

The new distribution, for perhaps very good reasons,, may excise part of a district and may add to it part of another district. The people in that district naturally object and direct their member that they want him to oppose it. The result is that districts may get completely out of balance over a period of years, and yet it is very hard for Parliament, for various reasons, to address itself to a remedy. So, as in Queensland and in New South Wales, and in line with what we may regard as current and prudent practice, we say by this Bill that having secured the right kind of commission, based substantially on the previous commission, we leave it to them; and we, as Parliamentarians, having laid down the principles on which they are to act, allow them to be the final arbiters in the matter of the details of the situation and boundaries of the different districts. I think that as it has operated for a good many years in Queensland and New South Wales, this principle is one that will commend itself to the electors of the State and at the same time enable an electoral balance to be maintained automatically and satisfactorily in a way that has been difficult to achieve in the past.

Hon. A. H. Panton: You do not think Parliament ever tried to alter the areas when they were sent on by the commission?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Does the hon. member mean 1937?

Hon. A. H. Panton: At any time.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No. Parliament in 1929, which is the only occasion where it previously dealt with the commission, accepted the commission's findings in the redistribution of seats Act of that year. In 1937, when the balance was lost again, the commission made its recommendations and the Government of the day introduced a Bill which was, I believe, entirely based on the commission's findings.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: And 25 members voted for it but it was not sufficient.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That is so. It did not commend itself to the House.

Hon. A. H. Panton: To half the House.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes. I think it can be said that any redistribution of seats Bill must always run the risk of not being acceptable to a considerable num-

ber of people. I feel that the Bill before the House is endeavouring to meet times which have changed in a revolutionary way in the last 10 or 20 years. It is designed to provide through an impartial tribunal, a balance not only as between districts and provinces, but also as between the metropolitan area and the rest of the State, which composes the outer areas. At the same time it does have regard to the electoral claims and rights of the not inconsiderable number of people—in fact the majority—who must necessarily now and in the future be the occupants of the metropolitan area. I think we have achieved that, and I think the measure represents an approach to a problem that deserves the support of the House. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

House adjourned at 10.53 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 27th November, 1947.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Government motor vehicles, as to number, control and fuel allocation ...	2202
Servicemen's land settlement, as to Ben Ord Estate contracts ...	2202
Railway omnibuses, as to number and equipment for country services ...	2202
Bills : Dried Fruits, 3r.	2203
Wheat Marketing, 3r.	2203
Industry (Advances), report ...	2203
War Service Land Settlement Agreement (Land Act Application) Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report ...	2203
Iron and Steel Industry, 2r.	2204
Licensing (Provisional Certificate), 2r.	2206
Milk Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r.	2210
Government Railways Act Amendment, 1r.	2212
Western Australian Government Tramways and Ferries, 1r.	2212
Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment, Assembly's message ...	2212

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

QUESTIONS.**GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLES.**

As to Number, Control and Fuel Allocation.

Hon. G. W. MILES (for Hon. C. F. Baxter) (on notice) asked the Minister for Mines:

On the 21st October, pursuant to notice, I asked the Minister—"What is the number of Government motor-cars and runabouts used by the Government?" The Minister replied "This information is not readily available, but will be prepared." Can the Minister now supply the information?

The MINISTER replied:

The latest return shows that 153 cars and 236 utilities are in use by the following departments:—

Agriculture, Chief Secretary's, Health, Child Welfare, Education, Fisheries, Forests, Fremantle Harbour Trust, Government Stores, Industrial Development, Lands and Surveys, Metropolitan Water Supply, Mines, Native Affairs, Police, Premier's, Public Works, Main Roads, Goldfields Water Supply, Railways, Tramways, Rural and Industries Bank, Factories and Shops, State Hotels, State Engineering Works, State Insurance, State Saw Mills, Housing Commission, Wyndham Meat Works, W.A. Meat Export Works, and W.A. Transport Board.

SERVICEMEN'S LAND SETTLEMENT.

As to Ben Ord Estate Contracts.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE (for Hon. A. L. Loton) (on notice) asked the Minister for Mines:

In replying to my question on Tuesday, the 25th November, 1947, the Honorary Minister stated that 60 per cent. was the agreed percentage payment for work completed on Ben Ord Estate. On how much of the 4,000 acres contract has 60 per cent. payment been advanced?

The MINISTER replied:

Sixty per cent. payment has been made covering the work done on 3,499 acres.

RAILWAY OMNIBUSES.

As to Number and Equipment for Country Services.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE (on notice) asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Is the Minister satisfied that the Rail-

way Department has sufficient vehicles to maintain its existing country bus services?

(2) Is the Minister aware that the Railway Department is utilising ill-equipped and unsuitable tramway buses for some of the above services?

(3) Is the Minister aware that tramway bus No. 19 on the Cranbrook-Perth run on the 25th November, 1947, was held up 28 miles from the nearest garage with a blockage in the fuel system?

(4) Is it a fact that as there were no tools on the bus, the crew had to borrow a shifting spanner from a neighbouring farm before the bus could proceed?

(5) Is it a fact that the Railway Department has instituted the Perth-Bunbury road service with the White semi-trailer bus which has done over 90,000 miles without a major overhaul and such overhaul is long overdue?

(6) Is it a fact that the Railway Department has instituted a Perth-Pinjarra service with a tramway bus?

(7) Will the Minister try to ensure that no further road services are commenced until his department has sufficient suitable buses to give a reliable service and provide for emergencies such as mechanical breakdowns?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes, with the exception mentioned in paragraph (2).

(2) On the Perth-Williams via Quindanning run, owing to the type of road, it is necessary to use a small type of bus which is hired from the Tramway Department.

(3) Owing to a blockage in the fuel system the tramway bus working the Cranbrook-Perth run on the 25th November was delayed approximately 60 minutes and 15 minutes at 132 Mile and Williams, respectively.

(4) Tools are supplied for each vehicle and it is the driver's responsibility to see that they are carried. If inquiries reveal that there was no tool kit on this particular vehicle, the matter will be taken up.

(5) The White semi-trailer is being used temporarily on the Perth-Bunbury run and it is anticipated that it will be released early next week for a major overhaul which is scheduled to take place at 100,000 miles.

(6) Yes, for the initial run only.

(7) Sufficient suitable buses are available to maintain all existing services with the exception mentioned in paragraph (2). At present a spare vehicle is available in the case of emergency.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Dried Fruits.

Transmitted to the Assembly.

2, Wheat Marketing.

Returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—INDUSTRY (ADVANCES).

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT (LAND ACT APPLICATION) ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. G. B. Wood—East) [4.38] in moving the second reading of the Bill said: This is a very small Bill. The Act contains a provision for leases to be of 999 years' duration. The Commonwealth Government does not agree with that and has asked the State to amend the Act to provide for the leases to be held in perpetuity. It is rather surprising to me that the Commonwealth has made that request. I do not know why it has done so because I suppose in perpetuity means almost freehold tenure of land.

Hon. L. Craig: No, it does not.

The HONORARY MINISTER: No, not quite. But it is nearer that than 999 years.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is about equal.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [4.39]: I have always been strongly opposed to the issue of leases for land. I heard one member interject that it was the same as freehold. It is nothing of the sort.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I did not say that.

The Honorary Minister: I said it was nearer that than 999 years.

Hon. L. CRAIG: When land is freehold the owner can do with it what he will.

Hon. C. B. Williams: But he has to pay rates on it and—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. L. CRAIG: Such conditions are applicable also to leasehold land. The terms of the lease can be altered from time to time. Especially in the case of agricultural land there is the danger that, if a man develops his property highly, land in the locality may increase in value, and in the end his annual rates under the lease may be greatly increased. That is important. There is also the danger that arises, especially in these cases, through the control of sales. The owner of the land can sell to whom-ever he wishes, but in the case of leasehold land the Minister may not approve of the transferee. I hope that some day the leasehold provisions in the land settlement legislation will be entirely removed, so that people who go on the land will own it.

I do not believe that they should have a free hand to exploit the land or not use it properly, but it should be their own to transfer to their children, or to somebody else if they so desire. There is a great difference between owning land and leasing it. I feel that the better rainfall areas, particularly, should be developed as homes for future generations of the same families, so that people owning land in those areas might plant trees that will live for hundreds of years, and effect improvements that will not show any cash return, though they add greatly to the beauty of the property and the area generally. When people fall in love with their land, knowing that their tenure is secure, they will effect improvements that are not necessarily productive, but which greatly enhance the beauty of the land. I cannot see anyone doing that with leasehold land.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Not even with a 999 years' lease?

Hon. L. CRAIG: No, because it might not necessarily be passed on to their children. Whether land is leased for 999 years or in perpetuity, the owner still never has full control of it.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (East) [4.43]: I am afraid Mr. Craig has the impression that I said there was no difference between the leasehold and freehold of property.

Hon. L. Craig: I did not think you said that, at all.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: In this case the Commonwealth Government has insisted upon the leasehold system. The people generally in Western Australia—and even the Labour Party, which first introduced the leasehold system in Western Australia—have not favoured leasehold greatly, inasmuch as a little while ago the homestead blocks, on which workers' homes are built, reverted to the freehold system. I see no difference between a lease in perpetuity and a 999 years' lease. I have no idea what the world will be like in a thousand years from now, but I feel it is only playing with legislation to make this alteration. However, if it is the desire of the Commonwealth Government I suppose there is no alternative.

I agree with Mr. Craig that there is no encouragement for men to effect some classes of improvements to leasehold property. I do not know what are the provisions for re-appraisement, but whether the periods are 10 years, 20 years, or 100 years, the holders of the leases will still be frightened of what may be done. It is quite all right in the pastoral areas to provide for a leasehold system, but where smaller areas of land are concerned, I am sure greater satisfaction is given both to the Government and the holder of the land if the holder obtains the land in fee simple. The argument advanced on the introduction of the measure was that in the past, returned soldiers with very little capital were placed on the land, and that it was felt that the payments necessary to obtain the freehold were an obstacle standing in the way of such men. I do not agree that that was the case.

The rental system in this State has been so generous that it could not be said to mar the possibility of a farmer being a success. At most the payment on 1,000 acres would not be more than £40 a year. Admittedly, farms today tend to be larger than they were immediately after the 1914-1918 war, when the object was to provide men with land at a low rental, but that does not encourage men to effect improvements, more particularly if it means that the more improvements effected the higher the value of the land and consequently the higher the rent. I do not object to

the Bill, but did not want the House to gain the impression that I was in favour of leasehold. I am not. I believe that freehold is the best tenure from every point of view. We have still great areas available in Western Australia, and I feel that the land should be owned by those who occupy it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.50] in moving the second reading said: This Bill, although very short, is important and will have far-reaching effects. It has arisen out of circumstances which have been aired in both Chambers for some time, that is, the iron-ore leases at Koolan Island. The Bill provides that the Minister may contract and arrange for the development and mining of any iron-ore, coal or limestone resources of the State. It is necessary to include limestone because that is a necessity in case of heavy industries.

The measure also provides that the Minister may promote or assist in the promotion of any company having as its objects or as part of its objects the development of mining of any of the iron-ore, coal or limestone resources of the State or the establishment, maintenance or carrying on of an iron industry, a steel industry or an integrated iron and steel industry. He may also direct or control or assist in the direction or control of any such company—in other words, be a director of such company—and make advances and guarantee funds to the company. He may also make any contract, alone or jointly, with any company for the provision of capital, the employment of staff and so on. In particular the Bill seeks to ratify the agreement made between the Minister for Industrial Development and H. A. Brasert & Co. Ltd.

Members may recall that some time ago Koolan Island was leased, and finally the lease was transferred to Brasert & Co.

Shortly after the war started, an embargo was placed on the export of iron-ore which, of course, resulted in the closing down of everything at Koolan Island. A large sum of money was expended on the island and exemption was granted to Brasserts until 12 months after the cessation of hostilities. Finally an application was made for further exemption, and the Government decided not to grant it as it would not permit the deposits on Koolan Island to be tied up. Brasserts then sent its secretary from England to negotiate with the Government to ascertain the position of the company because a large sum of money had been expended by it. The Government found that it could not willy-nilly forfeit the leases. Legally it could, but morally, if I may so express it, it could not.

After negotiations with the secretary of Brasserts, an arrangement was made whereby the company was to have the iron-ore deposits and the Government to retain the other half. At the end of the Bill there is a rather extensive map showing the division of the island and the deposits. The arrangement is satisfactory not only to Brasserts but also in every way. The agreement contained in the schedule sets out exactly what is proposed. Under paragraph (7) complete exemption for four years will be granted to the company and, at the end of four years, the leases will become liable to forfeiture, unless certain things happen. The agreement is subject to ratification by Parliament and by Brasserts. Already the company has ratified the agreement and it now rests with Parliament to do likewise. I have no hesitation in asking the House to ratify the agreement.

Under the terms of the agreement the company has to supply up to a maximum of 1,000,000 tons of iron-ore per annum to the Government, virtually at cost price f.o.b. at Koolan Island. There is an alternative price at the option of the Government, which is the cost of producing the ore, and is fully set out in paragraph (5). That is the lowest f.o.b. price, Koolan Island, at which ore is being supplied to the company's other customers. It may be subject to the Commonwealth's wishes that the iron-ore shall be exported, perhaps to the United States of America, in exchange for fabricated steel or iron.

Perhaps it would be interesting to examine the reason for the Bill. Some little

time ago, Mr. Conrow, who has had considerable experience in the production of steel, approached the Government with the object of starting heavy industry in Western Australia. Mr. Conrow wanted to float a company to use Koolan Island iron-ore, but at the time the whole of the island was under lease to Brasserts. That is when the negotiations, which have now been finalised, were started with Brasserts. Now, one-half of the iron-ore deposits will be available to the Government and also a million tons of ore from Brasserts, if we so desire. The intention of Mr. Conrow is to float a company with a capital of £125,000. When £75,000 has been subscribed, the Government will take up £25,000 worth of shares and will lend another £25,000 to the company. Mr. Conrow will receive 3,000 fully paid up shares as his expenses for the work he has done in negotiating.

If the investigations prove that an integrated steel industry is sound, a company to be called the Western Steel Enterprises may proceed to develop such an industry and make arrangements for further capital. By this I mean the £125,000 referred to. Mr. Conrow will be one of the directors, the Government will appoint a second director, and the shareholders will appoint a third director. The Bill provides that any companies to which the Government may subscribe will not come within the provisions of the State Trading Concerns Act. Clause 2 of the Bill is necessary because the measure must be construed as subject to the Commonwealth Constitution Act, and because the Commonwealth deals with questions of export and the raising of capital.

An important matter is that the technical officer of a large chemical manufacturing firm has arrived in Perth, and is examining the possibilities of his firm establishing a chemical industry in conjunction with these iron and steel works. A large range of chemical production is being investigated, and it will use, as the main raw materials, coal, limestone, acetic acid and methanol. Therefore, it is necessary to include limestone in the Bill. The Government may desire to enter into similar negotiations with a company whose products are closely related to those now under review. This probably brings to the minds of members the industry at Wundowie and the developments there.

The charcoal-iron industry at Wundowie comprises four main sections, namely, saw-milling, blast furnace, refinery and housing. At present there is a spot mill at Wundowie and those in authority are proceeding with the establishment of the main sawmill. Sawdust is being used for firing. It is hoped there will be little or no waste. A spot mill is in full production, and it is anticipated that the whole plant will be ready to carry on—in June, 1948—with the production of pig iron which will provide Chamberlain Industries at Welshpool with their requirements. It is hoped to use the waste products, such as slag, for the manufacture of slag wool and building board. It is estimated there will be a revenue of £1,000 a year from that source.

The work is progressing very rapidly. Some 50 houses have now been completed and are occupied by employees. There are 50 children at the school. It is true that at present the school is held in the hall, and the erection of a more suitable building is necessary. As I have pointed out, the Bill is introduced with a view of allowing the Government to take shares in companies for the purpose of promoting these industries, and especially of ratifying the agreement in the schedule. There may be other matters about which members would like to know, and, whether by way of reply to the second reading debate, or in Committee, I shall be only too pleased to endeavour to provide as far as I can, the information they desire. I refer members, for better clarification of the position, to the debate that took place in another place in connection with the Koolan Island leases, and the remarks of the Minister for Industrial Development which are contained at page 1047 and the following pages of the present year's "Hansard." I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. C. G. Latham, debate adjourned.

BILL—LICENSING (PROVISIONAL CERTIFICATE).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. A. DIMMITT (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.5]: The genesis of this Bill is almost entirely due to the difficult posi-

tion which arose in connection with the Rottneest Board of Control. Back in 1939, a provisional license was granted to the board and one of the conditions of the license, as is the case with all such licenses, was that the building should be erected within 12 months. Members will no doubt recall that early in 1940, Rottneest Island was completely occupied by the military authorities, with the result that the civilian population was evacuated to the mainland. It became entirely impossible for the Rottneest Board of Control to comply with the building conditions of the license. Since the island has been handed back to the board—about two years ago—it has been equally impossible for an hotel to be constructed.

Members will agree that the matter of housing the people is of paramount importance, and that the building of a luxury holiday hotel must wait until such time as the requirements of the unhoused or partly-housed people are satisfied. In 1941, legislation was introduced, which set out that the holder of any provisional license granted after the 5th December, 1940, could apply to have the period extended until the end of the war and 12 months after. That measure protected the rights of those people and delayed the process of building. But members know the risk that is now attendant on such a provision because we do not know when the war will be declared to have ended. The Commonwealth Government may, by proclamation, declare the war to have ceased; or a peace treaty might be signed. Either of those things could easily happen in the next six or twelve months. In that case, the holders of provisional licenses would have only twelve months in which to construct the buildings in accordance with the approved plans and specifications.

It will be realised that by 1949 the people are not likely to be completely housed, nor are building materials likely to be in full supply. This Bill seeks to extend the provisions of the section which relates to the eventual construction of the buildings until the 31st December, 1951, and from that date another twelve months will be allowed during which the holders of the provisional licenses may fulfil the building requirements. That is to say, they will be protected under this Bill, if it becomes law, until 31st

December, 1952. About two or three months ago the Rottnest Board of Control received from the Licensing Court a letter intimating that the board had not complied with the conditions of its provisional license. The 1941 legislation did not protect the Rottnest Board of Control, because it merely applied to provisional licenses granted after the 5th December, 1940. The Rottnest Board of Control's license was granted in July, 1939. The board's attention was drawn to the fact that not only was it not protected by the 1941 legislation, but it had failed to meet the requirements of its provisional license.

The Licensing Court pointed out that because of that failure the Board of Control could have its £1,000-bond, which was lodged with the application for the license, estreated. That naturally alarmed the board, and it applied to the Crown Law Department to find out where it stood. The Crown Law authorities suggested that this Bill be introduced and made retrospective to a date prior to the granting of the provisional license. At the same time, this measure gives protection until the end of 1952, to two other holders of provisional licenses—I think they are for an hotel at North Perth and one at Agnew. So, the Bill, if it becomes an Act, will provide essential protection not only for the Rottnest Board of Control, but for these other two holders of provisional licenses. I hope the Bill will meet with the approval of members. I support the second reading.

HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [5.13]: I realise it is essential that we do justice to the people to whom provisional certificates have been issued, but I would prefer to see this Bill provide a much shorter period. We have reached the stage, in connection with the whole question of liquor consumption, when we should review entirely our methods of drinking, the sale of alcohol and the standards of our hotels. It may be, when such is carried out, that a person holding a provisional license might not care to go on because of the buildings that would be required, while others, who have not applied for a license, might view the position as an attractive investment.

With your permission, Mr. President, I am going to deal with some factors con-

cerning liquor consumption, that I think should be reviewed at an early date and which, to my mind, raise the whole question of the wisdom of allowing provisional licenses to carry on for a term of five years. I do not think anyone who has ever criticised our way of life has failed to comment upon the present methods of drinking in Australia. Surely some more reasoned way of supplying alcohol, as a refreshment, could be devised. Personally, I do not like the habit of standing at a bar. There are many countries in the world where one is served with alcohol only whilst being seated. If our Licensing Act were reviewed we might find that provisional licenses would require that seating accommodation be made available for those desiring to take alcohol.

When we look at our hotels and see men rushing in after their day's work, standing two or three deep at the bars, we must wonder what is the urge that overcomes them. Having just recently returned from a trip through America, I can say that nowhere during the whole of my tour was I served with liquor whilst standing. If I went into an hotel or beer cafe, I would be told that certainly I could have a drink, but first I would have to find a seat. I suggest that if we adopted that course throughout Australia, we would at once administer a revolutionary stroke right across the methods of consumption of liquor, one that would be of benefit to every Australian. One has only to visualise the difference in companionship between sitting at a table and slowly consuming a glass of alcohol compared with the practice of standing at a bar and calling for round after round.

As a physician, I say frankly that I come across quite a number of individuals who assure me that always before going home they consume four or five schooners of beer in a very short time—quite likely, quite often. If we were to provide that everyone who wished to be served with liquor should be seated at a table, then that could be done when matters affecting these certificates came up for review. I would have no objection whatever to the Bill if I could see evidence of any sort on the part of the Government that an inquiry into the consumption of alcohol in this State was to be undertaken within the period of five years. Members can imagine

the effect upon a man who may just previously have rapidly consumed half-a-dozen schooners of beer before sitting down to his dinner. Physiologically, the effect upon the man entering his own home must be apparent.

Another factor I do not like in connection with our method of drinking is the closed bar system. Apparently one must go behind closed doors to carry on some nefarious practice, which merely consists of having a glass of beer. If our hotels were designed so that the applicable space were open, we would not see the amount of acute alcoholism that prevails today. As we carry on at the moment, one might almost say that drinking alcohol is practically solely a homo sexual affair, because no woman is allowed into hotel bars. If it is not a fact that she is not allowed in, it certainly is the custom that she never enters one. The moment one takes a partner in for a drink, one must go into the lounge and pay for the alcohol double the price that would be demanded if it were bought elsewhere.

Hon. W. R. Hall: Double the cost and less quantity.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I think the whole drinking problem is over-ripe for review not only from the point of view of its effect upon the individual but upon our national life. In this climate open air bars might well be introduced. If they were, we might give consideration to altering the times during which alcohol could be sold. There were many occasions during my tour abroad when I was able to secure liquor up to midnight or even later. I can assure the House that I saw very little acute alcoholism on my travels. I admit that the same dark blinds and closed doors were to be seen on occasions and they almost rang out aloud the fact that liquor was being sold within.

Generally speaking, we should see to it that the premises in which liquor is sold are opened up, and everything done in the open. Almost throughout the length and breadth of America, as I crossed it I could see men and women able to join together at tables in the enjoyment of alcohol. It was no longer a closed affair as it had been in the past, and still is in Australia. There is one other matter regarding which I desire to offer some criticism. I often feel

if I go to purchase a bottle of alcohol at an hotel that a tremendous favour is being conferred upon me by the publican. Certainly, I purchase it at a greater cost than I would have to pay if I procured the liquor at a shop or Government store. I see no reason why a monopoly in the sale of bottles of liquor should be given to hotelkeepers.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: There are licensed grocers.

The Honorary Minister: Yes, who have gallon licenses.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: A grocer sells liquor by the gallon but it has always been the custom, when I have bought a single bottle from him, that he charges it up in some other form. We are simply asking these people to break the law. That sort of thing has been going on for a good many years. We could well afford to review the position in connection with the certificates that are granted for the sale of alcohol. I can see no reason why there should not be shops or Government stores that would do nothing else than sell bottles of liquor, to which one could go quite openly and obtain a bottle as a matter of right and not as one of courtesy.

Furthermore, I must criticise the standard of our hotels. I should like to see much more rigid conditions under which certificates are granted for the erection of future premises. I agree with Mr. Dimmitt in that I can see no likelihood of any hotels of reasonable size being erected within the next five years, and so this seems to be an excellent opportunity to review the standard of hotels that will be permitted in future. If we are to look for visitors from abroad we must see to it that we provide better facilities and amenities than our hotels have today. A visitor from overseas will always look, in connection with the accommodation provided at hotels, for a bathroom attached to his bedroom. That should not present any insuperable difficulty in the metropolitan area.

I also agree that there must inevitably be varying standards of hotels in order that those who cannot afford the best accommodation will still be able to enjoy such as they can pay for. Generally speaking, the average Australian has not been willing to pay as much as he should for hotel accommodation, particularly if he desires to enjoy

accommodation that complies with modern standards. Too long has the hotel been regarded as being maintained from the profits of the bar. I think the interior facilities of a hotel should, as it were, stand on their own financial feet. One of the most beautiful hotels I saw abroad was in Vancouver and the only place alcohol was sold there was in a small private bar in the basement.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Were you able to purchase spirits there?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: None at all. If one wanted a bottle, an hotel boy would purchase it from a neighbouring Government store and bring it to one's room. In the hotel itself little or no alcohol was sold, and yet it was easily one of the most beautiful buildings I saw while abroad. I contend the question of hotel accommodation could well be reviewed. That will mean, of course, that one will have to pay more for the best hotel accommodation, which we should have in the centre of the city. Then again in our centrally situated hotels in particular, much wider menus should be provided than are available today.

If a person desires to have a meal during a week night or on Saturday evening at any leading hotel in Perth, he could almost write out his menu now, so little variation and such similarity are there to be found. If visitors from abroad are to be encouraged here, they will demand a much wider choice of foods. Without doubt, hotels oversea have a much wider choice for diners than is apparent here. If we are to encourage visitors in their tourist capacity, this matter must receive attention. There is also room for serious criticism of the Licensing Bench regarding the system of sanitation that is permitted in hotels, particularly with regard to some of the mass bathrooms and lavatories. The conditions in some of the country hotels are appalling.

The Honorary Minister: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I wonder if members of the Licensing Bench have had experience regarding hotels outside our own country. There is great need for an improvement in standards regarding the matters I have mentioned. Sometimes I have been astonished to note that Australians regard something as beautiful that I consider is very ordinary. Possibly that is only because I have had the opportunity and ability to travel abroad and, in consequence,

I am in a position to note the difference in standards. I would like to see members who deal with these licensing matters visit other countries so as to have an idea of what is available there.

I certainly think appointments to the Licensing Bench should not be on a merely political basis but from the point of view of knowledge and understanding of hotel standards. If these people were to go abroad they would be able to appreciate what the modern standards in hotels really mean. Then I think we would see some improvement in the hotels of this State. I wonder whether the Health Department has not also been at fault in permitting some of the sanitary accommodation in our country hotels. I know of country hotels in which the shower-rooms and the lavatories have windows facing on to a closed corridor, and so have no opening to the outside air. Yet those premises have been built in recent times. I believe the time is ripe to consider these provisional certificates on the basis of what really are the future requirements of the State.

While we are reviewing these certificates, might it not be well also to have regard to the relationship of breweries to hotel ownership? I do not know whether it is a good thing or a bad thing, but I would like to investigate the question, because I have a feeling that that relationship destroys the personal incentive which one expects from innkeepers and hotelkeepers. If a man is responsible to a board of directors, or if he himself owns a hotel, he will render a higher standard of service to the public than if he is simply placed in charge by a company whose main desire is to sell its alcohol and which regards as a secondary consideration the raising of the standard of hotel accommodation. I think the hotels which are at present controlled by breweries are of a higher standard than those which are not, but I would like to have the matter investigated to ascertain whether such control is becoming so extensive as to amount to a monopoly, thus preventing private enterprise from embarking on the hotel trade.

One factor that must be borne in mind is that when breweries acquire hotels, their main object is to press the sale of their products. I believe the correct method to be this: Each man should be allowed to

indulge his taste as to the liquor he consumes. Under the present system, there is little likelihood of our being able to purchase the thin beers one can obtain abroad. Many people prefer the thin beers which are brewed by the old German families, as they consider them much more pleasing than the type of beer brewed in Western Australia. Other people, of course, prefer the Western Australian beer. If, however, the trend is towards monopolistic control, we shall have still fewer opportunities to obtain varying types of alcohol. I do not wish to labour the question, but I have brought these matters before the House because I believe the time is ripe, in common parlance, for an investigation to be made into the consumption of alcohol during the time that this measure will be in force.

On motion by Hon. C. G. Latham, debate adjourned.

BILL—MILK ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [5.34]: I merely wish to draw attention to the fact that I am not altogether happy about the question of providing compensation for those people whose cattle have been destroyed as a result of having been found to be reactors to the tuberculin test. I have no objection whatever to fair compensation being paid to a man who has been ordered to destroy some of his stock; but it strikes me that there are many other avenues in our ordinary life which entail risk in business. If there is that risk, then we insure against loss. Could we go further in this Bill and provide compensation for a man who might lose a bull for which he paid one thousand guineas? Can we go on raising the amount of compensation to meet such a position? Should not the question of insuring herds and adding the cost of the insurance to production costs be considered? The reply will be that if this were done the cost to the consumer would be raised; but which is preferable?

Secondly, I would draw attention to the fact that there can be great risk to the milk supply by a too whole-hearted condemnation of cattle as a result of wide-

spread testing. I must advert to the fact that on more than one occasion I have brought before the House the need for the institution of compulsory pasteurisation along with the control of tuberculosis in cattle through testing. The two main factors to be taken into consideration in the effect that milk supply has on the health of the individual are tuberculosis and undulant fever. Ridding the herds of tuberculosis will not control undulant fever. If we start on a campaign of compensation for cows that are so infected, we shall find ourselves in extreme difficulty because nowhere has it been found possible to rid herds of undulant fever. The only method of making milk safe for the public, so far as undulant fever is concerned, is pasteurisation. It seems to me that when we are told that 43 per cent. of a herd are reactors—

The Honorary Minister: Who told you that?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: You mentioned it.

The Honorary Minister: That was in the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: If we destroy 43 per cent. of the herds in the metropolitan area, we are leaving untouched a condition which should have been rectified when we were dealing with the parent Act last year. We should have refused to allow milk to be produced in the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The destruction of those cattle will leave the rest of the metropolitan cattle to develop tuberculosis, as they will not be able to obtain sufficient nourishment where they are reared; so that makes nonsense to me. If we are to be sensible in this matter, we must go hand-in-hand with the two processes. We must see that the disease, tuberculosis, is eradicated from the herds over a time, but we should at the same time proceed as rapidly as possible with compulsory pasteurisation. It will take many years to rid the herds of tuberculosis; it will take a much longer period to rid the herds of tubercle if the cattle in the metropolitan area remain in the condition in which I and other members of the House have seen them. It would be much better to take such combined action. I have no objection to eradication of tubercle by means of the tuberculin test in

cattle, but I do not want that to halt any move towards compulsory pasteurisation.

Since I have returned from abroad, I have already seen one very virulent case of undulant fever, and I have heard of three others. This will not be got rid of by looking for tuberculin reactors in cattle. That disease can only be eradicated by pasteurisation. While I was abroad, I made it my business to look into the milk question. Wherever I went, I found milk was supplied, pasteurised, in a sealed bottle. Nowhere did I see milk distributed in open cans. I saw nothing resembling milk bars. I think it will be found that the milk sold at our milk bars contains the highest bacteria count. I saw no-one abroad drinking milk other than milk in a bottle sealed with straw, and in 99 cases out of 100 the straw had been wrapped in paper before, being handed to the customer. Even in the hotels milk was brought to the customers in 12-oz. bottles. Last year I was told that there would be the greatest difficulty in obtaining supplies of 12-oz. bottles.

My desire is once more to bring before the House the real need for compulsory pasteurisation in this State, and to make it quite clear that by concentrating solely on tuberculin reactors, we are delaying the process. I hope the Minister, in replying, will be able to tell the House how far he has gone, and how far the industry has gone, toward pasteurisation. I had a staggering experience when I entered the office of the Deputy Commissioner of Public Health in Chicago. During a conversation with him, when I said I was inquiring about pasteurisation, he asked, "Did you see tuberculous glands in the necks of children in Western Australia?" I said, "Unfortunately, yes." He said, "What a shame! That disease has gone from here." Yet that is a disease which we see in this country and I think there were about 39 known cases at the Children's Hospital when we last spoke about it. That disease is still here; and yet in a city like Chicago, with 3,500,000 people, it is unknown because, they assured me, not a drop of milk is sold that is not pasteurised, bottled and sealed.

I went to Boston and asked the Commissioner of Public Health whether he had cases of tuberculous glands of the neck notified. He said, "I do not think so. I will

find out. I never heard of it." He rang for his officers and they knew nothing about it. I decided to write to the children's hospitals in a number of large cities in America, and I have supplied the Premier with the letters I have received from those institutions. Almost invariably they attributed the absence of the complaint in a major way to pasteurisation of milk. In fact surgical tuberculosis of any sort is very rare throughout those big cities.

At lunch I was sitting one day with Dr. Balfour, Director of the Mayo Clinic. He turned to one of his colleagues and said, "You would not know what I am talking about, but in places where they do not pasteurise their milk they are subject to seeing tuberculous glands in the neck in young children." He said to me, "I suppose you still see them down your way," and I replied, "We do." He said, "When I first came here I used to spend hours taking these infected glands out of the necks of young children. We do not see them today."

When I was in the position to realise that in cities of that nature, just by the introduction of compulsory pasteurisation associated also with the eradication of tubercle from the herds, which is a slower process, they had eradicated tubercular adenitis, as infected glands in the neck are called and, in the main, surgical tuberculosis in children, I felt that every time I rose in this House I should emphasise the need in this city for compulsory pasteurisation. Surely no man who is fond of children or has children of his own is going to run the known risk in this city of those children developing tuberculous glands when he knows that by insisting on compulsory pasteurisation he can give them the opportunity to miss that horrible disease. I feel that more emphasis should be laid on what has been done towards compulsory pasteurisation of milk at the same time as we consent—as I readily consent—through this Bill to give compensation to men whose cattle have been destroyed. I ask, therefore, that the Minister tell the House what progress has been made towards that not only desirable but essential step of introducing compulsory pasteurisation in this State.

On motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter, debate adjourned.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Government Railways Act Amendment.
- 2, Western Australian Government Tramways and Ferries.

Received from the Assembly.

BILL—INCREASE OF RENT (WAR RESTRICTIONS) ACT AMENDMENT.*Assembly's Message.*

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to amendments Nos. 1, 2 and 3 made by the Council and had disagreed to No. 4.

House adjourned at 5.53 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 27th November, 1947.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Housing, (a) as to permits for Eastern Goldfields, (b) as to recipients of permits (c) as to non-revealing of recipient's identity, (d) as to proceedings of Royal Commission, (e) as to ruling by Mr. Speaker, (f) as to construction delay at Collie, (g) as to information re Goldfields permits	2212
Standing Orders suspension	2214
Bills : Superannuation and Family Benefits Act Amendment, 1r.	2214
Superannuation Act Amendment, 1r.	2214
Government Railways Act Amendment, further report, 3r.	2214
Western Australian Government Tramways and Ferries, report, 3r.	2216
Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment, Council's amendments	2216
Dried Fruits Act Amendment, 1r.	2218
Wheat Marketing, returned	2218
Public Works Standing Committee, 2r., Com. (point of order)	2218

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

QUESTIONS.**HOUSING.**

(a) *As to Permits for Eastern Goldfields.*

Mr. STYANTS (on notice) asked the Premier:

(1) How many building permits and the subsequent permits for release of materials were issued for Kalgoorlie, Boulder Municipal, and Kalgoorlie Road Board Districts for the six months from the 1st November, 1946, to the 30th April, 1947, and for the period from the 1st May to the 30th November, 1947, respectively?

(2) What was the value of the materials released?

(3) Is it correct that materials are not being made available promptly, so that contractors are able to complete workers' homes within a reasonable time of signing contracts?

(4) What quantity of corrugated galvanised iron has been made available to the above districts during the past six months?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) House permits issued 1/11/46 to 30/4/47—Kalgoorlie, 36; Boulder, 12; total, 48.

Value material and labour—Kalgoorlie, £10,514; Boulder, £3,421; total, £13,935.

House permits issued 1/5/47 to 24/11/47—Kalgoorlie, 55; Boulder, 13; total 68.

Value material and labour—Kalgoorlie, £18,199; Boulder, £3,978; total, £22,177.

Details have been grouped according to the post office addresses of applicants. It would be difficult to supply information under the headings of local authority districts.

(2) Information regarding value of materials is not available. Permits are issued on the basis of total cost of labour and materials.

(3) Authority to purchase materials is issued with the permit, but contractors in Goldfields areas are experiencing the same difficulties as metropolitan builders in obtaining certain materials, particularly flooring, roofing materials, water piping, porcelain enamelware, glass, etc. In the case of all items imported from the Eastern States, and particularly steel products, the position is difficult.