item on the notice paper to enable this Bill to be given consideration. It is truly a small Bill and seeks to validate a position which many people believe already exists.

Section 29 of the Land Act sets out the various purposes for which the Governor may set aside land and make reserves. These are many and varied, and among others include sites for town halls, public baths, libraries, agricultural societies, temperance institutions, cricket grounds, golf links, bowling greens, tennis courts, croquet grounds and racecourses.

Paragraph (j) of Section 29 permits the making of reserves necessary for the encouragement of towns, or for the health, recreation or amusement of the inhabitants. Recently a reserve in the Mt. Marshall electorate was made for the purpose of a club site, but when the club occupying the site had spent approximately £23,000 on premises and made application to the Licensing Court for registration under the Licensing Act, it was pointed out by the council opposing the grant of registration that the title to the land on which the club was sited was bad, in so far as the Governor had no power under Section 29 of the Land Act to make reserves for the purpose of a club site.

I took the matter up with the Minister for Lands and he was good enough to refer the subject to the Crown Law Department. The opinion of the Crown Law Department was to the effect that it was very doubtful whether Section 29 authorised the setting aside of land for the purpose of club sites. This Bill, if passed, will, I trust, give the Governor authority to make reserves for club sites and premises. I venture the opinion that it will confer a power to create reserves for this purpose, a power which the Land Department apparently thought it had had for a number of years. I commend the measure to the House and move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. L. F. KELLY (Minister for Lands—Merredin-Yilgarn) [10.50]: I have given quite an amount of consideration to this small amending Bill. If passed I feel it would clear up a doubt which now exists. I see no reason for delaying the measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

House adjourned at 10.53 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 6th November, 1958.

CONTENTS.

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.25 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

NARROWS BRIDGE.

Effect on Bus Services.

1. The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) To what extent, at this stage, has the fact of the completion of the Narrows Bridge sometime towards the end of 1959, been considered by the Metropolitan Transport Trust in future planning?

(2) Are there in existence, at present, any revised plans for the provision of bus services for residents served by Canning Highway in the area between Canning Bridge and Perth and between Canning Bridge and Fremantle?

(3) What services are likely to be rerouted over the Narrows Bridge when it is completed?

(4) What would be the estimated reduction in travelling time to reach the city for people travelling by bus over the new bridge from, for example, the Applecross and Mount Pleasant areas?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

(1) Some consideration has been given to bus routing when buses enter the city by the Narrows Bridge.

(2) No.

(3) Not yet considered.

(4) About eight minutes.

BOULDER PENSIONERS' COTTAGES.

Responsibility for Erection, Condition, etc.

2. The Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Who is the authority responsible for the erection, and passing of inspection, of the pensioners' duplex cottages in Wittenoom-st., Boulder.

(2) After completion, were the cottages inspected, and passed, before being handed over to the Boulder Council?

(3) Is the Minister aware that—

(a) Because of the notoriously badly finished-off condition of the cottages, some of them were vacant for 18 months after completion?

(b) When it rains, all the cottages' occupants are still having to place dishes and pails in various rooms to catch the water coming through the ceiling?

(c) Soot and tar stains from the badly designed kitchen stove chimney hoods are ruining the walls of the kitchens?

(4) Would the Minister for Housing be prepared to arrange for a technical officer of the State Housing Commission to visit Boulder immediately to examine the cottages, and report on the most effective way of improving the conditions before they become uninhabitable?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

(1) The State Housing Commission supplied plans and arranged for supervision by the Public Works Department.

(2) Yes.

(3) (a) No.
(b) No.
(c) No.

(4) No, but consideration would be given if the local committee made a request.

RAILWAYS.

Employment of Mr. S. W. Procter on Planning Board.

3. The Hon. L. C. DIVER asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is it a fact that S. W. Procter is now employed on the planning board of the Western Australian Government Railways, and is planning works which, if approved, will involve the expenditure of large sums of money?

(2) If so, does the Government consider the employment of Mr. Procter in his present capacity to be in accordance with the Royal Commissioner's recommendation that he should only be retained in a position where he would have no opportunity, even remotely, to influence the expenditure of large sums of money?

(3) What is the difference in salary now paid to Mr. Procter from that which he received as Motive Power Engineer?

(4) What is the estimated cost of providing office accommodation for the motive power section at Midland Junction?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

(1) Mr. Procter has been engaged since the 8th September, 1958, as a member of a planning board preparing preliminary information in connection with the proposed locomotive depot at Kewdale.

(2) The Government has not yet considered Mr. Procter's position.

(3) A reduction of £120 per annum.

(4) The commission advises that present office accommodation at Midland Junction is completely inadequate, irrespective of the motive power section. A programme of progressive expansion is estimated to finally cost £25,000.

DENTAL CLINICS.

Establishment in Country Centres.

4. The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY (for the Hon. J. M. Thomson) asked the Minister for Railways:

In view of the dental clinics recently opened, and those under construction in towns and suburbs already served by the dental profession, will the Minister inform the House if it is the intention of the Government to provide similar dental clinics in towns which have no dentists practising therein, such as—

Wagin;
Corrigin;
Lake Grace;
Gnowangerup;
Mt. Barker?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

Clinics already established have been placed in the larger country towns. Consideration is being given to alternative proposals by the Australian Dental Association for towns where the population does not warrant the establishment of a permanent clinic.

No. 5. This question was postponed.

Cost of Construction, Equipment and Staff.

6. The Hon. C. H. SIMPSON (for the Hon. J. M. Thomson) asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Are there any dental clinics, other than in the districts of Albany, Boulder, Bunbury, North Perth and Victoria Park and excluding the Perth Dental Hospital, in operation or under construction?

(2) If so—

(a) What is the cost of construction?

(b) What is the cost of equipment to be provided in such clinics?

(c) What staff is it envisaged will be employed in each of the clinics?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

(1) No.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

CHAMBERLAIN TRACTORS.

Transport to Kalgoorlie.

7. The Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is it correct that a number of Chamberlain tractors for the Eastern States were transported recently by road from Perth for loading on to the Commonwealth Railways at Kalgoorlie?

(2) If so, how many tractors were transported, and can this be taken as indicating a change of Government policy which, hitherto, has been aimed at directing wherever possible all freight to the railways without regard, in many instances, to transport economics?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) As no period of time is referred to in the question, no number can be quoted. There has been no change in Government policy. In some cases, however, the question of transport lies with the purchaser.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

First Reading.

Introduced by the Hon. H. C. Strickland (Minister for Railways) and read a first time.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILISATION BILL.

Second Reading.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [2.33] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is for an Act relating to the stabilisation of the wheat industry. It is not quite a counterpart of the measure introduced five years ago, but it is closely associated with the Act of 1954, and the principles contained in it. Following an agreement reached at the Australian Agricultural Council, it became necessary for the Commonwealth and the States to pass amending legislation. The Commonwealth legislation has already been passed, and it is necessary that this Bill, which is complementary to that legislation should be passed without delay.

Uniform legislation bringing about the ratification of the agreement reached at the Agricultural Council has already been passed, or is in the process of being passed, in all the other States of Australia. Hon. members will recall that in 1948 the Commonwealth, with the approval of the industry at a ballot of growers, asked that the States pass legislation to provide for the first five years of a stabilisation plan. In 1954, the current plan, which terminates with the marketing of the 1957-58 wheat crop, was submitted to growers at a ballot and was approved by them. The complementary Commonwealth and State legislation, necessary to make that plan effective, was then passed in the Commonwealth Parliament, and in the Parliaments of all the States.

The proposed plan provided for in this Bill is, apart from minor details, in line with the existing plan. It was agreed to by all State Ministers for Agriculture at the Agricultural Council meeting and, as hon. members know, the Agricultural Council of Australia is comprised of all the Ministers for Agriculture from all the States. When the council met, the industry presented to it certain requests, some of which were at variance with the existing plan and some of which were not agreed to by the council. I shall deal with those a little later.

The great value to the industry under the stabilisation plan now proposed is that it will ensure to the wheatgrowers, for a term of five years ahead, a guaranteed minimum price on up to about 160,000,000 bushels of wheat each year, commencing with the 1958-59 crop. The Commonwealth guarantee will apply on up to 100,000,000 bushels of wheat exported, and the legislation of the States will provide for the home consumption price of wheat sold in Australia as stock food for poultry, pig-raising and dairying. In a normal year, about 60,000,000 bushels are sold for internal use in Australia.

It can be readily understood that a guaranteed security of this nature, so far ahead, would be of inestimable value at any time, but never more valuable to the industry than now when huge wheat stocks are on hand throughout the world. It has been reliably reported that when the 1958 wheat crops in the northern hemisphere have been harvested, the total amount of wheat held in the producing countries will represent the equivalent of the world's requirements for well over two years. If it were not for the existence and the operation of the stabilisation plan, and the existence of an orderly marketing authority in the form of the Australian Wheat Board, which works hand-in-hand with the plan, the outlook for the wheatgrowers and their families, and the very many people dependent on the industry, would be vastly different from what it is today; also much of our development is linked directly and indirectly with the expansion and production of the wheat industry in Australia.

For a considerable time the Commonwealth Government has negotiated with assured overseas markets for wheat and flour, and agreements have been completed with the United Kingdom, Japan, Malaya and Ceylon, and further possibilities are being examined. The agreement with the United Kingdom provides, in effect a guaranteed market each year for 28,000,000 bushels of wheat as wheat, and as flour. The agreement with Japan gives Australia the opportunity to supply at least 7,500,000 bushels annually to that country; and Malaya has agreed to assure Australia the opportunity to supply at least 80,000 tons of flour and 14,000 tons of wheat in each year of the agreement. Ceylon has agreed to purchase 11,000 tons of Australian flour in the remaining months of 1958, and 100,000 tons of Australian flour in each of the years 1959 and 1960.

If hon. members realise that a ton of wheat equals 37½ bushels, and a ton of flour is equivalent to about 50 bushels of wheat, they will know the importance of the certainty of the contract arising from the international agreements. With the world marketing situation as it applies to wheat, and with the international wheat agreement not positive, but rather fluid at this stage, these bilateral arrangements are of great importance to Australia. For a long time, all Australia has endeavoured to have wheat placed on an international basis in so far as agreements are concerned.

I can recall, in the early 1930's, right through into the early war period, the attempts made overseas, particularly in the United States, to obtain an international wheat agreement which would give to the Australian wheatgrower and allied industries, some prospect of stability. In those days all the attempts were abortive. Indeed, today there is a prospect of an international wheat agreement, but as yet it seems a difficult thing to bring to fruition.

In addition to the agreements between the countries I have mentioned, opportunity has been taken at the meetings, internationally, to fight for the principles of fair and non-discriminatory trade. Australian wheatgrowers are efficient and relatively low-cost producers, and if the unfair practices of some countries can be avoided the Australian wheatgrowers must benefit—particularly if the unfair subsidies and non-commercial transactions can be eliminated from the world trade in wheat, which is extremely substantial. The decline in the price of wool, and the large harvest expected in Australia this season, make it essential that the stabilisation scheme be continued to ensure the wheatgrowers in general a guaranteed minimum price for the next five years.

Numerous estimates have been made as to the size of the wheat harvest in Western Australia this year. The one that appears to be officially accepted is that it will be in the vicinity of 58,000,000 bushels. Some country members with a knowledge of much of our wheatbelt area will, I think, say it is likely to exceed that figure. In addition, it is estimated that 22,000,000 bushels of oats and 6,000,000 bushels of barley will be harvested. So it is reasonable to assume that in the next season there will be not only a carryover, but also the likelihood of a considerable increase in the acreage sown.

The figures disclosed as to the number of Western Australian holdings growing wheat for grain is somewhat in excess of 8,000, and the acreage increase during the last two years is over 1,250,000 acres, making a total of over 22,000,000 acres under crop. The modern system of wheat-buying by overseas interests, although handled by individual companies, is actually controlled by the Governments within those countries. It follows that the Australian Government, and the Governments of the Australian States, must have legislation on their statute books; and there should be in existence an authority such as the Australian Wheat Board and the pool associated with the handling of their wheat activities.

It is also essential that there should be unanimity between the States, on prices especially, to administer effectively the interstate trading of wheat; orderly marketing is essential for the Commonwealth and State Governments to ratify agreements internationally. If that position were not certain, hon. members can appreciate that there could be chaos before and after the signing of agreements between Australia and other countries. This Bill provides for the repeal of the existing Act which applies only to wheat harvested after the 30th September this year.

The Government thought it preferable to print this entirely new Bill, rather than incorporate the number of amendments that would be necessary to the present Act. I will endeavour clearly to outline the main provisions and points of the new stabilisation plan, and the several principles involved. Firstly, it will operate for five years, commencing with the 1958-59 wheat crop and ending with the marketing of the 1962-63 crop. The Commonwealth Government will guarantee a return at 14s. 6d. a bushel to growers on up to 100,000,000 bushels of wheat exported from the crop in the first year of the plan. The guaranteed return of 14s. 6d. and the fixing of the return at that figure, were based on the findings of the recent survey of the economic structure of the wheat industry conducted by the Commonwealth Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

It will be adjusted in each of the following years on a plan of up to 100,000,000 bushels in accordance with the movements and costs based on a cost index established

from the survey. Later I shall give an outline of how that cost index has been put together. The first two five-year wheat stabilisation plans each guaranteed a similar quantity of 100,000,000 bushels. The next important point is that the Australian Wheat Board will be maintained as the sole constituted authority for the marketing of wheat within Australia, and for the marketing of wheat and flour from Australia for the period of the plan.

A tax will be collected on wheat exported equivalent to the excess of the export sales over the guaranteed return; and the maximum collection provided for under this proposition is 1s. 6d. a bushel. So, if wheat for export goes to 1s. 6d. beyond the 14s. 6d. guaranteed, the maximum collection will still be 1s. 6d. That amount will be paid into a stabilisation fund, the ceiling of which is expected to be £20,000,000. Any excess beyond this figure will be returned to the growers. This is expected to help as a basis for the stabilisation on a maximum of £20,000,000. The balance remaining in the fund at the termination of the present plan will be carried forward to the new plan as the nucleus of the new stabilisation fund. When the average export realisation falls below the guaranteed return, the deficiency will be made up first by drawing upon the stabilisation fund, in respect of up to 100,000,000 bushels of wheat from each crop. When the fund is exhausted the Commonwealth will meet its obligations under the guarantee.

So, on the export side the whole matter is completely tied up between the States and the Commonwealth to ensure that the guaranteed price of 14s. 6d. may obtain irrespective of the world market. The home consumption base price for 1958-59, in the first year of the plan, has been established as 14s. 6d. a bushel on a bulk basis free on rail to ports. There is a provision in the plan for annual adjustments in the following years. Provision is made for a loading on the price of all wheat sold for consumption in Australia to the extent necessary to cover the cost of transporting the wheat from the mainland to Tasmania in each season of the plan. As hon. members are aware, Tasmania does not grow wheat of f.a.q. standard, but only soft wheat suitable for biscuit-making; and it always has to obtain its flour requirements, or equivalent, from the mainland States.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: That comes from closing the banks on Saturday morning.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The river banks, maybe. A premium will be paid from export realisations on wheat grown in Western Australia, and wheat exported from this State in recognition of the freight advantages enjoyed by Western Australia, owing to its proximity to Eastern countries and the principal overseas markets for wheat. That premium will be 3d. per bushel, which gives to our growers some little advantage, because of the geographical consideration.

These main features, which I have outlined, closely approximate the points and features of the 1954-58 plan. The wishes of the Australian Wheat Growers' Federation were considered and, indeed, they have been substantially met. But, following its original offer to the industry of a new stabilisation plan, the Australian Agricultural Council, at the request of the federation, gave further consideration to two items relating to the guaranteed return and the home consumption price of wheat.

The first item is the use in the cost-of-production formula of a yield divisor of 15.5 bushels per acre. The federation requested that 14.8 bushels should be substituted, and, after a lot of consideration, the request of the federation was discarded, because it was felt that the better farming methods and the seasonal anticipations of this year could give a yield much higher than 15.5 bushels and give too much of an advantage to the grower to base his average production on 14.8 bushels.

The federation's second request was that a higher margin of profit should be included in the base home consumption price to an increase above the 14s. 6d. I have referred to. This, too, was turned down by the Agricultural Council as being quite unnecessary; so that at the request of the Agricultural Council and the Australian Wheat Growers' Federation, an economic survey was made by the Commonwealth Bureau of Economics, and this survey revealed fundamental changes in the wheat industry, particularly during the last decade. Smaller and more select acreages are being farmed. Modern machinery and equipment is being used, together with different farming practices and wider rotations. These changes have been responsible for improved production results.

All of these conditions apply in the wheat producing States of Australia; and the Agricultural Council—the Ministers are advised by their experts from their States—is positive that the average yield from all the States will exceed 14.8 bushels per acre, which the Australian Wheat Growers' Federation presented as a base.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: Was that their anticipation?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes, and it is something that can be reviewed. The Commonwealth Bureau of Agricultural Statistics, as the hon. member knows, in all its ramifications, covers exploratory costs of all rural industries and, although that is its opinion, I am not at this stage trying to give a long-range forecast of wheat prices or suggesting that that figure, for the time being, is likely to be wrong. We all know that seasonal variances can

cause a wide discrepancy. In this State, we have had an estimate based on a past average of 10,000,000 bushels. But it is better to select a base which is a reasonable one in anticipation of the better farming methods continuing and, perhaps, a better run of seasons, than to anticipate a yield of 15.5 bushels.

The cost-of-production formula has been liberalised in some important respects for the purpose of the new plan. The industry now receives the benefit of fair market values for land, and of improvements and stock, which results in a stubstantially higher allowance to the farmer for interest on the total capital value of his property. That has always been a very vexed question and, previously, only security values were provided in such an estimate of that part of the component of this cost-of-production formula.

The Agricultural Council has taken a prominent part through the respective Ministers of the States in bringing about a very amicable understanding between the growers' representatives of all States; and in its attempt to arrive at a proper formula after considering such matters as depreciation. In the previous formula, on which the existing Act was based, the assumption was made that farmers regularly replace their depreciable assets over time, according to the rate of depreciation allowed. All the requirements of the present formula are based upon the current replacement costs, which gives a distinct advantage in the cost structure and its relationship to the 14s. 6d. per bushel.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: A realistic approach.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: In practice, farmers frequently extend the life of such items as fences, buildings and dams. Though continuing repairs and maintenance costs are themselves allowed as annual costs, in the present component, replacement costs, too, have been considered. In addition, the owner-operator allowance has been raised to £1,040 per annum for the 1958-59 season, and will be subject to adjustments beyond that date in accordance with arbitration wage decisions. In that figure, the labour of the farmer's family is costed at award rates whether or not they are in fact paid at such rates.

With all of these components of the guaranteed price, it appears on analysis that the return which is assured cannot be said to be other than a reasonable one. I mentioned that the Agricultural Council did not agree to all of the requests of the federation. The federation requested a much higher profit margin in the home-consumption price, and the council would not agree to that. However, it agreed that it would examine the federation's proposal after the harvest of the 1959 wheat season.

The Select Committee of the Australian Wheat Growers' Federation has since accepted entirely the proposed new stabilisation plan, and when advising its acceptance of the plan, it indicated that the federation did not require a ballot of growers; and requested that all Governments should proceed to legislate for the plan as soon as possible as the State Ministers for Agriculture were unanimous in their view.

The respective State Governments have since prepared the requisite legislation and there will be, therefore, no point at all in the conduct of a poll, which was the action taken before the scheme was initially introduced five years ago. In view of the knowledge of hon. members of the importance of the wheat industry to Western Australia, and the percentage it represents of the total rural—and indeed State—economy, I am sure hon. members will welcome this legislation which seeks to give this major industry the stability which is necessary; particularly, as I mentioned initially, in view of the world accumulation of stocks and the record crops to be expected within Australia this year. I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Hon. L. C. Diver, debate adjourned.

CITY OF PERTH PARKING FACILITIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (Minister for Railways—North) [3.2] in moving the second reading said: Hon. members are aware that the parent Act, which was passed in 1956, bestowed on the Perth City Council the control and regulation of parking within the borders of the City of Perth municipal district. The Act gives the City Council the right to establish parking stations and facilities, metered zones and spaces, etc., but it does not provide the right to erect signs or notices. While it has been said that this right is implied, and the council has erected a number of signs, it is considered that a grave legal doubt would exist should there be a court case over an accident or something of that nature.

In order that all such doubts may be removed, the measure provides that the council may, in any road or reserve under its control, erect and maintain any sign or notice required to further the administration of the Act. It seems peculiar that while Parliament gave the necessary authority in regard to reserves, parking spaces,

and so on, it omitted to give the council the right to erect signs. This Bill will remove that anomaly. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

INSPECTION OF MACHINERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from the previous day.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

The Hon. W. R. Hall in the Chair; the Hon. A. F. Griffith in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Section 44C amended:

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I move an amendment—

Page 2—Insert a new paragraph to stand as paragraph (a) as follows:—

(a) deleting the words "into the State" in line three of paragraph (a), subsection (1).

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Can a new paragraph be inserted at this stage, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: A new clause would have to be dealt with later, but a new paragraph can be inserted at this stage.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: To explain the purpose of the amendment it is necessary to retrace portion of the Act itself. The principal Act in Section 44A provides that an airport licence may be granted to premises situated at the airport known as Perth Airport and to premises known as the Overseas Terminal, or such other premises so situated—that is at the airport—as the court may consider suitable premises. It also provides—it is important that members appreciate this—that an airport licence may be granted for premises situated at any other airport in the State as the Governor may, from time to time, on the recommendation of the court, by proclamation declare.

So, the Act does not confine the granting of a licence to the Perth Airport. It is quite feasible that an airport, such as that at Kalgoorlie, Geraldton, Port Hedland or Carnarvon could become a very busy airport. In fact, the airport at Port Hedland, which is an exchange airport, is an extremely busy one today. It is not beyond the realms of possibility that, with the rapid expansion of civil aviation, the department will require a service to be provided at these airports.

For example, passengers arriving on a plane at the Port Hedland airport do not come into Port Hedland; and the temperatures at that centre are such that a service will, at some time or other, be required. The Geraldton airport is also eight or nine miles out of the town. It is not practicable to provide a licence at any of these airports at the moment, because Section 44C—which the Bill proposes to amend—restricts the granting of a licence to serve only aircraft conveying passengers into and out of the State. Hon. members can, therefore, see the purpose of the amendment. It seeks to provide that should it be necessary to give a service at the Perth Airport, or at any other airport in the State, there will not be this anomaly of being able to provide a service only to aircraft conveying passengers interstate. I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is obvious that the Minister for Railways has thought this amendment out very shrewdly. As I told him, when I was speaking on the second reading last night, I have no objection to the amendment, except that I fear the consequences that might arise. In my opinion paragraph (b) of Section 44B has no effect, and it could be deleted from the Act. This would leave the airport licence at Guildford in practically the same position as it is in now. It simply provides that any other licence that the court may grant would apply only to those aircraft that come in and go out of the State. I am merely wondering what the Licensing Court will say about this amendment if it is passed, because it is possible that the Perth Airport, at least, will have a liquor licence which will enable the bar to be open for practically 24 hours a day. That is something much greater than the present sections of the Act allow. The amendment proposes to strike out the words "into the State," and this will mean that the section will have application to any aircraft. I am just wondering whether this is going too far; and I would like to hear the opinion of some other hon. member on the question.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I thank the hon. member for raising no objection to the amendment but still voicing several fears concerning it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Well, is it not feasible?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The hon. member knows the Act as well as I do. At present the bar at the Perth Airport is

open practically all day and night. Whatever licence is granted will be subject to the approval of the Department of Civil Aviation. The Act clearly defines that no individual can apply for an airport licence without he is nominated in writing by the Department of Civil Aviation. Should any position arise, such as that feared by the hon. member, the department would merely have to apply the regulations prescribed under the Act. In my opinion, the provision for granting a licence for six hours after the plane arrives is rather generous.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It could be.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I cannot imagine anyone sitting at an airport for six hours without eating or drinking. Any person coming off a Tiger Moth or any other plane that flies intrastate can obtain a drink at that bar provided it is open. In fact, any person can go to the airport, even on a Sunday, and buy a meal just before a plane is due to arrive. This applies also for half an hour after a plane has arrived. That is what the Act provides today. No hon. member should query this amendment to rectify a small stupid anomaly contained in the Act. At the moment any airline official, together with anyone else accompanying him can enter the licensed premises at the airport when he likes. Section 44C reads as follows:—

> (1) An airport license shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, authorise the licensee to sell and dispose of any liquor on the licensed premises specified in the license—
>
> (a) for a period of thirty minutes before the arrival at the airport of any aircraft conveying passengers into the State, and for a period not exceeding six hours during the time after its arrival that the aircraft is grounded at the airport, and for a period of 30 minutes before the departure from the airport of any aircraft conveying passengers out of the State.

That does not mean the passenger has to be travelling from overseas. As long as he travels interstate, the facilities are open to him. The facilities can remain open now, if desired. The following are the parties to whom liquor can be sold:—

> Any passenger who has alighted from or who intends to board the aircraft;
>
> Any airline official or any officer of the Commonwealth Department of Civil Aviation.

I take it that an airline official is any officer working in any of the airline companies in Perth. I spoke to one of the executives of the MacRobertson-Miller Aviation Company about this matter. I asked him if he had been able to obtain liquor in the circumstances I have mentioned. He replied that he had occasionally. I asked him if he was entitled to use the bar facilities, and he said that as he was an airline officer he was entitled to do so. It seems that even the pilot of a Tiger Moth aircraft can be termed an aircraft official.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: So long as he has travelled from outside of the State.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: He does not even have to be travelling on aircraft from outside the State. The next party to whom the liquor can be sold under Section 44 is—

> Any person who is in the company of any such passenger, official or officer.

So, if an officer of one of the airline companies in Perth desires to take a friend to the bar at the terminal, both the officer and his friend are entitled to have a drink within the prescribed hours. This Act is full of anomalies.

Another subsection states—

> Any liquor sold and disposed of under the provisions of paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of this section shall not be sold by the bottle or in a bottle and shall be drunk or consumed in or upon the licensed premises.

Paragraph (b) of Subsection (1) does not restrict the sale of bottled liquor, as long as the person is being served with a meal. The liquor can be drunk or consumed with a meal.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: As long as the liquor is consumed with the meal.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: That does not restrict the sale of bottles. The Act is open to all sorts of abuses. The object is to restrict the sale of liquor on aircraft, but if a passenger is served with a meal he can be sold a bottle of liquor; but not if he is at the bar.

If a person, travelling within the State, desires to obtain liquor at the airport through backdoor methods he can get any quantity he requires, because he has only to approach the pilot or an airline official and ask him to have a drink. As long as he is accompanied by the pilot or airline official he can be served with liquor. All I am asking is that this legislation should not enable the bar of the airport to be open for 24 hours a day. I am also asking for anomalies to be removed from the Act. All passengers who desire to use the bar facilities should be able to do so on the same basis.

The provision relates only to aircraft flying in and out of the State. Every week, passengers arrive from Darwin by the MacRobertson-Miller service; on Saturdays that service waits for the Qantas aircraft to arrive for the transhipment of passengers. All passengers on that

plane, even those who board the aircraft at Geraldton, are travelling on a plane which comes from outside of the State, and they are legally entitled to obtain liquor.

Yet passengers on another plane of the same airline, starting off at the same time on the same day from Derby, are not legally entitled to obtain liquor at the air port. So, there are loopholes in the Act which should be removed.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: When the Bill in 1955 became an Act, we passed it with the reservation that the Licensing Court had to be approached to obtain what is the most extraordinary and generous liquor licence in the State. At that time Parliament decided not to make the provisions too broad, otherwise the Licensing Court might consider it was too much of an open slather, and might refuse the licence. I have no objection to the amendment of the Minister, but it is my duty to point out my fear arising from the application of the Act.

I wish to comment on two points. The first is the reference to six hours after an aircraft has been grounded. The passengers do not know they will be grounded for six hours. The aircraft is generally grounded for some reason, but the passengers do not know how long it will remain on the ground. Sometimes the fault is rectified in a half hour, and sometimes it takes six hours. The passengers do not deliberately sit down to gorge or intoxicate themselves for a set period of time. The six-hour restriction is imposed to enable air passengers, who are grounded and who have no homes in this State, to make use of the facilities at the air port. The Minister has not read Section 44C of the Act correctly. Paragraph (b) states—

> to any person being served with a meal on the licensed premises in a room set aside for the purpose, if—
>
> (i) the liquor is drunk or consumed with the meal.

Subsection (2) then sets out that the liquor shall not be sold to them in a bottle. This is not the interpretation that the Minister placed upon it. However, let us give it a try and see what the court and another place think about it.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I move an amendment—

> Page 2—Insert a new paragraph to stand as paragraph (b) as follows:—
>
> (b) deleting the words "out of the State" in lines nine and ten of paragraph (a) of subsection (1).

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

> Page 2—Delete all the words in lines 6 to 12 inclusive.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I thank the hon. Dr. Hislop for his amendment. I am sure it is meant to be helpful, but I hope the Committee will not agree to it. I ask the hon. member to read subparagraphs (i) and (ii) of proposed Section (3) (a). Therein is contained the very objection the hon. Dr. Hislop is raising. Let us consider this in the terms of the amendment to which the Committee has agreed in respect to the Minister's amendment.

The court now has the power to grant a liquor licence to an airport within the State. This applies to any airport, no matter in what part of the State it may be situated; and the court deals with the manner in which liquor shall be served at an airport. Subparagraphs (i) and (ii), to which I have already referred, are the complete answer. It is as plain as a pikestaff.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: It is plainly wrong.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is a conflict of opinion. I believe the Bill is all right as it is. I would ask hon. members to bear in mind that this particular amendment was introduced in another place by the Minister and, I understand, the drafting was done by the Crown Law Department, which makes it pretty good; so far as the Minister is concerned, anyway.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Having looked at the proposed amendment, I think perhaps the hon. Dr. Hislop's fears could be overcome if in the words "in the Overseas Terminal Building or in such other premises so situate at the Perth Airport as the court approves" which he wants to delete, we changed the word "or" to "and". This would clear up the position.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: But you still limit the dining-room to the Perth Airport.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Yes. I think that is right.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The hon. Mr. Griffith has moved from the particular to the general, and back again. If we are to grant an airport licence, what we provide must apply to all airports throughout the State. We cannot say that the Perth Airport is to be the only place where a man can have alcohol served with his meal. The provisions of the Bill will apply in the future.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The mover of the Bill has such a soft heart and is so amenable to reason that he feels that if any mistake is made in the drafting, the

Government will get the Crown Law officers to correct it; so he agrees to the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: So far as I can gather at the moment there is a disjunction between the part of the building that is licensed, and the dining-room. We might make the whole set-up much better if we add another provision to the Bill. I have made available, to the hon. Mr. Griffith and to the Chairman, a copy of what I propose, but I do not know whether the Minister has one. What I suggest will mean that there could be a small bar in the dinning-room. Members may recall the licence which was formerly granted to the King Edward Hotel. Under the present situation, a waiter would take a diner's order for a drink, and then would have to go some distance to get it.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Not such a great distance, surely!

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: This is not a very good method. I am suggesting that a house licence be granted.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest to the hon. member that he move to add a new paragraph to stand as paragraph (c).

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Very well. I move an amendment—

Page 2—Insert a new paragraph to stand as paragraph (c) as follows:—

(c) adding the following subparagraph to paragraph (b) of subsection (1):—

(iii) if considered necessary for the adequate function of this section, the court may grant a house licence in relation to the room referred to in paragraph (b) of this section.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The explanation I gave Dr. Hislop on his previous amendment is more applicable to this one. The Minister, in another place, gave an explanation of this amendment, which he himself had inserted in the Bill. He said there was an appreciation of the fact that the Department of Civil Aviation wanted the two sections divided; and it was anticipated there would be some difficulty in supplying liquor from the bar to the dining-room. To overcome the difficulty, he moved his amendment.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: It is limited to the Perth Airport.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Now that the hon. member has had certain words struck out, it will not be. I understand it is envisaged that a small but convenient supply of liquor will be made available in the dining-room; so, the circumstances of waiting as envisaged by the hon. Dr. Hislop, will not arise.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: The Hon. J. Nicholson used to desire to make the position abundantly clear.

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

Ayes—12

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. A. L. Loton
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. G. E. Jeffery	Hon. J. D. Teahan

(Teller.)

Noes—10

Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon

(Teller.)

Majority for—2.

Amendment thus passed.

The CHAIRMAN: It does not look as if this amendment will fit into the Act. The Bill may need to be recommitted.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Where does the hon. member's amendment fit in?

The CHAIRMAN: That is what we are trying to work out. It will fit into the Bill as paragraph (c); but it does not fit into the Act.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

New Clause:

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I move—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 3:—

3. The Second Schedule to the principal Act is amended by—

(a) deleting the words "into the State" in line four of the third paragraph of the form Airport Licence; and

(b) deleting the words "out of the State" in lines eight and nine of the form Airport Licence.

This new clause amends the Second Schedule and has the same effect as the previous amendments. The Schedule is the form of licence issued to an airport licensee.

New clause put and passed.

Title—put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

Sitting suspended from 3.55 to 4.10 p.m.

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3).

First Reading.

Received from the Assembly and, on motion by the Hon. L. C. Diver, read a first time.

TOTALISATOR DUTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Council.

TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

THE HON. L. C. DIVER (Central) [4.12]: I am a little perturbed that the Government has seen fit to introduce this measure. The first part of the Bill seeks to re-enact the Town Planning and Development Act for another 12 months. When the Town Planning Act, as we know it, was introduced, it was to fill a gap between the action taken by the Government and the time when an all-party committee gave its blessing in principle to the plan proposed by Professor Stephenson. The legislation was brought down in the nature of a stop-gap plan, which it was hoped would continue for a relatively short time, to enable the metropolitan regional planning authority to come into being.

At the first or second meeting held by the all-party committee in regard to the Hepburn scheme, I took exception to what would happen concerning valuations where rural land and town land met; at the fusion of these two types of land. Much dispute took place over valuations, and certainly there has been as much confusion as I envisaged would take place. I was assured that such a state of affairs would not occur, because a comprehensive piece of legislation would be brought before Parliament, and, when it became an Act, the person charged with valuing the land would take into consideration all those areas of land marked for residential purposes, those to be set aside for factory sites, and those to be kept for rural purposes.

I had my doubts at the time, and I wanted to know what authority such an Act would give an officer of the Federal Government, who might be charged with the responsibility of valuing land as envisaged in the town planning proposals at the time. I wanted to know how we could influence such an officer by Act of Parliament. It will be appreciated by hon. members that on one side of the road there could perhaps be a dwelling area, while on the other side land could be set aside for rural purposes. I wanted to know how we could have two distinct valuations for land on either side of that road. I was assured at the time, not only by the Minister, but by the Lord Mayor of Perth and his town clerk, that this could be done.

But it would seem that all the anomalies I foresaw in regard to valuations have come to pass, and many of our rural landowners—as distinct from dwellers—are finding themselves trying to produce commodities on land which has an exorbitant rating, simply because of its close proximity to land that may be used for commercial or home-building purposes. I was told that a comprehensive piece of legislation would, in due course, somehow make provision to protect such land from exorbitant valuations.

I would be failing in my duty to those I represent if I did not, at this juncture make these remarks to the Government. I feel it is a very serious position in which to be placed, and one which the Government should realise. This matter has not been attacked as it should have been; and we are thrust into a position where we have no alternative but to accept the legislation before the House, and give the Act another year's life.

According to the Minister's notes, this interim plan will be given more than a year's life, because the Town Planning Commissioner has admitted that after Parliament has passed the Act, there will be a time lag before its promulgation, in order to set up an authority. Therefore, the soonest we will see anything of material benefit to the people—the landowner or the agriculturist who finds himself in the position of which I have spoken—will be somewhere near 18 months.

I say with all sincerity and with all the force I possibly can, that whoever may be the person charged in the near future with the responsibility for seeing this measure is placed before Parliament, should take action as soon as possible. I make these observations realising that our late Chief Secretary was stricken with a fatal illness. I realise that; but feel that this matter is of such moment to the community that the Government should have made arrangements for the early implementation of a metropolitan regional planning authority.

I trust that the Government will, at the earliest moment, see that steps are taken to ensure that legislation, along the lines that have been envisaged, is introduced at the beginning of next session, so as to remedy the deplorable conditions that exist today in regard to valuations.

As I have already said, the Bill is to give a further extension of life to the interim legislation in order to carry on town planning for another year. I do not know why the Government should not continue it for 18 months so that we would not have to deal with it again.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: We could have a look at your suggestion.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: I think it is worthwhile as it would save time in the next session of Parliament. I do not propose to go into the legal aspects of the Bill

before us, because I think there are other minds better able than mine to do so. However, it appears to me that the Bill will straighten out the weaknesses in regard to leases, as mentioned by the Minister; and it will also attend to the passing over of pieces of land that were previously Crown lands. These have been subdivided and have now reached such a stage of development that the local authority in the area concerned will be able to take over the responsibility under its terms of government.

I do not think there is any need for me to say any more at this juncture. As I have said, the Bill is one to rectify certain anomalies that have been brought about to a large extent by the shortcomings of amendments passed last year, and to fill in the need to hand over Crown lands to local authorities at the appropriate time. With these remarks, I support the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by the Hon. J. G. Hislop, debate adjourned.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

THE HON. R. C. MATTISKE (Metropolitan) [4.28]: During this session of Parliament the Government appears to have presented certain Bills for purely political purposes.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: What, again?

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: Yes. These Bills have been submitted in a slightly modified form year after year, even though a full debate has previously taken place. It is obvious that the Government is endeavouring to make political overtures to certain sections of the community. I deplore that attitude on its part, and feel its efforts would be better employed in giving time and attention to matters which would benefit the State as a whole.

This particular Bill is a further example. I have conducted considerable research into the measure, and I cannot see any good reason why this House should accept it. If it were passed, it would undoubtedly give unfair benefits to certain sections of the community without regard at all to the results which must inevitably follow. I think it would give benefits for which the industry would not be able to pay, and there could be only one result—unemployment.

I do not propose to deal at length with the many detailed provisions in the measure, but will speak briefly on one or two aspects. I will deal first with the clause commonly known as the "to and from" clause, which has been debated at length in this Chamber on many occasions in the past. I will not weary hon. members by reiterating all that has gone before; I need only say that, in the opinion of the Select Committee which investigated this legislation in 1954, the "to and from" clause was not desirable. This House on subsequent occasions has considered that provision not desirable and has refused to accept it, and I therefore deplore the fact that we are again faced with it.

Other aspects of the measure are the overall increase of 25 per cent. sought in the lump sum benefits, and the virtual removal of the limit of the employer's liability by giving the board power to make weekly payments beyond the statutory total figure for permanent, total or partial incapacity. When dealing with the Second Schedule the Select Committee said—

> Your committee feel that research should be made into this problem and would suggest that a committee comprising not only medical men but also leaders of industry and unions be appointed, as the committee feel that only by goodwill could this problem be resolved satisfactorily.

At that time, the Select Committee also made a recommendation that basic wage variations should automatically be applied to the Second Schedule. That was subsequently done by Parliament, and much good has arisen therefrom. It is quite a fair benefit, to which the worker is entitled. But the Government has not taken any steps to carry out the other recommendation of the Select Committee which I have just read; that research should be conducted into the whole of the basis of the Second Schedule. I feel that until that is done we should take no action at all to amend the benefits under that schedule.

The Bill also contains a further wide departure from normal compensation practice, through the coverage of illness and disease; and this opens up a terrific avenue which could not lead to other than confusion in industry. Where illnesses and diseases start is a matter that no-one can determine with accuracy, and, therefore, this can only lead to confusion. Under the Act at present there is no doubt about an accident, because it is the result of certain physical action at a particular time and, therefore, it can, in 90 per cent. of cases, be directly attributed to a certain period when a person may or may not be engaged at his normal employment. But by bringing in illnesses and diseases the already confused Act will reach a new peak of confusion. I draw the attention of hon. members to the report of the Royal Commissioners when, in 1948, they had this to say when dealing with illnesses and diseases:—

> It seems that no single scheme exists in any country whereby workers are compensated on the same basis for both industrial and non-industrial

accidents and sickness. The latter is provided for in various ways by voluntary contributory or governmental pensions systems. Evidence has shown that employees in Western Australia are somewhat similarly provided for by the Commonwealth Social Services and voluntary friendly societies, hospital benefit and other schemes. The introduction of a social service embracing compensation for incapacity through accident or sickness whether work caused or otherwise would clash seriously with Commonwealth Government legislation and place increased costs on local industries for the provision of benefits to a section only of the population.

I feel that if it is now the intention of the Government that the whole of the principle of compensation should be altered, at least an extensive inquiry might first have been held. Compensation, as the name implies, is simply a system under which a person legitimately injured at his work can be given a certain amount of money to enable him to maintain himself and his family until he is sufficiently recovered to enable him to resume either partial or full employment. I think it was never intended—and should not be intended—that he should be just as well off in that period of incapacity as he might have been had he not been injured.

The removal of the three-year time limit regarding claims for silicosis and pneumoconiosis is also a matter which requires careful consideration. While not professing to have any medical knowledge, I realise, from what has been said in this Chamber on previous occasions, that it is evident that these diseases perhaps do not make themselves obvious for a certain period of years; but I think that to remove the time limit completely is a wrong step. It would mean, in effect, that any miner who might leave his present employment completely free from any disease, could possibly go to some other country, work in the mines there and be stricken by disease and then, because of the legislation obtaining in this State, return here and claim compensation on the grounds that he had the disease prior to leaving the State.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That is not very logical.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I think it is too open, through there being no time limit, and I feel it requires a lot of research to find out what would be a reasonable time limit. The Bill also contains provision for the removal of the limit on medical and hospital expenses. There, again, there must be some limit in the Act, as otherwise it is too open to abuse. There are many ways in which this provision could be abused, and I think it would be extremely wrong for this House to encourage abuse by leaving the legislation so open.

These are but a few of the matters in the Bill which I could not possibly accept. On the other hand, I am certain that there are other matters, not contained in the measure, which might well be included to improve the conditions so far as industry, generally, is concerned; whether it be, in certain cases, to the direct benefit of the worker or, in other cases, possibly to make things fairer for the employer. Workers' compensation is of paramount importance to all sections of the industrial community and for that reason it should be abundantly clear, in the legislation, what the intentions of Parliament really are.

I venture to say that in the Workers' Compensation Act, as it stands at present, there are many aspects which are not clear even to persons fairly well versed in workers' compensation. I think that, rather than add to that confusion, we should take a positive stand in an endeavour to clarify and not further cloud the legislation. As an example, one need only look at the Act at present with regard to the definition of "worker." I have given this matter a lot of attention and I am not quite sure who is a worker and who is not. That is the starting point of the whole measure. When we have confusion in legislation it can only result in costly and unnecessary litigation which may preclude one of the parties from obtaining his just deserts. We have heard it said here—and I quite agree—that there may be workers who are firmly of the opinion that they have certain rights and entitlements, but who are not able to enforce those rights and entitlements, because they have not the wherewithal to enable them to embark on what could possibly be fairly extensive litigation.

For those reasons let us clarify the whole of the Act, so that there can be little if any doubt as to what the intentions of Parliament are. In order to overcome this confusion, I hope the House will not agree to the second reading of the measure, and I hope the Government will take heed of a recommendation I am about to make. I recommend to the Government that it consider the setting-up of a committee of experts to look into the whole of this legislation and to advise regarding a complete re-write of the whole Act.

The Hon. E. M. Heenan: Don't you think the Government has already taken some advice from experts?

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: No doubt it has, but I recall many instances—last year and the year before, when debating certain detailed provisions of the measures then before the House—when the Minister introducing those Bills had to admit that the Government had not contacted certain interested parties directly connected with

workers' compensation. Although Select Committees appointed by Parliament achieve a certain amount of good as a result of their inquiries and by the reports that are published, the members of them cannot possibly have the full knowledge possessed by persons who, in their every-day walk of life are directly concerned with one aspect or another of workers' compensation.

For this reason I suggest the formation of a committee to investigate the whole of the Act. On that committee there might well be representatives of the insurers; self-insurers; employers; employees; the medical profession; and the legal profession.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: The worker would be in the minority, wouldn't he?

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: By this means the Government would be able to obtain expert advice on the various aspects of workers' compensation and so tidy up a measure which at present is causing a good deal of concern in industry. There is no need to labour this matter unduly, and for that reason I hope the Government will take heed of my suggestion. I trust the House will not agree to the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by the Hon. C. R. Abbey, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 4.47 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 6th November, 1958.

CONTENTS.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.25 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

No. 1. This question was postponed.

DIESEL FUEL.

Tax Paid to Main Roads Department.

2. Mr. BRAND asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What amount was paid into the funds of the Main Roads Department from the tax on diesel fuel, during the year ended the 30th June, 1958?

(2) What amount is likely to be received from this source during the current financial year?

Mr. TONKIN replied:

(1) £475,000.

(2) £475,000.