrolhos Islands Breaches.

26. Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Fisheries:

What is the latest position regarding the protests by Geraldton fishermen regarding alleged Abrolhos Islands breaches of fishing regulations or laws?

The MINISTER replied:

The Geraldton Professional Fishermen's Association has asked me to meet and discuss the question with them. I shall do this at the earliest convenient time.

COLLIE MINERS' UNION.

Rule 91b.

27. Mr. CROMMELIN asked the Minister for Labour:

Will he give the wording of rule 91b of the Collie Miners' Union?

The MINISTER replied:

No such rule can be found. I would like to indicate to the member for Claremont that the rules of any union may be inspected at the Arbitration Court at any convenient time; but with regard to his question I must add that my officers cannot find any such rule.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1. Health Education Council.
   Introduced by the Minister for Health.
2. Government Railways Act Amendment.
   Introduced by the Minister for Transport.

JUNIOR FARMERS' MOVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BROKEN HILL PROPRIETARY STEEL INDUSTRY AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

RACING RESTRICTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

MR. WILD (Dale) [4.54] in moving the second reading said: The purpose of this Bill is, in short, to take Armadale out of the metropolitan area—as it is now known—so far as trotting is concerned, in order that trotting may be permitted at Armadale in the form of a country club. Negotiations have been going on for many years, in an endeavour to achieve this objective and I have here a file, which was collated by the ex-secretary of the Armadale-Kelmscott Road Board, Mr. Spencer Gwynne, who first endeavoured, in the early 1940's, to achieve this objective.

The efforts of this committee in Armadale culminated, two or three months ago, in a further deputation—they had had prior deputations over the years—to the Armadale-Kelmscott Road Board and, as a result, I was asked to be present at the following meeting; and a letter, dated the 18th June, 1958, was subsequently forwarded to me, reading as follows:—

Mr. G. P. Wild, M.L.A.,
Parliament House,
Perth.

Dear Sir,

Re Trotting Act: Further to the discussion with you concerning the present Trotting Act, it was decided to request you to sponsor an amendment to the Act which would provide for Armadale to be regarded as a country area and thus enable the local trotting breeders and owners to conduct midweek meetings in Armadale. I feel you are fully conversant with the position and know exactly what the board requires, but should fuller details of the number of horses, owners and trainers in this area be necessary for you, please do not hesitate to contact me and the necessary information will be compiled and submitted.

Yours faithfully,
W. W. ROGERS,
Secretary.

One can well realise that the name of this Act implies exactly what it was, when the legislation was introduced in 1917. It was a racing restriction Act; and, when one reads Hansard of 1917, the year in which the legislation was placed on the statute book, one realises that it was put there to do exactly what it says—to restrict racing, for two reasons: firstly, because there was a war on, and it was felt that the manpower could be better used elsewhere; and, secondly, to curtail the large number of small racing clubs which apparently flourished around the metropolitan area in those days. I am not sure what they call those clubs, but they were unlicensed race clubs and were scattered around the metropolitan area.

Mr. Potter: Where would they have the trotting at Armadale? Around the brickyards?

Mr. WILD: I will enlarge on that later; but the Armadale trotting ground is considered to be the second best in the State—it is exactly two circumferences to the mile—if one places Gloucester Park as the first. It is considered to be the most perfect trotting ground we have, apart from Gloucester Park.

When the legislation to which I have referred was before Parliament the number of race meetings per year was reduced from 102 to 76; and it was decided, at the same time, to incorporate trotting. As the result of that the Western Australian Trotting Association was given the right to conduct trotting meetings on 35 days per year, plus five days for charity. The debate which took place on that measure was most interesting, and one pertinent point which came out of it was a remark by the late Sir James Mitchell—then a Minister in the Frank Wilson Government of the day—who said that it was the only occasion he could remember in his parliamentary career—as it was at that time—when every member in the House had been in attendance and had spoken on a Bill. From that one can see that even in those days the legislation created a considerable amount of interest.

Time marched on and the member for Fremantle decided in his wisdom, in 1925, that Fremantle should have trotting. As a result of his efforts, Fremantle was finally granted 10 racing dates, plus two meetings to be held for charity.

The position at the moment is, roughly, this: The control of trotting in Western Australia comes under the jurisdiction of the Western Australian Trotting Association. That body controls trotting not only in the country, but also within the metropolitan area; and, therefore, any other club—apart from the Fremantle Trotting Club which was provided for in the amendment moved by the member for Fremantle in 1925—that desires to conduct a trotting meeting within the metropolitan area must not only apply to the Western Australian Trotting Association, but also would have to take one of the dates that have been allotted to the association.

So, naturally, that association very jealously—and quite naturally—has guarded those rights to ensure that no other club is allowed to spring up within the metropolitan area, as we know the boundaries today. The association itself conducts 35 ordinary meetings—plus five for charity, at Gloucester Park, and Fremantle has ten ordinary meetings and two for charity.

In reading through the parliamentary debates of 1917—and I have read every speech that was made in this House and in another place in that year—I can find no reference as to why the boundaries of the metropolitan area, so far as trotting meetings are concerned, were fixed on a 30-mile radius. One would have thought that the Minister of the day—the hon. Mr. Robinson, who introduced the measure—would have made it 20 or 40 miles just as easily. However, there was not one word in the whole of the Bill or in any of the debates giving a reason why the radius was fixed at 30 miles.

Over the years the W.A. Trotting Association has been able to control trotting in the metropolitan area and the tracks on which trotting shall be conducted because of the limited number of meetings that are permitted within that area. However, the wishes of the trotting fraternity in Western Australia—I say this

quite confidently and certainly—from one end of the State to the other are that Armadale should be placed outside the metropolitan area in order that it can run a few midweek meetings during the year. I am instructed to inform the House that the wishes of the Armadale committee are that not only should it be given the right to conduct trotting meetings as a country club but also that it should be permitted to hold meetings in the winter-time. I shall speak on that aspect a little later on.

Outside the metropolitan area there are three district councils which, at certain times of the year, send in delegates to the Western Australian Trotting Association, and together they formulate the dates when trotting shall be run at various centres throughout the country. So if Armadale is permitted to be placed outside the metropolitan area it will undoubtedly come into the zone or area bounded by Harvey and Pinjarra; and each year when the appraisal of the racing dates comes up, the delegates from those three clubs will discuss with the committee of the Western Australian Trotting Association not only the number of racing dates, but also the days on which they can hold trotting meetings during the ensuing year.

In allowing Armadale to be placed outside the metropolitan area, there will be many advantages accruing to the trotting fraternity in this State. Due to the large number of horses that are trotting at present, many owners have been most concerned in recent months at the number of times their horses have been balloted out. For the information of those members who may not be fully conversant with the procedure of balloting out, I would point out that there are certain races in which young horses, coming into form, are entered so that they may be able to prove themselves. Owners naturally must race them in order that they may get used to the track conditions and lose their greenness, with a view to bringing them up to their true form and eventually to winning races.

Therefore, in the metropolitan area in recent months, it has been found, in nearly all the races that are held for horses wishing to qualify, that there are anything from 40 to 50 which the committee cannot cope with. If members would care to peruse the daily Press, they will find that 40 to 50 horses are balloted out each week.

Mr. Brady: Would they be from the metropolitan area or from the country?

Mr. WILD: They would come from both parts to race at Gloucester Park or at Fremantle. They could be horses coming from the country to the metropolitan area; or, alternatively, they could be horses trained within the metropolitan area. I know one owner who lives at Armadale. He is connected with one of the big studs at that centre and he has had his horses balloted out three weeks running. That occurred not recently, but just before the winter recess and I understand that it costs not less than £6 a week to feed a horse when it is racing, and not less than £10 a week to feed and race it. Eventually the winter recess came around—which usually lasts about four to six weeks—and so that man was denied the opportunity to race a horse that he had ready to win a race. I have no doubt about that. Furthermore, approximately 70 per cent. of the trotters that we have racing in this State today are stabled south of the river.

In regard to the particular area that so urgently requires this amendment to the Act, I would indicate to the House the changes that have taken place in the last three to four years so far as trotting establishments are concerned. In Armadale at present there are at least 50 horses being trained on the Armadale track. In addition there are, I am informed, approximately 20 being educated for racing. Then we have not less than six studs at Armadale. There is the Yeldon stud farm with approximately 70 horses; Richard's stud farm; Dempsey's; the Derrynasura farm which was recently taken over by the Porter family; the Harrison's and the Fletcher's.

There are in Armadale 50 horses being trained for racing and 20 being educated, and I am advised by the trotting authorities that there are no fewer than 200 to 300 horses in and around Armadale in various stables and studs at the moment. The Armadale track was put down many years ago by a committee formed in the early 1940's. Mr. Spencer Gwynne, who was the secretary of the road board at that time, was chairman of that committee. Over the years the committee has slowly improved that track by the holding of gymkhanas.

Finally, the Armadale-Kelmscott Road Board decided three years ago, in its wisdom, to allocate a fairly large sum of money, which had been left by the late Mr. R. F. Sampson to that local authority, to be spent on some sporting activity in the district. The committee proceeded with the erection of a grandstand. I say without fear of contradiction that it is the finest trotting ground in Western Australia, other than those at Gloucester Park and Fremantle.

Mr. Brady: Is it equipped for night trotting?

Mr. WILD: In reply to the hon. member's question I would say "No," although some of the light standards have been erected around the ground. I am advised by the committee which is sponsoring this move that lighting can be installed relatively easily provided the necessary permission is given.

On this point I would like to read to the House some of the comments made by hon. members here—and by others who have unfortunately passed on—when a move was made some years ago to attempt to do what I am now endeavouring to do on behalf of the committee. In March 1946, the Government of the day appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into trotting in Western Australia. It was styled "A Royal Commission to inquire into the control of trotting in Western Australia"; and the terms of reference were "to inquire into the administration, conduct and control of the sport of trotting in the State of Western Australia," etc.

As a result, Mr. Gwynne, to whom I have referred earlier, in his capacity of chairman of the committee called upon Mr. Dunphy, who at present is a member of the High Court Bench. I understand that at the time he was in the Crown Law Department, and he was the officer responsible for calling together the people who desired to give evidence before that Royal Commission. It is interesting to read the correspondence that passed between Mr. Gwynne and Mr. Dunphy, the Crown Solicitor, who was collating the evidence.

Mr. Sleeman: In what year was that?

Mr. WILD: On the 21st March, 1946, Mr. Gwynne had this to say, and practically all of it is applicable today—

> I, Spencer Gwynne of Armadale, Chairman of a Committee formed for the purpose of establishing a Trotting Club at Armadale, desire to give evidence before your Royal Commission.
>
> The evidence it is desired to give is in support of an amendment of the existing legislation controlling trotting, to enable a trotting club to be formed at Armadale under similar conditions as country trotting clubs are established and conducted.
>
> Under existing legislation this is not practicable owing to the metropolitan area, as defined under the Racing Restriction Act, 1917, extending 30 miles from the Town Hall, Perth, whereas the Armadale trotting ground is only 19 miles.
>
> The position of Armadale in this respect is probably unique in W.A. as the district is essentially a primary producing district of 275 square miles.
>
> Its distance from Perth excludes local trotting owners and breeders, of whom there are many, from personally training and racing their horses at Gloucester Park or Fremantle. The result is these owners must perforce send their horses into training stables in the vicinity of Perth or Fremantle, thus incurring considerable expense, and denying themselves the privilege of looking after their own horses at home where in most cases pastures, etc., are available on their own properties.
>
> It is desired by my committee to urge that the Racing Restriction Act, 1917, be amended in such a manner as to exclude Armadale from the metropolitan area or to permit its registration as a country club.
>
> The important reasons given in support of this are—
>
> (1) Armadale could then be allotted dates on which trotting meetings could be held without having to be granted some of the dates now allotted to Gloucester Park and Fremantle. It is not reasonable to ask those clubs to forgo dates in favour of Armadale.
>
> (2) Armadale could then hold trotting meetings under the same conditions as other country centres whose district conditions are almost identical.
>
> (3) Under existing legislation it is considered that Armadale is suffering a disability not experienced by trotting owners anywhere else in the State.
>
> In conclusion, the President of the W.A. Trotting Association has expressed sympathy with Armadale's difficulty and has advised the undersigned to seek an amendment of the Act to permit a country club to be registered here.
>
> Should you consider my evidence advantageous to your deliberations I will be pleased to attend and give evidence.

The final reply to that was sent by the secretary of the Royal Commission dated the 1st April, 1946. It stated—

> Spencer Gwynne Esq.,
> Armadale.
>
> Dear Sir,
>
> Further to my letter of the 27th March, 1946, the Commissioner desires me to advise you that he considers that the evidence mentioned by you does not come within the terms of his inquiry.

At the time when this move was made certain members of Parliament were written to and asked as to where they stood on the particular amendment to that legislation. The hon. member for Murray-Wellington on the 12th December, 1945, wrote this letter to Mr. Gwynne—

> Dear Sir,
>
> Re Trotting Bill.
>
> It is unlikely that a Trotting Bill will be introduced into the Assembly this session.

Present indications are that trotting in Western Australia will be examined, and reported upon by a Royal Commission, and I think legislation will follow the report.

You should watch for the terms of the Commission, and if you think it necessary, in the interests of the Armadale Trotting Club, you could place the position of the club before the Commission. I cannot see any reason why you should not hold trotting meetings at Armadale, and I should be pleased to do anything I can to assist you.

With best wishes for Xmas and the New Year,

Yours faithfully,
Ross McLarty.

Then there was a letter from the hon. member for Darling Range who was the hon. member for Swan at the time. It is dated the 11th July, 1945, and reads as follows:—

Mr. S. Gwynne,
Chairman of Meeting
Proposed Trotting Club,
Armadale.

Dear Mr. Gwynne,

With reference to the proposal to form a trotting club at Armadale, and your letter of 6th ult. I wish to advise that I have discussed the matter with the Crown Solicitor, Mr. E. Dunphy, and he informed me that at present there is no Act which specifically controls trotting in this State, but he is preparing the draft for an Act to cover this purpose. As it will be a Government measure the draft will be submitted to Cabinet for approval before being presented in Parliament. If approved by Cabinet, the matter should be discussed in the House during the coming session.

Mr. Dunphy suggested that in so far as trotting was concerned the metropolitan area should include a radius of 15 miles from the Town Hall, and as this area would include Fremantle, but not Armadale, I feel that such a definition would be favourable to you and should not antagonise any metropolitan clubs.

I consider that the formation of a trotting club in Armadale to be registered as a country club is a very commendable proposal, and would be of great value to the district both as a sport and as an encouragement to local horse breeders. You may rest assured that I will do all I can to support the necessary legislation and wherever possible assist in any way to further the project.

There are also on this old file a letter from the present President of another place, the hon. Sir Charles Latham, and from two deceased members, the hon. Mr. C. F. Baxter, and the hon. Mr. Wood. They all wrote in exactly the same terms as those used by the two hon. members in this Chamber to whom I have made reference. So one can say that at least as far as parliamentary representations in that part of the world are concerned, over many years they have agreed that it was in the interests of Armadale that, as far back as 1945, it should be placed outside the metropolitan area, and the club should be allowed to be classed as a country trotting club.

To those engaged in the trotting industry—which without doubt is a big industry—and to the State, the proposal I have put forward will be of benefit. It will be of benefit in the first place to the breeders, of whom there are very many in Armadale and in other places. It will be of great assistance to owners and trainers of horses. I can assure the House that all of these men are behind the move I have outlined.

I do not often go to the trots—as most hon. members know, I prefer to follow racing—but I took the trouble of going to Fremantle only a fortnight ago, and to Gloucester Park last Saturday, to talk to as many as I could—I am referring to those actively engaged in the sport as either trainers or owners—and I did not come across one man who said he was opposed to Armadale being placed outside the metropolitan area, thus making it a country club.

Mr. May: Have you discussed it with Mr. Stratton?

Mr. WILD: I have. Mr Stratton has turned over in bed and disagrees with what he said in 1946. Even though I pointed out to him that quite a number of his committeemen, with whom I have discussed this proposal, were much in favour of it, he was against it. With all due respect to Mr. Stratton and what he has done for trotting in this State, I say there are many others engaged in the industry; and whilst his wishes to some degree must be respected, he is only one member of a very large committee.

I repeat, that from many conversations I have had, I could not find one man who disagreed, but all thought that nothing but good could come from having Armadale made a country club. In fact, the feeling everywhere was that it was an excellent idea, and it was hoped that I would be successful in my move to have the Act amended in order that the objective might be achieved.

Mr. Brady: Is it affiliated with the Trotting Association now?

Mr. WILD: No. As I mentioned earlier, a committee was formed out there but they have never been able to say to anybody, "We will have a club", because they have not been allowed to try. I think I can say that there have been eight or nine gymkhanas in the past 11 years; and they

get very ready response out there. But, of course, they are only allowed to trot at these gymkhanas for trophies—members of Parliament and others are called upon to give trophies—but one could say even then, that a great interest has been taken in these events over the years by the trotting fraternity. There would nearly always be 10 or 15 starters in each of the races during the afternoon.

I commend this measure to the House and trust that, in the interests of trotting throughout the length and breadth of this State, hon. members will give it their support in order that Armadale may become a country club. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Minister for Police, debate adjourned.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

Second Reading.

MR. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [5.24] in moving the second reading said: This Bill proposes to amend the Legal Practitioners Act, 1893-1957. The suggested amendment enunciates a programme for entry into the legal profession; and I claim that it also envisages a benefit for the profession and for the public generally. It is practical, and it is inspired by a determination that, as far as it is in my power—and in that of the hon. member for Fremantle, together I trust in that of the majority of hon. members in this Chamber—this vision will be realised.

There are two main avenues at the present time for entering the legal profession. Firstly, graduates in law of any university recognised by the Barristers' Board may enter it. These graduates are required to serve two years of articles and pass the board's graduate examination. Secondly it is open to persons who pass the matriculation examination prescribed by the University of Western Australia for admission to the Faculty of Law. These people are required to serve five years of articles and pass the intermediate and final examinations as set by the Barristers' Board, to the satisfaction of that board. These examinations are based on the standards required by the University for those graduates who sit for the law degree —the LL.B. This latter course is known as the Supreme Court course.

The proposed amendment deals with one section, and one section only, of the Act —Section 13—which reads—

> No articled clerk shall, without the written consent of the Board, during his term of service under articles, hold any office or engage in any employment other than as bona fide articled clerk to the practitioner to whom he is for the time being articled, or his partner; and every articled clerk shall, before being admitted as a practitioner, prove to the satisfaction of the Board, by affidavit or otherwise, that this section has been duly complied with.

I claim that there is every justification for an amendment of the present Act—and particularly of this section, which has remained in the Act since its inception in 1893—that is, for 65 years. I have figures to prove—and I will submit them later—that this section has outlived its usefulness, and should no longer be held as sacrosanct. It is interesting to know that the Barristers' Board requires an articled clerk to seek its written permission before he is allowed to engage in employment outside the hours of his articles. Nowhere in the Act at all is there any mention that a stipulated wage shall be paid to an articled clerk by a practitioner; and I claim, rightly so too.

There is no arbitration award for law clerks and there is a reason for that. If one bothers to take the trouble to discuss this question of articling clerks with legal practitioners, one finds that the practitioners themselves are not generally jumping out of their skins to welcome the practice, for the simple reason that they are required, when they take on a clerk, to devote a certain amount of their time—and time means money to the professional men—to these clerks for the purpose of tuition.

Therefore, when they realise that they can pay a girl a small wage—and girls do receive small wages—and that girl can be kept fully occupied in typing and carrying out other forms of legal work, they are more prepared to engage girls and have them fully occupied in the business than take on clerks and have to spend a great deal of time teaching them the rudiments of law.

If the wage to be paid to an articled clerk were stipulated, practitioners would be even more loth to engage them, and a most important source of entry to the legal profession would dry up. Therefore I can understand why no stipulated wage for clerks is set out. I have conducted certain inquiries and made the surprising discovery that some law clerks today are receiving as little as £3 a week. I have heard, although I have not been able to prove it, that last year one received only £2 a week; and that clerk was in his fourth year of articles. He may be a qualified practitioner by now; and, although I have not been able to prove what I have just said, I believe it to be a fact.

However, the point is that articled clerks are not paid a stipulated wage, and what they are paid is left entirely to the discretion of the practitioner concerned. I have already told hon. members of one instance that I know of—and which I can

prove to be true—where an articled clerk is receiving, at the moment, £3 a week; and he is in his third year of articles. I claim that articled clerks should be permitted to earn a proper living while they are studying for their articles and undergoing practical tuition.

In 1932, 1933, 1936, and again in 1938, the hon. member for Fremantle, who has become the custodian in this Chamber of the Legal Practitioners Act, made valiant attempts to remedy the anomaly and the injustices that were being caused to law clerks of those times, and since, by the presence of this section in the Act.

Mr. Sleeman: I wish you better luck than I had.

Mr. EVANS: Thank you very much. I asked certain questions of the Minister as to how many articled clerks in the past seven years had special permission from the Barristers' Board to engage in outside employment. I was told that only four had such permission. I claim that that is a very good argument why the present section should not be retained. I asked another question of the Minister which reads as follows:—

> How many non-graduate articled clerks are there today?

The answer was "Four"; and not one of them is serving his articles in a country district of this State. It would seem that those who take on this course, and enter five years articles, have parents who can afford to put them through their course, keep them, help them, and clothe them whilst they are doing their articles and receiving a small wage such as £3 a week. It seems that the poor man's son or daughter has no chance; otherwise there would have been more than four non-graduate articled clerks.

Also it seems as though very few sons or daughters of parents who have means to support them are entering the profession—not nearly as many as one would expect with the population growth. In other words, parents of secure means, or in good economic circumstances, have found that their sons and daughters became a burden to them, and they have not been able to support them through a law course; otherwise there would have been more than four articled clerks studying to become lawyers and legal practitioners.

Mr. Bovell: I suppose you mean a financial burden?

Mr. EVANS: Recently I was speaking to one of the Crown Law officers—I think most hon. members here, at some time during their parliamentary careers, have had some contact with him—and he was telling me that when he was an articled clerk—and, of course, it was well after 1893—he received the sum of 5s. per week from his practitioner. That is a few years ago, but there is no mention of a stipulated wage in the Act. At that time his father was required to pay to the practitioner concerned a premium of £240. The premium idea has gone by the board now, and I claim that it is time law clerks were more emancipated and the profession as a whole given greater status and maturity by striking out this section from the Act and inserting another in its place.

It is my intention, by the introduction of this Bill, to repeal Section 13 and substitute another section which I consider is more practicable and will be just as much a safeguard to the profession; in addition it will be of general benefit to the public. I further asked the Minister for Justice—

> How many articled clerks—
>
> (a) graduate,
>
> (b) non-graduate
>
> are serving in this State?

The answer was that there are 12 graduates and two non-graduates. Earlier I mentioned that there were four. When I asked how many were engaged in outside employment, the answer was "None." Yet I have been told of an instance where one person sought permission from the board and was told that such permission would not be forthcoming.

Mr. Court: What sort of employment did he propose?

Mr. Sleeman: What does it matter what sort of employment it was so long as he earned an honest living?

Mr. Court: It could be relevant.

Mr. Sleeman: Why?

Mr. EVANS: As a matter of fact, the person concerned wanted to work as a petrol bowser attendant. I also asked how many persons were serving as articled clerks in the country, and the answer was "None." The member for Nedlands posed a question which some hon. members may have in their minds: What type of employment would be condoned by the board? Perhaps the Barristers' Board might not favour the idea of an articled clerk wanting to open a swy school in the sandhills.

However, the section concerned had nothing whatever to do with the character of articled clerks, or those who wished to become legal practitioners, because Section 20, paragraph (b) of the Act covers that aspect. I have no intention whatever of amending, or even considering that particular section which reads—

> No person, however qualified in other respects, shall hereafter be admitted as a practitioner unless and until he has—
>
> (b) satisfied the board, and obtained from them a certificate that he is, in the opinion of the board, in every respect a person of good fame and character, and fit and proper to be so admitted,

> and has observed and complied with the provisions of this Act and the rules.

I shall now get back to the point where I mentioned persons applying to the board for permission to work.

The argument that has been used in the past is that the board has refused very few applications. But I consider that very few application have been made to the board, for the reason that several persons whom I know who applied to the board in writing, and asked the secretary of the Barristers' Board if they would be allowed to carry on a certain type of work outside the article hours if they became articled clerks, were told that the board frowned upon articled clerks doing any work whatsoever.

Such records, I am informed by the Minister for Justice, are not kept by the board. But I know three or four cases, and I am sure there could be others, because a person to be registered as an articled clerk must submit a fee of four guineas to the Barristers' Board. Most people who contemplate taking articles are wary when they know of the provisions of Section 13 of the Act. Accordingly they write to the board first and ask whether they would be permitted to do a certain type of work, and when they receive an answer which is rather discouraging, or in the negative, that is the end of it. The four guineas stay in their pockets; they are not prepared to supplement the fund of the Barristers' Board. They know that if they register and find they cannot continue with the course, the money is forfeited. That is why there are so few refusals by the board. Another reason is that very few applications have been made to the board.

I can think of only one person—who was once a member of this Chamber—who was successful in obtaining permission from the Barristers' Board. I refer to the late Mr. Thomas Walker. He was well up in years, and the Barristers' Board, I am led to believe, was not too happy about his application. But he was a man who held senior rank in his party—he was approaching Cabinet rank—and no doubt the Barristers' Board thought it had better not tinker too much with him or something might be done to annoy it.

Finally, he became an articled clerk. But the amusing thing is that he served the last year of his five-year course of articles as Minister for Justice! He is the only one I can recall; the only one the Barristers' Board allowed to do outside work.

Mr. Court: Have you made application on your own behalf?

Mr. EVANS: No.

Mr. Court: Do you propose to if this goes through?

Mr. EVANS: This proposal has no personal interest to me at all; it will not mean any personal gain whatever. The reading of the submission should satisfy the hon. member on that score. As has been mentioned by the hon. member for Fremantle on a number of occasions, a Select Committee was appointed in 1938 to inquire into the operations of the Legal Practitioners Act. The committee comprised the late Mr. Rodoreda, the late Senator Seward, Mr. Styants—my predecessor—and the present leader of the Country Party.

The late Mr. Rodoreda was himself an articled clerk for three of the required five years before he became a member of this House. We all know that the leader of the Country Party is a qualified legal practitioner. The recommendation of that committee with regard to Section 13 reads, inter alia, as follows:—

> We recommend that where articled clerks make application to be allowed to engage in other employment the Barristers' Board shall grant permission to earn outside his articles provided that such work shall be done outside office hours.

The purpose of my Bill is to provide facilities for articled clerks to be able to work outside office hours, and to earn a proper living. Its intention is to enable them to become legal practitioners, and thus to benefit the profession and the public generally. Strangely enough, so far as the law students of the University are concerned, so long as they are attending lectures, and so long as they pass the required examinations, no question is asked at all; none whatever. I know many of them who cut lawns, or deliver milk. Some of them, until recently, were working as petrol bowser attendants, while others were cinema operators. No question was asked about them. Section 13 was not held over their heads. In New Zealand and in some of the States of Australia, every opportunity is given to young people.

Mr. Sleeman: New Zealand is the best of the lot.

Mr. EVANS: I agree; but Western Australia is the worst. I would like to quote the case of Sir Isaac Isaacs, who was the first Australian-born Governor-General. He tells the story that, had he not been allowed to deliver groceries whilst studying law and undergoing articles, he would not have been able to afford to become a lawyer, and thus, perhaps, he might never have become a judge, or later the first Australian-born Governor-General of this country.

There are other great figures which spring to mind. For instance, there is Abraham Lincoln in America. He was a hard-working man who had to toil incessantly to qualify in his profession. But in America there is no Section 13, or similar provision, to contend with.

I have some figures here, Mr. Speaker, and I will seek your permission to distribute them among hon. members for their interest. I have had these figures duplicated for the convenience of hon. members. They have been taken from the Annual Law Review of the Western Australian University for the year 1951. They are the latest figures available, and have been extracted from page 14 of that particular journal. They relate to the years 1921 to 1951. Hon. members will notice that I have added figures for 1954 to 1958.

The information for the two years I have added have come firstly from the Minister representing the Chief Secretary, as to the population of the State in this year, and as to the estimated population for our State in the year 1960. Information has also been obtained from the Minister for Justice, as to the number of practitioners practising this year. Hon. members will notice that in the year 1921 the ratio of legal practitioners practising in this State, for every 10,000 of population, was 5.1. The annual Law Review points out that practitioners in 1939 were in no way underworked; in no way whatever. We find that in 1933 the ratio had dropped to 4.3 In 1939 the figure was 4.0, and it has progressively dropped since, until this year, when it is 3.3.

As I have mentioned, the estimated population in 1960 is 730,000. This represents an increase of 25,000 on this year's population. Assuming that the ratio of 3.3 remains constant—and figures indicate that it could become smaller—the number of legal practitioners in 1960 will be only 240, an increase of merely two on this year's numbers, against an increase in population of 25,000.

That increase would mean that the ratio of legal practitioners per 10,000 population would drop to 2.5, a very dangerous level. What is the reason for this? I suggest it is this: That because of the high cost of living today—and such high costs are borne not only by those on the lower rungs of the economic ladder but also by those on the higher rungs—they are all feeling the tightness of the economic collar. The sons and daughters of these people are being discouraged from entering the profession when they are not allowed to hold any other form of employment. The Barristers' Board quite obviously discourages them and gives a negative answer when they desire to work. That is one reason why the legal profession in this State is becoming unpleasant or unattractive to those people who should be entering it.

Mr. Court: There could be another reason.

Mr. EVANS: This is an important one.

Mr. Court: Most professions are finding it extremely difficult to get students because passing in a profession is a very heavy academic task; and during the last ten years particularly there have been other occupations offering much more money and with much less worry and study. They have attracted the youth.

Mr. EVANS: I agree with the hon. member. However, this is one reason; and it could be remedied without any danger to the profession, with resultant benefit to the public.

Mr. Court: There are other professions—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think a barrage like that is fair, and I ask the hon. member to address the Chair.

Mr. EVANS: As a result of questions and inquiries made of legal practitioners in this State, I was informed that because of the pressure of work placed upon them today—they are definitely overworked—they are unable, as a whole, to devote as much attention to their clients as they would desire and at the same time keep up with modern trends in the legal field. They are not able to keep up to date with modern readings, readings of modern case findings and law digests. They are also unable to keep in touch with the legal fraternities in the other States of Australia and, at the same time, give the attention to the public which it warrants and deserves.

Lawyers openly claim that they cannot do that because of the amount of work which is piling up. Trends indicate that work will definitely increase in the legal field in a few years' time. Therefore, it would seem that the public is getting a very bad deal from the legal profession today.

Recently, we saw an article in the "Week-end Mail" in which certain legal practitioners were castigated by particular writers when inquiries were made by that newspaper. I claim that the legal profession is not as black as it was painted by that newspaper; the members of that profession are human and much overworked. Here is a remedy that will help the profession. If the public is deprived of the attention it desires, it is not receiving justice. One member of the legal profession, a former member of this House, said, "Justice is sweetest when freshest".

I will now pass on to the statistics and compare the ratio of the legal practitioners in other States per thousand of population with the ratio existing in our own State. In New South Wales in 1950, there were 6.9 legal practitioners per every 10,000 people. In Tasmania in 1950 the figure was 5.5. Victoria in the same year had 5.4; and Queensland in the same year had 5.4. The figure for South Australia in that year was 4.6; and in Western Australia, in 1951, it was 3.4. I suggest that could be due to the presence of such a provision as Section 13 in the parent Act.

This section does not occur in the legislation in any of the other States of Australia. The Bill is framed in such a manner that it corresponds very closely with the wording of Section 13, but has a material difference. Section 13 will be repealed and the following subsection will be inserted in lieu thereof:—

> 13. No articled clerk shall, without the written consent of the practitioner to whom he is articled,—

We find that the practitioner becomes all-important, because he understands the potential of the lad and would know the places in a locality where work was offering. It goes on—

> —which consent shall be filed with the Board by the articled clerk within fourteen days of its being granted—

Therefore the Barristers' Board will be fully cognisant of the work to be undertaken by this law student. The provision continues—

> —hold any office or engage in any employment—

This is an additional safeguard. I am not asking too much. I am asking that the law student be allowed to engage, with the permission of his own practitioner, in a form of work which would give him a proper wage outside the hours in which he is desired to attend the office of the legal practitioner. He would be on a par with the law student at the University. So long as he attends his lectures and passes his examinations, he is allowed to do as he likes. The amendment will place the student with a legal practitioner on a basis comparable with that of a law student at the University.

Mr. Sleeman: You are easily pleased.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Can you tell me if this idea is in use in any other country—the United States in particular?

Mr. EVANS: In the United States and in New Zealand. In Victoria there is no mention of employment. I have their Act here. In the Tasmanian legislation, the word "employment" is mentioned, but permission can be granted by the legal practitioner—it is similar to this amendment. In the other States of Australia there is no mention of provisions similar to our Section 13.

Mr. Sleeman: Queensland?

Mr. EVANS: It is not mentioned in their Act either. There are two alternative courses: to attend the University, or do a legal course through the Supreme Court. There is no mention that the student will be prohibited from earning outside the hours of lectures.

I claim I have presented a fair picture of the legal profession today. I have pointed out the ills of the profession, and I trust that I have given a true diagnosis of those ills; and in this amendment I have suggested a remedy. I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Minister for Justice, debate adjourned.

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

Second Reading.

THE HON. A. F. WATTS (Stirling) [6.1] in moving the second reading said: This Bill proposes to amend Section 135 of the Land Act, which provides for what shall be done in regard to applications for land, in circumstances where there is more than one application and the matter is referred to a board, as provided in this section; which board makes the determination that somebody should have the land or, alternatively, that none of the applications should be approved. The Bill proposes to amend the section in three ways. The Act provides that the board shall consist of three persons appointed by the Minister, and that is all that Section 135 says about the personnel of the board.

The Bill proposes to make it compulsory that one member of the board shall be a person acquainted with and having practical knowledge of the farming conditions prevailing in the district wherein the land applied for is situated. I understand that in more recent times there have been instances where persons, qualified in the way I have mentioned, have been appointed to the board in specific cases and, in the cases where it has taken place it has been, in my opinion, a very considerable improvement. But this measure proposes to make it a requirement of the Act that at all future times such an appointment be made. There are obvious reasons why such an appointment should be made and they will, I think, be apparent to almost every member.

Obviously, knowledge of the potentialities of the land, the particular type of soil and the management it requires, must have a considerable effect on the consideration of who should have the land. Incidentally, also, a person who is acquainted with the land and its requirements would be better able to judge the proposals of the applicants when they were brought before the board, as to whether they would be likely to be successful or not in regard to that particular area. As I say, this advantage has apparently been conceded in more recent times by the Department of Lands, because I understand that such people have been appointed to the board on certain occasions. But I wish to ensure that it shall be the practice in the future.

The second proposal contained in the Bill is to amend Subsection (3), which provides that the board may require the personal attendance of and when deemed necessary the examination on oath of applicants, objectors and other witnesses and any member of the board may administer such oath. I propose to add the words "and the board shall during the examination of an applicant exclude therefrom all other applicants." In more recent times, particularly, there has been a large number of applicants for blocks of land and it has been the practice of the boards, I understand, to allow all the applicants to be in the room at the same time, so that each hears exactly what the other applicants have to say.

In the majority of cases it is necessary, if one wants to put up a good case in order to be the recipient of a block of land which has been thrown open for selection and for which there has been considerable competition, for one to set out in considerable detail just what one is going to do, how much one is going to spend and what methods one is going to adopt, as well as what facilities one has for carrying out the rapid improvement of the property; and it seems to me—I have every reason to believe that it is true —that the net result of all the applicants being present to hear the other applicants put their cases, has been that sometimes there has occurred a little exaggeration on the part of later applicants, with the effect that the wrong applicant may have got the block, the board having been to some extent deceived.

Nowhere else that I know of, in circumstances such as this, is it considered desirable that examinations of this character should be made in public and, for the reasons I have given, I suggest that all other applicants should be excluded while an inquiry is being made. If that were done we would be unlikely to have this competition—almost an auction—which it is suggested has taken place in certain cases.

The third amendment contained in the Bill seeks to add a new subsection after Subsection (3). It is quite a new proposition, and one which I consider is reasonable and should be inserted in the Act, and I am going to explain why. To my knowledge and to the knowledge of other persons, from time to time there have been people who have ascertained that a piece of Crown land is not being used and have set about getting the Lands Department to throw it open for selection. Frequently it has been found, for example, that it has been subject to a reservation by the War Service Land Settlement Board or to a reservation by the Forests Department, and the person who has found it and who has been anxious to make application for it, has either, by his own activities or, sometimes through an agent, or, sometimes through the member of his district—

Mr. Bovell: Which is the usual course.

Mr. WATTS: Yes, which is the most popular procedure, as the member for Vasse has pointed out; and this person has finally succeeded in inducing the War Service Land Settlement Board to give up its claim, prevailed upon the Forests Department to abandon its right, and induced the Lands Department to throw the block open for selection.

Mr. Nalder: That does not often happen.

Mr. WATTS: That is the rarity, I will admit, but I must assume—and I do know —that there are some cases where it does happen. In any case, when all this has been done the application is made to the Lands Department for the land and then somebody else puts in an application and there is a hearing. We then find that although the person who has gone to all this trouble is not eligible under the Lands Act to be disqualified, and although he puts up a reasonable proposition for the development of the land within a reasonable time and shows—as in one case that I know of—he has the facilities and the money to enable this to be done, somebody else gets the land.

I do not think it reasonable, in those circumstances, that the original applicant —I will call him that—should be deprived of the land unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the board that he is not fit to have the land. In my view, and in such a case as I have mentioned, a person having gone to the trouble of finding the land and taking—through the channels I have mentioned—the steps to which I have referred, should be given the opportunity of being granted that land in order to develop it.

So I propose that a new section should be added to provide that, when the board is determining an application, it shall grant the land to the applicant—if any—who appears to the board to have been responsible, by himself or his agent, for having the land applied for, thrown open for selection, unless such applicant is by reason of the acreage of land already held by him ineligible to hold the land applied for, or unless the board, having regard to the evidence, is of opinion and so declares, that such applicant would be unable, within a reasonable time, to develop the land applied for.

I think that is a reasonable proposition. The board should, on the evidence before it, gauge the respective merits of the applicant who was responsible for the land being thrown open for selection—if any —and having done so—all things being

reasonably right—it should give him some measure of priority. So, for those reasons, I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Minister for Lands, debate adjourned.

METROPOLITAN BEACH TRUST.

Introduction of Legislation.

Debate resumed from the 27th August on the following motion by Mr. Marshall—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should take early steps to introduce legislation to establish a metropolitan beach trust.

THE HON. L. F. KELLY (Minister for Lands—Merredin-Yilgarn) [6.12]: I feel that the hon. member for Wembley Beaches has introduced into this Chamber a motion which must undoubtedly give all hon. members a great deal of food for thought, especially when we realise that this subject has been the centre of attention by many people for a great number of years. I do not suppose that there is any part of our State which is in more constant use by such a large number of people than are the metropolitan beaches of Western Australia.

As far back as we can remember, those beaches have always been, for thousands of people, a haven where they can relax and, in many cases, recover from the exhaustion they have suffered as a result of the heat and the trying conditions experienced during our summer months. By making a visit to one of our beaches they have been able to regain, to some extent, that strength and concentration of which they have been deprived.

The beaches have also provided a venue for recreation for countless thousands of our people, especially the younger members of the community. The majority of us can look back for more than half a century and realise that the metropolitan beaches have been put to good use during that long period. I feel that the availability of these beaches to the people has resulted in considerable improvement to the general health of the community; because on many occasions, we have been told, by members of the medical profession, of the wonderful propensities that sea water has for very many ailments and complaints.

Mr. Court: The Minister for Health had other views about City Beach a while ago.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. KELLY: I was about to comment on the position of our beaches and to say that few places are richly endowed with such variety of beaches of a high standard as are found in this State. There are, literally, thousands of beaches here, many of which have not yet come within the scope of development, but all of which possess a very special quality. As time goes on, they will undoubtedly come within the venue of the expanding nation. Our beaches could be largely classified as extending from Albany to Geraldton, although the member for Gascoyne will no doubt tell me good beaches are found beyond that coastline in the Shark Bay and North-West districts.

Mr. Rhatigan: Good beaches are also found in Broome.

Mr. KELLY: The hon. member tells us about his good beaches; and no doubt the Minister for Health will have something to say about the beaches around Esperance.

Mr. Nulsen: We have wonderful beaches at Esperance.

Mr. KELLY: There are some very good beaches at Esperance. We know that they are located in that area. In the main, the majority of beaches greatly frequented are found in the length of coastline to which I referred.

From the metropolitan area, down the coastline as far as Mandurah and northwards to Geraldton, a great deal of expansion is taking place along the beaches. Quite frequently new beaches are being opened up. Many of them have new attractions, either by virtue of their situation or by the development of facilities for attracting tourists and fishermen, which are not found in some of the older established beaches.

With the expansion taking place, particularly in the near metropolitan area, many modern homes are being erected. Some of the beaches are being developed on privately-owned land. That being the case, the owners have a right to build houses quite close to the shore. That is a bad circumstance and should not be allowed to continue.

There is also a problem which has become very rife in recent times and which concerns people known as squatters. Without any legal right, they erect all sorts of humpies and shanties with corrugated iron and pieces of inferior building material. Once they become established, they feel they have some right to remain. The local authorities concerned very often experience great difficulty in dislodging the occupiers. One of the most dangerous features is the lack of sanitation facilities in those centres where squatting has taken place. A firm stand will have to be adopted in order to prevent the continuance of that practice in any shape or form. Squatting along the beaches is most undesirable. I think the problem should be tackled, and it could come within the purview of a motion of this kind.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Do you intend to dislodge those who have already been established?

Mr. KELLY: The reasonable way is not to dislodge immediately people who have been established or some time, but only those who have been established in the face of the regulations which were known to exist and who were warned against building. I have no compunction about shifting the latter. For those who have been established for some years, and who possess a degree of proprietorship of an area by virtue of length of occupancy, some reasonable period to shift goods and chattels should be allowed. That period could vary according to the circumstances. That is one of the problems which will face any local authority attempting to overcome a situation which has grown up over the years.

A problem of the majority of local authorities adjacent to the Fremantle and metropolitan areas—and one very difficult and costly to overcome—is the ever-changing beach appearance. The more the hand of man has interfered with our coastline, the more difficult it appears to have been to retain anything like the beaches we knew in days gone by. I do not think the ocean currents have changed a great deal in the intervening period.

I remember the beach at Cottesloe very distinctly as it was some years ago. At that time the beach was in the vicinity of 80 to 100 yards wide. It was the venue for very large gatherings of people, particularly on days like Empire Day, observed in the manner it was, when many thousands of adults and many more thousands of children congregated along Cottesloe beach. It was a beautiful, broad and flat expanse of beach with shallow water up to within easy distance of safety for the children.

We know that over a period of years beach erosion has been terrific along that beach. The Cottesloe Municipal Council has, from time to time, endeavoured to arrest the erosion. It has expended quite an appreciable amount of capital in restoring the beach to something of its former condition. That has been done without avail. In the main, that council has not been solid enough financially to put into the beach restoration the amount required to arrest erosion.

Another example of a similar type of beach difficulty occurred in South Fremantle. Many people who were accustomed to visit South Fremantle will know that the beautiful line of pine trees, growing almost to the water's edge, is now non-existent. The whole of the beach area, and practically the whole of South Fremantle coastline has been badly disarranged. The erosion is of a very serious nature, and a considerable amount of engineering ability is required to bring that beach back to anything like its former state.

The local authorities, by and large, endeavoured over the years to arrest the problems which arose in the various beaches under their control. They found the process very costly, and not a great deal has been achieved in very many areas. I think that the majority of the local governing authorities view the matter from the point of view that it is very difficult to gauge the direct benefits that a road board area gains from its popular beaches.

The cry over a period of years has been that the beaches are not worth anything to a local authority; though I would not agree with that, because of the fact that the local beaches do attract many thousands of people, during the summer months particularly, during which period the whole of the business people are reasonably well off if the season is favourable, and that must enhance the rates that come to a local authority during those summer months. Most of those rates continue during the winter period, too, and there is considerable revenue available to the local authorities from that source.

But beyond that they have very little opportunity of collecting revenue to any great extent; and so beaches resolve themselves into being the baby of the local authority which finds itself powerless to spend the necessary finance to keep the beaches in order, and provide the amenities needed, with the result that they have become somewhat neglected in some road board areas.

I think it could be said that once a new area is opened up as a beach under the existing conditions, depreciation begins to take place rapidly, and following the deterioration of a beach and the beginning of erosion, all that is needed is a storm to occur for the havoc to be very great.

Salt damage, too, is similarly taking place. There is no end to the amount of salt erosion; and, as a consequence, structures are being affected as well as the beaches. They, too, become very costly to maintain. In the main, the total number of beaches, particularly within the metropolitan area, are beaches that are vested in the local authorities; and as they are responsible for the developmental work under the conditions that we have known for quite a long time, the beaches become very neglected. I would not think that blame is attachable to the local authorities; because they lack the revenue, and the beaches are not earning it. Therefore it is illogical that they should spend a great amount on maintaining something which is after all largely a playground for visitors.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Some of them intend to spend a lot of money, don't they?

Mr. KELLY: Yes. I have mentioned one or two. The number of visitors that come to a beach, I think, largely depends on the amenities that are provided for them in the way of shelter sheds and

promenades, safe bathing areas, and different things of that kind. Nevertheless, the amount of money that has been spent on beaches is negligible when one considers the vast area of beaches that we have in this State.

One could perhaps mention Rockingham and Mandurah as being two of the areas where, more particularly, the approaches to the beaches are receiving a lot of attention. The local governing authority in each of those road board areas has done a very good job over a number of years. This has not been achieved in a short time, but it has been a gradual improvement and the beaches are attracting a large number of visitors.

I think that could be the case with all our beaches if we got down to some basis of improvement; and found some way of raising finance, to develop those beaches as has been suggested by the member for Wembley Beaches. It was rather appropriate that he should introduce a motion of this kind seeing that he represents Wembley Beaches.

It can be said for the beaches that quite a few are being given some attention by their local governing authorities, but not sufficient, if we are going to grapple with the difficulties which are increasing daily because of erosion and other difficulties that have arisen.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Are you supporting the motion? I do not want to anticipate you; but you have not said that you are supporting the motion.

Mr. KELLY: I am having five bob each way up to now! I think there are two main questions that our minds must revolve around to quite an extent. One is from where finance will come, sufficient to cover the requirements of a motion of this kind; and the second is whose responsibility it would be to raise that finance, and how. I feel that if a suggestion such as is embodied in this motion were to get us anywhere, it would need, firstly, to be as a result of a conference between the local governing authorities affected by the beach areas, and the Government; because to my way of thinking, only by getting together in a friendly capacity, could we get to a point of discussing ways and means of overcoming what is now, and will remain, a vast question as the years go by.

In population, we are approaching the 700,000 mark now, and the beaches that are already in existence are very numerous. But as the years go by, and more people want to get further out, away from the madding crowd, we will find that many more beaches will be opened up, and I feel that they need to be opened up on some basis that will have a pattern for development. Otherwise, we are going to perpetuate the difficulties that we have experienced up to now; and any hon. member can see them for himself in any number of beaches in close proximity to the metropolitan area. A conference between the two bodies that I have suggested could discuss the machinery that it would be necessary to put into operation if we are to tackle this problem on a wholehearted basis.

Mr. Court: I take it that the Government does not favour the formation of a trust.

Mr. KELLY: I am speaking for myself rather than for the Government. I would make this suggestion: That the two bodies —the local government authority and all those affected in that organisation, and the Government—should get together in conference.

Mr. Court: That is not the Government's view?

Mr. KELLY: I will tell the hon. member all about that as I go along. The hon. member is trying to forestall me. I am endeavouring to give a sequence of thought that will give the House my total ideas in this regard, and I think my reasons for this will be realised.

As a basis for discussion, I have in mind the Argentine ant scheme. I realise that I wearied the House at some length last night in discussing that scheme and the success it has been; it is working on a contributory basis between the local governing authorities affected and the Government, and is causing no undue hardship on either. I say undue because, although a fair sum of money is involved—£105,000 annually—overall, in an expanding country such as ours it is not such a great deal when one realises what is being achieved. It would certainly not be a great deal of money if it were being spent on laudable work, such as the conservation and development of our beaches.

So I feel that a scheme such as the Argentine ant scheme would meet the situation if the cost of it were spread over a period of years. We would be able to raise the necessary finance without its becoming a burden on any one particular section of the community. I think all the authorities concerned must get together at a conference and approach the whole matter in a friendly and co-operative way. We must have such an approach if we are to achieve success, particularly where a number of local governing bodies have different ideas. Unless they get together in a friendly and co-operative spirit there would not be sufficient scope for the necessary constructive thought to enable us to overcome this problem—and it is a problem.

Mr. Roberts: Is the Government prepared to initiate such a move now?

Mr. KELLY: My reply to the hon. member is exactly the same as it was to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—I will come to that in due course. In my opinion, as a result of a conference of that kind,

so many divergent views would be expressed that a scheme would emerge which would enable something worth while to be done. The will to achieve must be the main ingredient. The responsibility would be wrapped up in the results of a conference of that kind; and in my opinion the responsibility rests squarely on the shoulders of those local authorities who are affected, and on the Government, because they are the two mediums which have the power to raise the necessary finance. The success of the scheme would rest entirely on those responsible bodies.

I feel that the motion moved by the hon. member for Wembley Beaches undoubtedly highlights to hon. members here, and to the State generally, the necessity for some action. But the motion as it is now worded would not be entirely acceptable to the Government. I am of the opinion that one or two words should be changed in order to put the motion in its correct perspective. If these amendments are agreed to, it will enable some discussion to take place; and from those discussions would emerge a plan to overcome what has been a long-standing problem.

Firstly, I would like to delete the word "introduce" in the third line of the motion and insert in its place the word "consider". The Government also feels that rather than have a metropolitan trust we should have a State trust; and to that end I intend to delete the word "metropolitan" in lines 3 and 4 and insert in lieu the word "State". The motion would then read—

> That in the opinion of this House the Government should take early steps to consider legislation to establish a State beach trust.

I move—

> That the word "introduce" in line 3 be struck out with a view to inserting the word "consider".

MR. OLDFIELD (Mt. Lawley—on amendment) [7.55]: There is no doubt that when private members in this Chamber introduce motions, the Government is most adept at drawing the teeth from them. Once again we see an example of it. The hon. member for Wembley Beaches has made an honest attempt to bring before the House his ideas about what should be done to set up a beach trust, which he believes is the only solution to the problem with which we are confronted today. Whether we agree with him or not is beside the point in this instance, because once again we have seen a Minister, who sits on the front bench, moving an amendment to a motion which will have the effect of drawing its teeth. It is most unfair to the private member concerned.

However, to get down to the problem with which we are faced, I think the whole question now hinges on one point, and one point only—that is: Who is going to pay for the improvements and the maintenance which are necessary on our metropolitan beaches; and, if the amendments of the Minister are carried—and no doubt they will be carried—on all beaches throughout the State? There are several questions one might ask oneself.

Let us take a hypothetical case and say that the Government does what the hon. member for Wembley Beaches suggests and introduces legislation which ultimately passes both Houses of Parliament, and a trust is set up. In that case I ask myself these questions: "If the trust is set up, will its activities cover river beaches, and which ocean beaches will be included or brought under the authority of the trust? Which local authorities throughout the State or within the metropolitan area will contribute to the trust to give it the necessary funds to perform its work?" Finally—and this is the one which I think would cause the most argument between local authorities in the metropolitan area and between members of the trust—"Which beaches would the trust spend its money upon first?"

Mr. Sleeman: South Fremantle.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Why not North Fremantle—Leighton Beach? That is an eyesore if ever there was one.

Mr. Rowberry: What about Sydney Harbour?

Mr. OLDFIELD: We have to be reasonable and rational in our approach to this matter. The Minister mentioned Mandurah as a case in point. Mandurah, Rockingham, and other southern beaches are within a short car-ride of the metropolitan area; and throughout past years those beaches and resorts have been developed by their local authorities purely and simply to attract tourists to those beaches and towns.

The attraction of tourists to the towns enhances the value of business and residential properties in those areas. That, in turn, means an increase in rates, and thus additional revenue for the local authorities concerned. They are able to spend more money on their beaches, and so increase the patronage to those beaches. It is a natural cycle and is the normal way of business; the local authorities are putting back into their beaches what they have got out of them. Because of this they are able to make more attractive resorts; and there is no doubt that Rockingham and Mandurah are two prosperous little towns which have been built up by a policy of attracting tourists—not by taking money from the whole of the metropolitan area or the hinterland, but by taking it from those who visit the places concerned, and enjoy the benefits provided by the local authority.

It can be argued, and no doubt it will be argued during this debate, as it has been on previous occasions, that the same should apply to the inner city beaches of the

metropolitan area. We speak of those stretching from Fremantle to, say, Waterman's Bay. It can well and truly be argued that the local authorities are receiving large amounts of revenue from people who own businesses on the waterfront. So, indirectly, by patronising the beach the people are making their contributions. The more the people that patronise the beach, the more the money that is spent on various businesses and, accordingly, the local authority receives more revenue. If the local authorities were to put back into the beaches most of what they took out from the area, we would see great improvements on the beach front in the metropolitan area.

It might be said that some people who attend the beach do not spend anything. But the fact that they travel to those beaches by omnibus, and the fact that they pay their fares, is indirectly a contribution to the local authorities who, in turn, levy a rate from the bus operators concerned. So, as I have said, indirectly the people who attend the beaches contribute to the revenue of the local authorities who are responsible for the upkeep of the beaches. Even though these authorities claim they are not getting any money, they are, in fact, receiving large sums from these sources.

It comes down to this: Those who use the facilities provided by the local authorities at the beaches are the ones who should be prepared to pay for them. Are we going to ask the residents of Kalamunda and Armadale to contribute to a beach trust? I do not know whether the Kalamunda or the Armadale-Kelmscott Road Boards would not have just as strong a case for setting up a similar trust for people driving through the hills. I am sure the hon. member for Darling Range could put up quite as strong an argument for a hills trust as has the hon. member for Wembley Beaches in the case of the proposed beach trust. I do not deny that the beaches are a national heritage, and that they should be looked after. But I do not agree that another statutory body should be set up—one that shall receive funds from some particular section of the people, though as yet we do not know which section.

We should stick to the principle that has prevailed in the past; namely, that those who benefit should pay. Those who benefit are the transport companies, the business people, and those who attend the beaches. We can very easily pass the necessary legislation, as we did last year for the City of Perth to enable it to install parking meters. I do not suggest for one moment, however, that parking meters should be installed at the beaches. We could follow the example set in the Eastern States and provide legislation whereby the local authorities could charge a parking fee if they so desired. In the Eastern States, no matter where one pulls up, a parking inspector comes along and issues a ticket for 2s. It does not matter how long one stays; one still pays a 2s. fee.

The whole of the money derived from motorists is put back into the beach at which it is collected. This is administered by the local authority. If we wished we could pass the necessary legislation to enable the Perth Road Board to charge a fee of, say, 2s. for parking. We all know that at Scarborough it would get many thousands of pounds, and this money could be put back to improve facilities such as dressing sheds, which at the moment, are almost non-existent. It seems a funny thing that the wealthier a local authority is, the less inclined it is to spend money on improvements. The North Fremantle Council is only a small body with not a great amount of revenue. Its overhead is fairly high, and it is not able to do much for Leighton Beach.

Mr. Sleeman: It does not control Leighton Beach.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I understand it does.

Mr. Sleeman: No.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Then who does?

Mr. Sleeman: It is hard to say. The Harbour Trust is supposed to.

Mr. OLDFIELD: If the member for Fremantle does not know who controls that beach, I am sure I should not be expected to know. I think that up till now it has been controlled by the North Fremantle Council. Many years ago, the Cottesloe municipality spent a large amount of money on its waterfront; but it has done nothing in recent years, with the possible exception of pulling down the jetty. The improvements made to the beach under the control of the Nedlands and Claremont Road Boards—namely, Swanbourne—are not bad when one considers the patronage it receives. They have done a fairly reasonable job.

But the Perth City Council, the wealthiest local authority in the State, and one which sets itself up as the paramount governing body in the State—even above Parliament—has done very little to improve the facilities at the beach under its control. The Perth Road Board is called upon to spend many thousands of pounds on the beaches in its area because of the development that has taken place, and it has done a fairly good job in administering the area under its control. The Wanneroo Road Board is essentially a rural authority; we would not consider it a metropolitan road board because of its boundaries, and the rural nature of its lands, and the low rates payable. It has done all that could be expected of it.

At present these people are not permitted to charge a parking fee, unless they take over land on a private basis; but if we were to permit them to do so,

they could mark out areas, and charge a fee and the money received could be spent on improving the existing facilities. This would go a long way to finding an answer to this problem. I say this because it is up to the local authorities concerned to retain control of the beaches they have had under them for many years.

I do not want to see a statutory body set up with a view to taking over all the beaches. I agree whole-heartedly with the hon. member for Wembley Beaches that it is most unfair that the ratepayers living in a ward, perhaps three miles away, should have to pay high rates to provide amenities for people outside the district. I agree with his reasons for wanting a trust, but I do not find myself in the position of supporting the setting up of a statutory body to take over all the ocean beaches, and I hope the Government will take cognisance of all I have said.

MR. CROMMELIN (Claremont — on amendment) [8.11]: I am sure we will all agree with the hon. member for Wembley Beaches that something should be done to improve our ocean beaches. I only propose to refer to the more heavily populated beaches, from Leighton to North Beach. These, of course, comprise different types. Many people remember Cottesloe some years ago when it was a very broad beach. Possibly thirty years ago, with the extension of the North mole, the currents and the tides caused erosion on this beach, and we find that each winter it becomes smaller and smaller.

I would go further and say that very few people alive today realised the problems that we would be up against in regard to beaches possibly 40, 50, or 60 years hence; because if they had done so it is fairly certain, in my opinion, they would never have allowed roads and houses to be built on the edge of the beaches. At Cottesloe we have reached the stage where the main road is on the edge of the sandhills. Nothing more can be done for the Cottesloe beach, except possibly the erection of a groyne which might help to alleviate the drift and current. It is possible that in time this could build up a wider expanse of beach.

It seems to me, however, that Cottesloe is lacking in the ordinary facilities that a beach requires. I refer, of course, to changing rooms, parking space and that sort of thing. But when we go a little further north, to Nedlands, it is different, because the beach is wider. There have been some improvements and the Nedlands council has a lot of land available for sale, some of which has been sold. Over the next five years the council proposes to spend some £100,000 on beach improvements.

Coming further, to City Beach, on which the member for Mt. Lawley commented, in my opinion this particular part of the coastline is the only part on which real improvements could be effected, because of the great area and wide expanse of beach. The sandhills do not rise until they are 300, or possibly 400, yards from the sea. If anybody has had an opportunity of seeing the beaches in Durban and Capetown, in South Africa, he will know that they are very similar to that which we find at City Beach.

The people in charge there, with a lot of foresight, have insisted that there shall be no building closer to the sea than at least 300 yards. Consequently, behind the beach they have been able to plant and maintain lawns and trees. They have also established pools well back from the seafront where children, who must be of different ages, are allowed to swim and learn to swim without being frightened by the pounding waves.

The idea has been effected throughout much of the colony; but on the whole of our metropolitan beach areas it is practically impossible, because there is no space to carry out such a scheme. A possible exception might be City Beach behind the road and between the road and the beach. At Scarborough a wall has been built, and parking is allowed right on the beach front. Therefore, there are very few facilities at that beach for the growing of lawns.

Successive Governments have not looked forward to the growth of the population over the last 40 or 50 years, and they have not said to the local authorities, "Keep your building land back; we are going to provide you with roads and with plenty of water supplies so that you will in the future be able to establish beaches." It is not the fault of this or the last Government; it goes back for a number of years. But we have now reached the stage, in some cases, where it is impossible to bring the beaches back to what they could have been, had foresight been shown some 60 years ago. They can be improved, but not made as attractive as beaches in other parts of the world.

We have to face up to the fact that the Commonwealth has a strip of land in the Nedlands Municipal Council area; and I should imagine that the Commonwealth will take a lot of shifting—although we have an assurance from the Government that the Commonwealth will be asked to move. That is one of the best beaches in the metropolitan area, and no-one is allowed to go to it. We also have to face up to the fact that there is a sewerage plant there. Is the Government prepared to move it so that there will be no possible risk of contamination? All this is tied up with the development of beaches.

Several speakers have pointed out that finance has been the bugbear of local authorities. I could not agree more. But no Government in the last 50 years has made any attempt to help any local authority financially. Over the last few years local authorities have had to face increasing costs. Nobody can deny that. Wages

have gone up, and naturally the local authorities have had to economise on the things from which they receive no revenue. However, it is not too late, by a long stretch, to do something about the position.

I would not like to see a trust formed, because it would take away some of the effect of work being done by the local governing authorities. I would say that today, with the general growth of local government associations, they are becoming stronger and stronger. This has been proved by the meeting which took place this week. The Local Government Association is a big organisation, and one which is entirely voluntary except for its paid servants. Therefore, I feel that an approach by the Government to all local authorities on a national and tourist basis would bring very good results.

I am not going to bring politics into this matter, but would point out that the other evening the hon. member for Wembley Beaches, when introducing his motion, said that the statutes governing local authority administration of the metropolitan region were so and so. He continued by saying—

> Within its own area and within the scope of the above Acts, each local authority is at liberty to set its own pace and to determine its own revenue and loan funds, receipts and expenditure. In actual fact, each one does exactly this, as representation on the controlling council or board is by triennial rotational electoral voting based on property qualification, and thus sectional interests and pressure groups can and do use influence in determining policy matters.
>
> The ratepayer has not direct redress other than the triennial election—with the exception that appeals may be made to the Minister for Local Government to determine interpretation of the authorising Act, or as to whether the local authority is acting in a legitimate manner or not. A new Local Government Bill has been in course of preparation for the past seven years and possibly when finally enacted will overcome most of the present difficulties of administration with the exception of finance.

Those were the exact words used by the hon. member for Wembley Beaches. His remarks suggest that most local authorities are elected by a certain section only of the community and are governed by pressure groups. However, he went further than that. In the draft of the proposed Bill which he sent to me, he suggested that the proposed trust should consist of one member of each local authority having beach fronts within its boundaries. On the one hand he slathers the local authorities because they are elected by a sectional vote and are under the control of pressure groups, and then he turns around and proposes to form a trust comprised of one member from each local authority. I cannot follow him.

For my part I commend the suggestion that improvements be made to our beaches in order to save them; because if this is not done, we will not have many beaches in 50 years' time. If the local authorities can be brought together by the Government on a sensible national basis with the idea of setting up beaches along our coastline—beaches that will be an attraction to tourists from overseas—it will be very good. I feel certain that this is the time to do it, as enthusiasm is high. Everybody has been shot at in the different local authorities for not doing anything; but I feel that the convening of a meeting would be certain to obtain results.

I agree with the Minister when he says that at times ratepayers accept taxes without violent opposition. As the Minister has pointed out, the Argentine ant tax may be finished in a year's time. Therefore, that will provide an opportunity to do something for our beaches. Different authorities are paying a different rate of Argentine ant tax. In my own particular municipality they are paying 1½d. in the £; and in Cottesloe, it is 2d. in the £. I do not know what the others are paying; but if the local government authorities could be prevailed upon to ask their ratepayers, through a referendum, whether they would be prepared to make some contribution for such a national asset as the beaches, I think the response would be very good. However, we could not ask the people to do that unless there was some response from the Government.

The hon. member for Wembley Beaches suggests that the Government will provide £25,000 per year. I presume that he has quoted that figure on fairly authoritative premises; otherwise he would not have done so. However, £25,000 from the Government would not be a great deal; and if all the local authorities in our State responded, that figure should be raised.

Hon. members may recall that a week or so ago I suggested that there might be an easing of the system of allocation of traffic fees to local authorities. Even that would be a help when they were lumped together by all local authorities. I feel that now is the time to do it. Let us do it well, as I think the results which could be achieved would be well worth while.

I do not support the amendment moved by the Minister as it now stands, because I do not think that we should tie ourselves down to a State trust. I have an amendment on the notice paper, but I think the Minister has cut across it to some extent. Assuming that the Minister's amendment is successful, I propose then to move a further amendment along the lines which I have indicated. I hope that something can be done in regard to this very important matter of our beaches.

MR. HALL (Albany—on amendment) [8.28]: I would like to say a few words on the amendment moved by the Minister. I do not know what hon. members are talking about when they speak of our beaches. I wonder if any of them has ever paid a visit to Albany. When I look at the metropolitan beaches I think that the hon. member for Bunbury is exporting better sand than can be found at Swanbourne.

Seriously, I commend the hon. member for Wembley Beaches. One might call him "Mr. Beaches" if he had the beaches to support the representation. However, he must be commended on moving the motion, the implementation of which I think would be to the advantage of the State. I feel that the Minister has taken a step in the right direction in the matter of a beach trust.

As you, Mr. Speaker, have travelled overseas quite a lot—inter-continent and interstate—I feel sure you are in a position to make comparisons. Queensland has stepped into the picture with what is known as "The Golden Mile," or "Surfers' Paradise" in order to attract tourists. We find that South Australia is trying to attract tourists. They are buying farm lands, which have very little attraction in comparison with our State beaches; yet they are laying out large sums of money in order to attract tourists in competition with Queensland. And hon. members who visited South Australia as members of the parliamentary delegation would be aware of what the intention is there.

That brings me back to the fact that the Minister has taken the right view—that this is definitely a State problem. As one who represents beaches outside the metropolitan area, I feel that this is the only way in which to develop our beaches and employ our natural resources. Going up Apex drive at Albany on a fine day, one can look for many miles in both directions and all around one can see beaches with first-class potentialities. There is also what used to be the quarantine station, but has now been turned into a holiday resort. I made representations to the Minister for Works some time ago, to have a road put through from the Frenchman's Bay-rd. to serve this tourist resort.

In this spot we have two beaches—inner Bramble Beach and outer Bramble Beach —which are comparable with any others in this State. I commend Mr. Wheeler, who had the enterprise to go in there and put through a road for himself, as this place will prove a great tourist attraction for the State generally and for Albany in particular. Part of the plan is to have a golf course and tennis courts there, together with swimming, boating and fishing, but all this will require a great deal of finance if the project is to be developed properly. At Nannerup there is a beach at least equal to anything in the metropolitan area, with a natural swimming pool.

Then there is an area where week-end huts can be erected—as the Minister said, not the old style of shacks—at a distance of perhaps a quarter of a mile back from the sea, so as to avoid the heartbreaks which occurred at Emu Point where squatters years ago built nice homes, only to find that they will eventually have to be shifted, in accordance with the planning. I hope the Minister stays his hand in that regard, but of course he must be guided by what has taken place elsewhere. We must also see that similar trouble does not arise at Cheyne Beach.

If the whole question is tackled on a State-wide basis it will open up a considerable potential for our timber mills. Huts could be erected by means of State finance and then hired or leased to some controlling body; and that would also attract tourist capital to this State in competition with the other States. The problem must be dealt with from that angle if we are to achieve anything worth while; and I ask the Government to bear in mind that this should not be a metropolitan beach trust, but a State trust, in the interests of the whole State.

THE HON. J. B. SLEEMAN (Fremantle —on amendment) [8.35]: I wish to say a few words in fairness to the North Fremantle Municipal Council. If the amendment is agreed to, I trust that we will be told who owns and controls Leighton beach. There is no doubt that it would be a wonderful beach if North Fremantle controlled it or was given a fair go in regard to it. The hon. member for Mt. Lawley wanted to know who controlled that beach. On the 25th September, 1957, I asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways the following questions:—

> (1) Is he aware that preliminary notice has been issued to the Leighton Surf Lifesaving Club requiring the club to vacate the land occupied by it under lease from the Railway Department?
>
> (2) Does the issue of such advice mean that a decision has already been made on the future of this land, which is the subject of an application by the North Fremantle Municipality for the creation of a reserve for recreation?

The Minister for Transport replied as follows:—

> (1) Yes.
>
> (2) No. As plans are being considered for improved railway facilities in this area the department has given preliminary notice to lessees that the land may be required.

On the same day I asked the Minister for Lands a question as follows:—

> (1) Has the proposed inspection, by the Under Secretary for Lands and the Surveyor General, of the area known as Leighton beach, been made?

(2) If so, has he received and considered a report on this matter?

(3) If not, when will the inspection be made?

To which the Minister replied—

(1) No.

(2) No.

(3) Within one month.

That was about 12 months ago, and the North Fremantle Municipal Council has heard nothing about it since. In addition to our not knowing who controls that beach, there is also the fact that the huge wool stores, erected at Leighton beach in 1915 or 1916, with the promise that they would be removed immediately the war finished, are still there. The position is nearly as bad as that with reference to the quarters of the Hansard staff, which were put up as a temporary building when this House opened, and are still there. I appeal to the Minister, if he ever gets this trust going to find out what portion of the beach North Fremantle owns; or whether it will ever get a portion; or whether the railways or Mr. Tydeman and the Harbour Trust are to control it. Some people down there say that the Harbour Trust will take over the beaches very shortly. It is impossible for the North Fremantle Municipal Council to do anything at present in regard to the beaches there.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—on amendment) [8.37]: I oppose the motion and the Minister's amendment. That amendment cuts across the bows of the amendment which the hon. member for Claremont placed on the notice paper and which typifies our policy in regard to the preservation and development of our beaches. Instead of the Minister's amendment reading that "In the opinion of this House the Government should take early steps to consider legislation to establish a trust," I would rather that the wording were "In the opinion of this House, the adequate preservation and development of beaches, the problems of which are accentuated by seasonal demands and use by people outside the local governing authorities directly concerned, is beyond the financial resources of such authorities, and the Government should formulate a programme of financial assistance for those authorities, through a subsidy formula, without the creation of a further Government authority in the form of a beach trust and without reducing the powers, responsibilities and initiative of local governing authorities."

That, as I have said, actually expresses our policy in essence. However, as I have mentioned, the Minister's amendment has prevented our moving just that form of amendment, although the hon. member for Claremont pointed out that at a subsequent stage of the debate it is his intention to move an amendment which is more in accord with the policy to which we hold. The hon. member for Wembley Beaches, who moved the motion requesting the Government to introduce legislation for the purpose of creating a metropolitan beach trust, summed up his argument by saying, "I feel I have established that local authorities are either unwilling or unable to satisfactorily maintain or improve ocean beaches in the metropolitan region." An examination of that part of his summing up reveals that he has established nothing of the sort. I grant that he is in part correct, but in small part only.

If we say that some local authorities are unable satisfactorily to maintain or improve their beaches without financial assistance from the Government, he is only right in that respect. He is only right in saying that they are unable or unwilling to do this without financial assistance from the Government. I emphasise those words "without assistance." Let us look at the statement of the hon. member for Wembley Beaches—that local authorities are unwilling to develop or improve the beaches under their control; and I feel that in considering this we will realise just how wrong he was. Let us look for a moment at what the Nedlands Council intends to do with the beaches under its control. It plans to make Swanbourne beach a highly developed playground area; and, to that end, intends to spend approximately £100,000.

Mr. Sleeman: Is that for the land that the Commonwealth now has?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Perhaps, in part, that would account for some of the expenditure on improving a certain acreage that they hope to get from the army. Let us look closely at how Nedlands feels in regard to a Government trust to control our beaches. In "The West Australian" of the 4th July, 1958, there was a paragraph headed "Nedlands Opposes Beach Bill," which reads—

> The Nedlands Council last night decided not to support the Beach Trust Bill. "It merely introduces another statutory body, and we have enough already," said Councillor H. L. Leckie. He claimed that each local authority could look after its beaches satisfactorily. Councillor R. J. Firkin said that funds would probably be spent on the administrative side of the trust rather than on actual beach development. Nedlands, he added, had a small beach frontage and would pay heavily without receiving its just dues.

On the 10th July there appeared in "The West Australian" a plan showing what the Nedlands Council intended to do in regard

to improving and developing the beach under its control and beneath that plan was a paragraph which stated—

> This is a plan of the Nedlands Municipal Council's Swanbourne beach development project. It is likely to cost £100,000 over a period of years.

Mention is then made of the fact that portion of the army land adjacent to the Swanbourne beach area is sought from the Commonwealth Government, as it is now under the control and care of the army.

In the case of the Nedlands Municipal Council, we have a local authority which is certainly not unwilling to look after its beaches. On the contrary, it desires to retain its powers and rights in every way. It desires to retain its initiative in connection with the improvement and development of the beaches under its control. The only way in which the meaning of the word "unwilling" could be applied to the Nedlands Council is that it is strongly opposed to the formation of a trust.

Mr. Kelly: I suppose the council would be willing to come to a conference to discuss a matter of that kind?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I have no doubts on that score. Let us turn to how the Perth City Council feels about the statement made by the hon. member for Wembley Beaches that local authorities are unwilling or unable to care for, control, improve and develop the beaches under its control. What do we find in this case? We find that already the Perth City Council has done much to improve and develop both the City and Wembley Beaches and intends to do a great deal more and spend a great deal of money—over a period of years—on future development.

As proof of that, and in order that we may properly ascertain the Perth City Council's attitude in this regard, I will quote a cutting from "The West Australian" of the 1st April, 1958, headed, "City Council against Beach Trust Plan." This is what is contained in the article—

> The Perth City Council is not in favour of a metropolitan beach trust . . . .
>
> A memorandum submitted by Town Clerk Green to a council meeting yesterday claimed that the trust proposals were unsatisfactory in a number of fundamental aspects.
>
> The council decided to inform Marshall that:
>
> > It had accepted its full responsibilities for the development of beaches under its control.
> >
> > It considered that the expenditure in setting up another local authority was not warranted.
>
> Green said that the trust could include three members with no responsibilities to any authority affected by the Control Trust Act.

That is the trust as proposed by the hon. member for Wembley Beaches.

So it is interesting to see how the Perth City Council, which is a very strong member of the arm of local government feels in regard to the proposition that there should be a State trust to develop and improve metropolitan beaches. In short, that council told the world that it is prepared to accept in full its responsibilities in this regard.

Mr. Marshall: It has been saying that for years.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Surely it has proved that it has really begun a big development programme and has done a great deal of good in the area I have referred to, and I think I have already indicated to the hon. member that it intends to do a great deal more. Of course, other local authorities are unhappy or wary of the proposition of a State trust. They feel chary about agreeing to it, probable for five reasons, which may be summarised as follows:—

> 1. That the overhead administration cost of a trust would prove to be high and would, in all probability, follow the trend of Government departments by increasing with the years.
>
> 2. That power, to an extent, would be whittled away from local government and centralised in the hands of the State Government.
>
> 3. That under a form of trust there would be a specialised form of taxation; a sectional tax which would fall on one section of the community only; namely, the ratepayers.
>
> 4. That in its original form it was parochial to the extent that it catered merely for metropolitan beaches and not for beaches along any part of the coastline of the State.
>
> 5. That it has reference only to ocean beaches and not to river beaches.

I see no real reason why a Government should not assist with the development and improvement of river beaches. I think it goes almost without saying that river beaches cater for the needs not only of the people of the metropolitan area, but of those drawn from all parts of the State by the provision of an amenity that is highly regarded.

Mr. Potter: Does this motion differentiate between river and ocean beaches?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I would say it does.

Mr. Kelly: There is no mention of it.

Mr. Potter: No; there is no mention of it.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I would say it does; and, throughout the remarks made by the hon. member for Wembley

Beaches there was no mention that he intended to include other beaches throughout the State.

Mr. Potter: I am speaking of the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: If the hon. member had listened to me closely enough he would realise that I made a remark that, in the original form, it was parochial to the extent that it referred only to a metropolitan beach trust. With regard to river beaches I was saying that they meet a very great public demand, and I put forward the plea that the assistance to river beaches should run parallel to that granted to ocean beaches.

I notice that the beach at Peppermint Grove is the venue for the attraction of a great number of visitors during each weekend of the summer months. That lovely beach is enjoyed by a large number of people. The secretary of the Peppermint Grove Road Board has stated that his board has been involved in considerable expenditure in maintaining this river picnic beach, which is used largely by people drawn from other suburbs and other parts of the State. He also mentioned that the visitors included members of trade unions and other picnic parties involving, sometimes, 6,000 people in one day.

Mr. May: They spend a great deal of money, too, while they are there.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Yes; but that money does not flow into the hands of the local governing authority.

Mr. May: Yes it does, through the ratepayers who run the businesses on the beach.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: To a small extent only, and to an extent which is not commensurate with the expenditure involved in providing amenities which the member for Collie would like there; which I would like there; and which the people who frequent the beach would like also.

Mr. May: How much does the local authority spend on the beach?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It spends a great deal of money on it.

Mr. May: There is not much to see for it.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I would view with pleasure a visit to that beach, in company with the hon. member for Collie, in order to show him what has been done by the board along the foreshore.

Mr. Lapham: Where does the money come from?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: From the local authorities.

Mr. Lapham: Yes; but originally from the ratepayers of the district.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Yes.

Mr. Lapham: Do you think that those people should be taxed to provide amenities that are used by others who come from all parts of the State?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: No. I have already mentioned that the Government should provide some assistance in that regard. If the hon. member will consult the policy which is set out on page 6 of the notice paper he will see the truth of that. However, it is difficult to set out a policy in a few words.

Mr. Lapham: You still contend that the ratepayers should subscribe for the amenities on the beach which are for the benefit of everybody else?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I think it is the duty of the local governing body to see that this is done. But it is also the responsibility of the State Government to do something to assist. I feel exactly the same way as the Minister does. The Minister said that the responsibilities in regard to the improvement and development of beaches lies squarely with local authorities and the Government. I agree whole-heartedly with that remark. In fact, I think it is very heartening that that should be so. I thought his speech was very sound in many respects.

Mr. Lapham: You do not find too many people in the Scarborough district agreeing with that.

Mr. Court: Under the proposition that has been put forward by the hon. member for Wembley Beaches, they pay their share of the rates.

Mr. Lapham: They pay more than their share.

The SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. member for Cottesloe now.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Apart from the individual stands that have been taken by local authorities and to which I have referred, let us have a close look at how local government feels about the financial side of any trust proposal that might be envisaged by the hon. member for Wembley Beaches or the Minister. After all is said and done, finance is the really important part of this question. As to how local government feels on the question of finance, I would like to refer to a newspaper cutting which appeared in an issue of "The West Australian" dated the 19th March, 1958. It is as follows:—

> Six representatives of local authorities who met yesterday to consider the proposed trust for metropolitan beaches decided they would not agree to a trust unless the Government financed it.

That was their view. Six representatives of local government said they would not agree to a trust unless the Government financed it.

Mr. Lapham: Who were the six?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: No mention is made in the Press cutting of which six. In "The West Australian" of the 22nd March there appeared a paragraph headed "Local Government Accepts Beach Plan." Hon. members should listen to this rather closely. It reads—

> The Local Government Association will support the formation of a metropolitan beach trust financed by the Government. This plan was recommended by representatives of local authorities at a meeting last Monday, and last night members of the association agreed to accept it. However, the association considered that much more research into the beach-trust proposal was required.
>
> Dr. H. R. Nash (Mosman Park) who attended the meeting on Monday, told the association that Fred Marshall, M.L.A. for Wembley Beaches, had no concrete scheme to put forward.

The point I want to make is that local government only accepted the proposition of a beach trust financed by the Government. The Minister made a comment about that point not so very long ago.

This, I contend, gives us a lot of food for thought, and the food for thought revolves around the financial aspect. If the Government were to try to force a sectional tax on ratepayers to finance the trust against the expressed will of local government it would be an arbitrary and absolute abuse of its powers.

Mr. Kelly: I do not think that has been suggested.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I appreciate from the remarks of the Minister when he replied to the speech made by the hon. member for Wembley Beaches that he had no intention of doing that.

Mr. Hawke: How could the Government do that?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Attempt to force, or try to bring about a state of affairs whereby a sectional tax was placed on a section of the people.

Mr. Hawke: How could the Government do that?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: By doing the same sort of thing in co-operation with a majority of local government to bring about this tax. However, the Minister did say he was not prepared to accept the proposition put forward of introducing legislation for a beach trust unless a conference preceded that possibility, and at that conference the details could be thrashed out in a friendly atmosphere.

I would say that any form of taxation on a section of the people—namely, the ratepayers—is not wanted. I have already enumerated the five reasons why it is not wanted: Firstly, the high overhead administration cost; secondly, the whittling down of local government powers; thirdly, in the original form reference was made to the metropolitan area only and not the country beaches; fourthly, there would be a sectional tax; and, fifthly, reference was made only to ocean beaches and did not include river beaches.

The opinion of the Cottesloe Council is rather an interesting one. It gives qualified support to the proposition of a beach trust. Its view is one which should be sought because of the fact that its beach is one of the beaches which have been very seriously eroded through the years. The erosion has affected the area to such a great extent that people nowadays do not derive the same enjoyment from the beach as they did when the Minister for Lands was a teenager.

This letter here from the Town Clerk indicates the feelings of the council with regard to the beach trust. He says, among other things—

> Council favours the establishment of the beach trust but considers that any Bill placed before Parliament should contain clauses providing for the finance of a trust.

Certain things which the Minister has said in the meantime have resolved the feelings on that point. The letter goes on to say—

> It is considered that local authorities should retain control of beaches within their district and should carry out any work decided upon by the trust. If the State Government would provide adequate financial assistance to local authorities for beach development my council believes that a trust would then be unnecessary.

So we see that Cottesloe's only wish for this trust is, more or less, a last-ditch wish. Even then it has a proviso. It would infinitely prefer to share the burden with some Government assistance and retain its powers, rights, initiative, and responsibility for doing the work itself, instead of handing over its rights, responsibility, initiative and power to a State trust.

What I have had to say in regard to the proposition of a trust does not mean that I do not want any action. On the contrary, I feel that action is badly needed, and needed from a financially sympathetic Government. I hoped that some financial assistance would be forthcoming from this Government. If the proposed trust does not come to fruition, as is apparently desired, I feel that the Government would be unwise and wrong in principle to try to place the whole financial responsibility upon local government with regard to preservation and development of our beaches—both ocean and river beaches.

It is our belief that action should be taken along the lines set out in the amendment I read at the outset of my speech. With regard to our policy on this particular subject, I think I should read part

of the policy speech made by the hon. member for Murray in 1956, prior to the last election, when he indicated our policy on this particular matter. Largely, our policy runs along the same lines; although there would, of necessity, be some changes which could take place in the wording.

Mr. W. Hegney: When you say "our" policy, what do you mean?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I would say the party's policy with regard to what we would do in respect of beaches.

Mr. W. Hegney: You mean the Liberal Party?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I think so. What did the Minister think I meant?

Mr. W. Hegney: I was not sure. I thought it was non-party.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I think it is very wise of a party to have such a policy, and I would exhort members opposite to have a policy with regard to this matter.

Mr. Potter: We have a policy.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: That is excellent.

Mr. W. Hegney: You are not treating this as a party policy?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Not a bit. After that by-play, I shall continue with the point I was making as to what is the Liberal policy with regard to beaches. I think it is pertinent to read it at this stage. This extract deals with the question of beaches and is taken from the policy speech of the hon. member for Murray when he was Leader of the Opposition in 1956. It states—

> Beaches.—In Western Australia we are singularly blessed with first-class beaches. They are used by all the people. They are a great boon to country folk at holiday time. They could and should become a great tourist attraction. Because they have always been there, we are inclined to undervalue them.
>
> We feel it is not equitable that all expenditure on beach facilities, improvement and prevention of erosion should be borne solely by the ratepayers resident within the beach area concerned.
>
> The university is at present conducting experiments to determine the causes and solutions of beach erosion. We are prepared to examine the findings of these experiments to give all the assistance we can to carry out their recommendations where practicable. We will fully co-operate with the beach road boards in any co-ordinated plan for beach preservation and beautification.

Mr. Kelly: It does not say anything about providing finance. He can give the proposal his blessing.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There is more envisaged in that policy. There is no mention of not providing any finance.

Mr. Hawke: He was a shrewd leader, the member for Murray.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: To follow this point with regard to Government assistance, I contend there are sound and logical grounds for Government assistance by way of subsidy to local government for the purpose of preservation, development, and beautification of our river and ocean beaches, and at least it should be part of the Government's responsibility to assist in preventing erosion of beach areas.

Let us take the erosion of beaches. Cottesloe is a case in point. All hon. members will realise that countless tons of sand which have been removed from Cottesloe beach over the years have, in the main, finished up on North Fremantle beach, adjacent to the North Mole. So much sand has built up there that it has consolidated into quite solid foundations, and buildings have been placed thereon. The Government is receiving rentals for buildings erected on that land.

In a sense, if the Government is prepared to receive moneys from rentals of land that has been built up by sand taken from some other place, it should be prepared to accept the responsibility, at least in part, for compensating for the denudation that has occurred in the other region.

Mr. Kelly: The revenue from rentals would not go very far.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I contend the Government has a responsibility in regard to beaches because of the tremendous importance of the potential tourist interest and trade that could come here because of our beaches. Mention has been made by previous speakers of the extent to which some beaches in other places have been improved so that they become actually magnets for tourists. Hon. members will readily realise that tourists can have a wonderfully beneficial effect upon the economy of the country as a whole. There is, in fact, a big industry to be developed here, and the Government could play a large part in helping the tourist industry by assistance to local governments for the development of the beaches. I feel that what is required is that the local authorities should retain complete initiative in regard to this, but that Governments should realise that they have some financial responsibility and that they should get together to formulate a plan whereby assistance could be given for the purposes that I have described.

MR. POTTER (Subiaco—on amendment) [9.17]: I support the amendment moved by the Minister for the reason set forth by the hon. member for Cottesloe in his concluding remarks. At the same time, I must commend the hon. member for Wembley Beaches for having brought forward this

motion, because it has caused quite a bit of controversy, and has livened up public opinion in regard to the beaches. At this time, when it is considered that the beaches in his area will be in the forefront in the Empire Games in 1962, something should be done in order to encourage the local authorities to do something with reference to the beaches. There is also the aspect of tourist traffic to which reference has been made by previous speakers.

Whatever proposal is agreed to—whether it be the motion moved by the hon. member for Wembley Beaches or the amendment foreshadowed by the hon. member for Claremont—we must have somebody to call the interested bodies together; and I am speaking of the local authorities. It does not matter how much we may speak about the matter here, or what we may say, these local authorities must be brought together under some responsible body which could convene a meeting of this kind. The Minister has suggested that the Government will probably do this. He emphasised what had been done about Argentine ants, and a formula something similar to that which was adopted on that occasion is necessary with regard to the control of our beaches. Many of these local authorites have a worth-while scheme and will ultimately make a very worth-while contribution to the objective we have in mind.

The hon. member for Cottesloe has referred to Mosman beach on the river. There again, I differ from him. I feel that this proposed trust—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I must be right then!

Mr. POTTER: —should cover both ocean and river beaches. I am interested in this matter because we have a Subiaco beach! Unfortunately, in the survey, something happened, and the high-water line has receded, so that the beach does not come down to the high-water line. This has been a controversial topic for a number of years, and there is a lack of development in that regard. It is in the constituency of the member for Nedlands.

As the Minister has said, these local authorities have plans and they should be encouraged to show initiative and submit those plans. It is necessary that all these authorities should be called together with the idea of formulating some scheme and framing legislation necessary to achieve the objective we have in mind. That would be a step in the right direction. If it did not go all the way that the hon. member for Wembley Beaches desires, at least it would enable him to feel that, in introducing this motion into the House, he had perhaps inspired some action on the part of both the Government and the local authorities.

I think he is to be commended in that respect; and we have no alternative at the moment but to adopt the motion in its present embryo stage. As a result of the Government convening these local authorities, we would in time, I hope, achieve some action with regard to the beaches.

I do not feel that it is necessary to reiterate what has already been said in regard to the state of most of our beaches. The whole thing is to get down to something practical and implement some policy which will enhance our beaches and make them worthy of visitation by tourists, and also by regular local visitors, and show tourists that Western Australians are a people who have a certain grace of living.

MR. JOHNSON (Leederville—on amendment) [9.22]: The debate on this matter has illustrated the fact that there is a good deal of general agreement on the need for some control over our beaches. I think agreement needs to be reached on method and on finance. The view I have on this matter is somewhat different from any that has been expressed so far. I intend to be brief because I realise that the amendment suggested by the Minister indicates the intention of the Government to cause some study to be made of the debate and of the problem generally, to see what can be done.

Mr. Brand: Do you really believe that?

Mr. JOHNSON: I sincerely hope so, anyway. Things may have been different when the Leader of the Opposition sat on this side of the House; but I have some confidence in the Government which is now occupying the front bench.

Mr. Brand: I do not know why.

Mr. JOHNSON: There is a matter upon which I must examine my conscience, because I feel that the Leader of the Opposition might agree with it. That is that the proposal to form a beach trust is a proposal to form another public body; and we seem to have an awful lot of them. I feel it would be a good thing if we could reduce the number of boards and similar bodies, without reducing the functions carried out by them. I do however, think differently from the Minister with regard to his proposal that the beaches of the whole State should be controlled by a single board.

My proposition is that we should examine the legislation of the State of Victoria relating to the Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works. That is a body which controls a number of items, powers, authorities, and responsibilities, including beaches; and I feel we could examine, with profit to our State, the possibility of establishing a metropolitan area board of works, or some other somewhat similar body, to absorb the duties of a number of existing boards.

I feel that we as a State, deal with a number of items, at times, which are the responsibility not of the whole State, but of the metropolitan area only. Under

matters relating to town planning, we have debated, and considered outside the Chamber, a number of ideas which include the matter of beaches and the improvement to tourist facilities, and roads leading to beaches and other places.

All the principal tourist features anywhere near the city of Perth are included in the metropolitan area that is covered by the town planning set-up under the governing authority and covered by the Hepburn report. I would suggest that the Government consider while investigating the idea of the control of beaches the establishment of some kind of board having responsibility over the whole of the metropolitan area as set out in that plan. Portion of the authority which is now held by the local governing bodies, could be put in the hands of a controlling board; also portion of the authority which is now held by the Government.

I feel that a metropolitan regional board should control and attend to water supply, electricity and gas, passenger transport, the tourist attractions of the region—that is, parks, river beaches, and ocean beaches —and possibly some other matters. If that were so, finance, which is needed for the development of the metropolitan area —some of which could, or should, be applied to the development of the tourist industry by the improvement of our beaches —could come from the profits of the metropolitan water supply instead of being applied, as now, to help with the losses made in the country areas water supplies.

Similarly, in relation to electricity—I do not think it is relevant to gas. The whole idea is, I must admit, as far as I am concerned, only a preliminary idea, but is one worthy of study. When it is considered that a body of the kind I have suggested could take over the responsibility of a number of boards—at least the metropolitan water supply, portion of the responsibility of the State electricity supply, the metropolitan transport trust, the parks and reserves board, the Swan River Conservation Board, the proposed metropolitan beach trust and a number of others—hon. members can see that there is a possibility of even saving money and yet getting the same work done.

The Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works Act was first passed in 1915, and it had a very limited application. It was consolidated in 1928 and at that time covered only the authorities relating to water, sewerage and drainage; but it was later amended to include bridges and highways and, in 1956, parks and foreshores. It has its own method of control and its own method of finance. I think that serious study should be given to the proposition.

In suggesting a body to control all the beaches in Western Australia, we are spreading the expenditure of the possible income of that body over too large an area. Most of the finance would, as usual, have to come from the city; and it could be spread over such beaches as the 90-mile beach in the North, and we would hardly see where the money went. There is a lovely beach just out of the town of Esperance which could do with some help, and there are the beaches mentioned by the member for Albany. There are beaches all over the place; some I have seen, and some I have not seen.

I would say that they all require improvements of one kind or another. But as far as the metropolitan area is concerned, I think we want a metropolitan authority controlling not only the beaches but a number of other matters which could be integrated under the one control. I am not opposing the amendment moved by the Minister that the Government should consider legislation; but I trust that when consideration is given to any legislation to control beaches, consideration will also be given to the possibility of an authority covering a number of responsibilities in a limited area, instead of the other proposition of an authority covering a single responsibility over an unlimited area.

I support the motion and I congratulate the hon. member for Wembley Beaches for his initiative in introducing the subject for debate, because I feel that the debate in itself is of great interest to all of us.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—on amendment) [9.34]: The speech of, and the amendment moved by, the Minister has made the debate on this matter much more easy up to this point than would otherwise have been the case. I think very wisely he, on behalf of his Government, has refused to be stampeded into introducing legislation for a beach trust. The idea of a beach trust is very attractive when one first hears a mention of it; it is like town planning—everybody is keen on town planning until we have to get down to the job of resuming somebody's land, raising some money to implement the plan, reconstructing a road or doing something of that nature. Then everyone finds faults with that part of the proposed plan. In other words town planning is first class so long as it does not affect my sort of business!

It is much the same with a beach trust. Everyone is keen to have a beach trust. They say, "We must have our beaches developed." No one argues with the general principle but when we have to turn round and say that so and so has to take the responsibility for the development and the actual lay-out of the beaches and so on—and, of course, who will pay for it—everyone's interest in beach trusts cools off somewhat. Therefore I feel that the Minister has agreed that our approach to the problem is the one that should be adopted at this particular stage.

It was foreshadowed rather clearly in the amendment on the notice paper under the name of the member for Claremont; but in view of the amendment moved by

the Minister we have to discuss the proposition on a more roundabout basis. However, there is no need for us to oppose, or at least for me personally—and I am speaking personally at this stage—to oppose the amendment moved by the Minister because we can still meet his proposition and at the same time submit to the House one which conforms with our policy on this particular matter.

I am a great believer in encouraging local authority to accept its full responsibility. It is no good having those authorities and then usurping some of their functions, or intruding in their domestic affairs. If we find that a local authority is either incapable of meeting its responsibilities in a particular direction, or is unwilling to meet those responsibilities, surely we can deal with it as a specific case. The Government can always use its persuasive powers; and if persuasion fails there is always Parliament. But surely it is better to come to Parliament with specific cases rather than put a blanket over the whole of local government in respect to this problem of beach preservation and beach development!

It should be realised that local authorities have to live with their own local deeds, or misdeeds as the case may be. No two beaches are alike. The general nature of the area differs from one beach to another; and the potential of one area as against another differs very drastically as one moves up and down the coast. Therefore, we have to accept the proposition that a particular local authority should be in a position to judge the magnitude and the nature of the developments that should be undertaken within its particular boundaries. We should encourage them in their work, and encourage them to use their initiative. If we are able to create the wherewithal, both technically and financially, for the local authorities to undertake their responsibilities, I am certain we will get a greater diversity of ideas for our beaches, so that there will not be a sort of general pattern covering all of them.

Mr. Potter: That is very desirable.

Mr. COURT: I think it is most desirable. But it would be most difficult if we had a trust which was financially responsible. We would not be able to get this diversity of ideas. Over the years there would be a tendency for a certain pattern to be followed. I think one of the great attractions to the tourist is to have diversity so that he can go from point A to point B and see something different instead of visiting one beach and, on visiting another beach, see much the same thing.

The question of divided control can be most embarrassing. If the trust is to have a certain responsibility in connection with the foreshore, over a defined area, it follows that in some place in the scheme of things there could be a conflict between the local authority and the beach authority. That has been well exemplified in a minor way in connection with the development to which the member for Subiaco referred; namely, the foreshore at Nedlands on the Perth side of the Nedlands jetty.

An argument has been going on there for many years between the Subiaco Council and the Government as to who owns a certain part of the land. Following a reclamation scheme by the Government the Council disputed their responsibility and has not yet been able to reach agreement with the Government on the question of the high-water mark. The problem is not terribly serious because the Teachers' Training College, coming as it is proposed in Crawley, will solve most of the difficulties. Then the Government of the day and the Subiaco Council will have to get together and resolve their differences in respect to the area from the Teachers' College down to the Nedlands jetty.

On the other side of the jetty, of course, a very commendable job of development has been done by the local authority. That is where the boundary of the Nedlands Municipal Council starts, and it has developed a wonderful area of playing fields which are made available to sports which normally cannot and do not have a gate—in other words do not have gate proceeds.

Further round in Matilda Bay there is more divided control. The National Parks Board, as it is now known, is actually responsible for the development and maintenance of Matilda Bay; but it is technically within the boundary of the Subiaco Municipal Council. Hon. members will recall the newspaper controversy that goes on when we near Australia Day as to who is responsible for the hygiene and sanitation. The Subiaco council says, "That is our responsibility at law and we are responsible to see that the area is hygienic." The National Parks Board says, "You keep out of this because this is our area," and they have never resolved that particular difference.

I just instance that to show what can happen when there are two authorities trying to work side by side. Therefore, if we create a situation where a local authority is able to assert itself, and undertake its responsibilities, and show initiative, we avoid the problem of overlapping authority. Whichever way we look at the proposition finance will come into it. Most local authorities want to do the right thing. They have the desire, and, in most cases, they have the technical ability to do the right thing. But it gets down to the question of pounds, shillings and pence. There seems to be general agreement throughout the Chamber on the question of people additional to those who live in the immediate vicinity of beaches making a contribution to the cost. So the argument revolves round the question as to whether there will be a trust with an income of its own or

whether the local authorities will receive their funds from another source—obviously from the Government in that case.

It is interesting to note that when the hon. member for Wembley Beaches contacted members regarding the financial proposition to get support for his proposed Bill, he gave us an indication of where he thought the funds could come from. It is very interesting to note that on the metropolitan area he proposes a rate of ¾d. in the £. From that he would get £119,490 per annum, a total in round figures of £120,000. From the country, at a rate of ¾d. in the £ he estimates to get £68,055; and the Government subsidy, from road funds—£25,000—makes a total of £212,545; and in five years the grand total would be £1,052,725. I should imagine the Treasurer commended him for that.

Mr. Brand: How to raise £1,000,000 in three easy lessons.

Mr. COURT: It was a question of raising £1,000,000 with the Treasurer escaping virtually unscathed, and the poor old maligned property owner bearing the burden. There is a rather quaint twist about this method of raising funds because during the discussions on the Local Government Bill there was much criticism of the property owner—this so-called big, bad wolf, the man who should be deprived of any special franchise rights. But when it comes to raising money everyone says, "Let us have a rate" whether it is to get rid of ants or to establish beach trusts or anything else.

Mr. Kelly: You anticipated that, I suppose.

Mr. COURT: It is rather interesting to note the use that the poor old property owner has for money-raising purposes. I am sure it is not intended that a notice shall be placed on the beach, "Non-ratepayers keep off" because that would really start trouble.

Mr. W. Hegney: They would not be in the swim.

Mr. Marshall: Rigby illustrated that in "The Daily News."

Mr. COURT: I should imagine that, in the case of people coming from the country, it would be rather amusing trying to distinguish between those who had paid their ¾d. in the £ and those who had not. It would probably be necessary to invent some distinguishing feature—perhaps we could ask them to wear different types of bathers.

Whilst we might be facetious about this, there is a serious side, because it is the poor old property owner who would be called upon to pay this rate. To raise that tax in the country would meet with great hostility, particularly as this trust was branded, both in the motion and in the Bill, as a metropolitan beach trust; there was no suggestion at that stage that it should be a State-wide beach trust. The Government foreshadowed amendments making this a State beach trust, instead of a metropolitan beach trust. However, I can see no point in opposing the Minister's motion for the deletion of this word with a view to inserting the word "consider". In due course somebody on this side of the House will be submitting an amendment in an endeavour to express more clearly our policy which is aimed against the establishment of such a trust, particularly at this point of time.

On motion by Mr. O'Brien, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.45 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, 4th September, 1958.

CONTENTS

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.