

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 10th September, 1959

CONTENTS

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :	Page
Carnarvon Hospital, new children's wards, and kitchen	1528
Government-controlled hospitals, contract price of bread in Fremantle area	1528
Transport of tomatoes, Webberton Siding to Fremantle	1528
State Housing Commission homes, rental on vacating, and in advance	1528
Midland Junction Abattoir, sale of hocks and sheep's skulls	1529
Medical practitioners and natural therapists, numbers practising	1529
Albany Regional Hospital— Progress and work force	1529
Completion, opening, and bed capacity	1529
Comprehensive water scheme, questionnaires on modified proposal	1529
Eastern States industry, establishment in Western Australia	1530
QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE :	
Narrows Bridge, Parliamentary inspection	1530
BILLS :	
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment— Com.	1530
Report	1535
Noxious Weeds Act Amendment, 2r.	1535
Industrial Development (Kwinana Area) Act Amendment, 2r.	1536
State Hotels (Disposal)— 2r.	1538
Com.	1549
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act and Traffic Act Amendments— 2r.	1549
Com., report	1549
State Electricity Commission Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r.	1549

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

1. *This question was postponed.*

CARNARVON HOSPITAL

New Children's Wards, and Kitchen

2. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Health:
 - (1) In view of the big increase in the child population at Carnarvon and the lack of hospital accommodation for them, has any consideration been given to the building of at least two children's wards; and, if so, when?
 - (2) When will a new kitchen block be built?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes. Plans are being prepared for additional ward accommodation, including provision for children, and for other hospital additions, including kitchen block. It is expected that work will commence this financial year.

GOVERNMENT-CONTROLLED HOSPITALS

Contract Price of Bread in Fremantle Area

3. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister for Health:
 - (1) What was the tendered price of the successful tenderer for the supply of bread to hospitals controlled by the Government in the Fremantle area?
 - (2) What was the price per loaf under the previous contract?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) 5½d. per lb.
 - (2) 5½d. per lb.
4. *This question was postponed.*

TRANSPORT OF TOMATOES

Webberton Siding to Fremantle

5. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Transport:
 - (1) Was a permit issued in recent date for motor trucks to load tomatoes at Webberton Siding for haulage to Fremantle?
 - (2) If so, on what grounds was the permit issued?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) No permit has been issued recently for the road transport of tomatoes from Webberton to Fremantle. Some such transport has been effected by the Midland Railway Company's road service under its annual license to operate over the Geraldton-Perth route.
- (2) This is merely the use of one of two alternatives offered by the existing service.

6. *This question was postponed.*

STATE HOUSING COMMISSION HOMES

Rental on Vacating, and in Advance

7. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:
 - (1) Does the State Housing Commission charge one week's extra rent to a tenant who is vacating a commission rental home to take the tenancy of a larger commission rental home, plus the two weeks in advance on the new home?
 - (2) If so, what is the reason for the extra charge of one week's rent?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes. The transfer is always at the tenant's request.
- (2) When a house is vacated, the commission is involved in the loss of at least one week's rent. In special cases, such as widows and pensioners, the extra week's rent is usually waived.

MIDLAND JUNCTION ABATTOIR

Sale of Hocks and Sheep's Skulls

8. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Did the Midland Junction Abattoir call tenders this year for the purchase from it of hocks and sheep's skulls?
- (2) Was the highest tender accepted?
- (3) Who was the successful tenderer?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No—all tenders have been rejected.
- (3) Answered by No. (2) above.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS AND NATURAL THERAPISTS

Numbers Practising

9. Dr. HENN asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) How many known registered medical practitioners are practising—
 - (a) in the metropolitan area;
 - (b) in country areas?
- (2) How many known natural therapists are practising—
 - (a) in the metropolitan area;
 - (b) in country areas?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) (a) 656.
(b) 149.
- (2) (a) & (b): It is not possible to answer these questions as natural therapy is not defined and persons practising natural therapy are not registered.

ALBANY REGIONAL HOSPITAL

Progress and Work Force

10. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is the work on the Albany Regional Hospital proceeding to schedule?
- (2) Does he contemplate a reduction of the work force on the Albany Regional Hospital?
- (3) If so, what are the reasons for such contemplated reduction?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) See No. (2).

Completion, Opening, and Bed Capacity

11. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) What is the approximate date for completion of the Albany Regional Hospital?
- (2) Can he give the anticipated bed capacity for the following sections:—
 - (a) surgical;
 - (b) medical;
 - (c) general;
 - (d) maternity;
 - (e) children?
- (3) When is it anticipated that the hospital will be opened?
- (4) Will the hospital be at maximum bed capacity when opened?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) December, 1961.
- (2) (a), (b), and (c) — 83 acute beds (12 x 6 bed wards and 11 single bed wards).
(d) 27 beds.
(e) 15 beds.
- (3) To coincide with date of completion—December, 1961.
- (4) Yes, at the bed capacity as stated; but the hospital is designed for further expansion, if necessary.

COMPREHENSIVE WATER SCHEME

Questionnaires on Modified Proposal

12. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) How many questionnaires relating to the proposed modified comprehensive water supply scheme have been sent to primary producers?
- (2) What are the details of questions submitted?
- (3) When does he expect the second questionnaire to be forwarded to primary producers?
- (4) What are the proposed details of the second questionnaire?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) 4,550.
- (2) The details are as follows:—

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF COMPREHENSIVE WATER SUPPLY SCHEME

With the help of local Road Boards, this questionnaire is being sent to all farmers in the area included in the original Comprehensive Water Scheme prepared in 1946, but excluded from the Modified Scheme in 1947.

The information obtained from the questionnaire will enable a comparison to be made between present conditions and those obtaining 10 years

ago and will give a more up to date picture of requirements throughout the area than would otherwise be available. It is likely that more detailed surveys will be made subsequently in some areas.

At this stage only simple "yes" and "no" answers are required. Please cross out the one not applicable; fold the sheet; seal and post. No stamp is required.

Please return the questionnaire by 1st OCTOBER, 1959.

Failure to return a form will be taken to mean that your water supplies are satisfactory, and that you would not be interested in a district scheme for piped supplies. However, if that should be your view, we should prefer to have it indicated on a return rather than to have no reply from you.

All information supplied in reply to the questionnaire will be treated as confidential as regards the individual.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Name
 Postal Address
 Road District
 Ward
 Location Nos.
 Approximate cleared area

1. Is water supply adequate for present needs covering—
 (a) Stock Yes/No
 (b) Domestic purposes Yes/No

2. If present supply insufficient, can adequate provision be made by further development of sources within the farm? Yes/No

3. If the carrying capacity of your holding increases, do you consider sufficient additional water can be made available from the sources within your property? Yes/No

4. Would you be in favour of a Comprehensive Scheme for bringing piped water to farmers in your district, similar to the existing Modified Comprehensive Scheme? Yes/No

- (3) An accurate forecast cannot be given at this stage, as a great deal will depend on answers to the first questionnaire.

- (4) Details of the second questionnaire are not available at this stage as the matter is under consideration between State and Commonwealth departments.

13. *This question was postponed.*

EASTERN STATES INDUSTRY

Establishment in Western Australia

14. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

As, according to a recent report in *The West Australian* on the 30th June last, he stated that a manufacturing industry involving £40,000 worth of capital was likely to come here from the Eastern States, is he yet in a position to indicate what progress, if any, has been made in the direction mentioned?

Mr. COURT replied:

Negotiations have almost reached finality; and, in fact, may be completed later today. I hope to announce details of the enterprise within a few days.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

NARROWS BRIDGE

Parliamentary Inspection

Mr. HEAL asked the Minister for Works:

Approximately 18 months ago the previous Minister for Works made arrangements for members of both Houses of Parliament to inspect the progress of the Narrows Bridge. Will the Minister, in the next month, make similar arrangements to enable members of both Houses to undertake a tour of inspection of the bridge?

Mr. WILD replied:

I will have a discussion with the Commissioner of Main Roads to see whether we can organise a tour.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee

Resumed from the 8th September. The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Roberts) in the Chair; Mr. Perkins (Minister for Transport) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 7—Section 442 amended:

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on the clause after Mr. Brady had moved the following amendment:—

Page 5, line 13—Insert after the word "kindergartens" the words "swimming pools."

Mr. PERKINS: Since this Bill was previously before the Committee I have had a discussion about the amendment with Mr. White, of the Local Government Department; and the reply he gave me brings home very forcibly the dangers of accepting amendments unless they have been

considered by technical officers of the departments concerned. Mr. White gave me a detailed report which reads as follows:—

Referring to the proposed addition to clause 6 of the Bill suggested by the honourable member for Guildford-Midland, I advise that it would not be desirable to include in the projected sub-clause (21A) a reference to swimming pools to be operated either alone or jointly with other districts unless there is also a machinery alteration to another part of the Act to provide power for local authorities to unite in operating a swimming pool.

The other items listed in sub-clause (21A) are specifically authorised by Section 481 (1) (b) (iv) of the Municipal Corporations Act and in most cases they would be operated by an outside committee, for example a kindergarten or an infant health centre would not be operated by a council or by the board itself but by a committee set up for the purpose. At present there is no power under the Municipal Corporations Act for municipalities to join in establishing and operating a swimming pool, but there is a power conferred by Section 480 (1) (b) (ii) for a Council or Road Board to subsidise a Council in providing a pleasure resort, a place of recreation or similar work and this might be interpreted to cover a swimming pool. There is, however, no provision for joint operation or for the subsidising Council or Road Board to have any say in the way the pool is controlled or operated, the power amounting simply to that of subsidising.

Under the Road Districts Act there is power for a Road Board to join with an adjoining municipality or with an adjoining Road Board to establish a pool and in such a case the control of the pool is vested in the authority in whose district it is situated but the subsidising authority has the right to consider and approve the by-laws for the control of the pool which are to be made by the controlling local authority.

He has a further interesting comment referring to the proposed Local Government Bill which we hope will be before Parliament next year. He writes—

The Local Government Bill covers the position of joint works very adequately by Clauses 323 and 324 and if that measure is dealt with next year this will provide a much more satisfactory power to deal with joint works. Moreover, far better provisions in relation to swimming pools are included in the measure together with an express power to borrow for the purpose.

If members have listened closely to those comments, they will realise that if the words "swimming pools" had been added after the word "kindergartens," Parliament would merely be giving power to municipalities, jointly, to borrow in order to provide for the establishment of a swimming pool; but the addition of those words would not provide the necessary machinery for the subsequent administration of the legislation.

That advice exemplifies what I said when the Bill was before the Committee previously; namely, that there is great danger in making amendments of a technical nature to be incorporated in Bills unless we fully realise the implications. If amendments such as this were included they would do no harm, but they would be ineffective and would only clutter up the Bill. Further, in view of the fact that we will have a comprehensive Local Government Bill brought before Parliament next session—we hope—this portion will be satisfactorily cleared up.

The only way that these amendments could be incorporated in this measure would be to go through the Municipal Corporations Act and add sections to it to provide for the machinery I have referred to. Most members know Mr. White, of the Local Government Department, as a very experienced officer. I have discussed this matter with him in great detail, and he has advised that we should not tinker with the Bill at this stage. I continue to oppose the amendment, and I hope the Committee will not agree to it.

Mr. BRADY: I am not going to press for this amendment unless other members desire that I should continue with it; but I do not think there is any great substance in what the Minister has said as an argument against the amendment being agreed to. It is well known that in road districts there are such organisations as kindergartens, community centres, creches, and so on. I can visualise a position where road boards or municipalities could borrow money to establish a swimming pool, and then permit an outside committee to administer or manage it.

In fact, for the last 25 years in Midland Junction, a local committee has been conducting the infant health centre on ground granted to it by the municipal council. Although it may not be advisable for a local authority to borrow money for the establishment of a particular project, and then allow an outside body to conduct it, the fact remains that such action has been taken in the past. If the Minister thinks that there is something to lose by accepting the amendment, I will not insist on it.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I hope the member for Guildford-Midland will insist on his amendment. There is not a great deal of substance in the argument advanced by the Minister. From what he said the other

afternoon, when the Bill was in Committee, it is quite evident that he will do all he possibly can to try to prevent the insertion of these two simple words in the Bill. All the member for Guildford-Midland desires is to include swimming pools amongst this multiplicity of organisations. The discretion regarding the management of the pool would still remain with the local authority concerned.

The honourable member's amendment is designed to permit one or more local authorities to act jointly for the establishment of a swimming pool. When the Bill was in Committee previously, the Minister was afraid to accept one word as an amendment; and he said that any amendment would have to be submitted to his departmental officers. What harm can accrue from the insertion of these two simple words? The amendment can do only good.

The other afternoon the Minister for Transport interjected by saying that when I was a Minister I refused to accept any amendment to a Bill. I correct that statement because whenever an amendment was put forward for the improvement of any measure that I introduced, it was accepted. The Minister for Transport, however, seems to be afraid to get away from what is printed in the Bill; and he is averse to accepting any simple amendment. The other evening in Committee, I noticed that some of the members on the opposite side of the Chamber gave the impression that they considered the Minister's action was ridiculous. In fact the member for Narrogin did get up to say something along those lines; and he gave the Minister a hint that the attitude he was adopting was so untenable that the least he could do was to report progress and seek advice.

The Minister has now obtained that advice; but if the Minister's attitude this afternoon is anything like his attitude the other day, I do not know how the Committee will fare. The other day he said that the insertion of these two simple words would make a mess of the legislation. I ask members on the other side of the Chamber: Would this amendment make a mess of the legislation? Does the member for Narrogin, since he has heard the report by Mr. White, hold the same view today as he did the other afternoon?

I hope the member for Guildford-Midland will insist on his amendment. It will do no harm. It might help the Perth City Council, and some adjoining local authority, to establish a swimming pool for their ratepayers. I support the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS: No matter what I say, I will not convince the member for Mt. Hawthorn. That is obvious. It is also obvious that he never listened to a word I said when I mentioned the advice I had received from Mr. White of the Local Government Department. Had the member for Mt. Hawthorn listened, he would not have made the stupid remarks he did.

Mr. Hawke: This debate looks like going on for a while.

Mr. PERKINS: This is not a Party issue.

Mr. W. Hegney: You are trying to make it one.

Mr. PERKINS: In view of the explanations I have given, members should realise that the amendment will achieve no useful purpose. The member for Mt. Hawthorn said I adopted a stupid attitude the other day. I am not an authority on local government—it is not the department I administer—but my opinion was borne out by the most expert advisers we have; and Mr. White of the Local Government Department is one of them. I must accept the advice of Mr. White. When putting the case to him I did not colour it at all. When I asked him what effect the adding of these words would have, he said they would be useless.

Mr. W. Hegney: Did he say they would do any harm?

Mr. PERKINS: He said they would be redundant.

Mr. Hawke: Why are they useless?

Mr. PERKINS: Because there is no provision in either of the Acts to control such a swimming pool.

Mr. Hawke: Good Lord!

Mr. PERKINS: That is the position; and it is no good the Leader of the Opposition giving large sighs.

Mr. Hawke: Large size what?

Mr. PERKINS: This matter can be cleared up when the Local Government Bill comes before Parliament; we hope next session. Members who have studied that legislation will know that it contains a new approach entirely to this question. We are merely trying to graft amendments on to legislation that was framed many years ago. I think these two Acts must be at least 40 years old. Changed conditions demand a changed approach; and that, of course, is included in the local government legislation which we hope to introduce. I would rather the Committee did not insert the words.

Mr. HAWKE: The only time the Minister for Transport is even half happy is when he is suggesting we leave something for next year; the only time he would be completely happy would be if he suggested that we should leave something for another 10 years. Had the Minister been anxious to help municipal councils and their ratepayers in connection with this matter, he would have had an amendment drafted to provide for the legal operation of swimming pools. He has not lifted a finger in that direction. He merely gives the old conservative excuse that nothing can be done because, to give the municipal authorities complete power to establish swimming pools as suggested,

would mean another amendment having to be included in the Bill. All the Minister says is, "Wait till next year."

Mr. Perkins: It is not very long.

Mr. HAWKE: It does not matter to the Minister that two adjoining municipal councils might be anxious to proceed with a swimming pool now; he merely says, "Wait another 12 to 18 months." This means they will have to do without a swimming pool for two more summers. It is a poor approach to an important matter. The Minister knows that the establishment of swimming pools has become popular over the last few years.

Mr. Perkins: There will be no hold-up.

Mr. HAWKE: Some pools have been established in the district the Minister formerly represented. Parliament should offer every encouragement to local authorities that wish to establish swimming pools in conjunction with each other. We should not refuse this facility merely because it requires a little work to draft a further amendment.

Mr. Perkins: There will be none held up if we do it next session.

Mr. HAWKE: What next will the Minister try to put over us? If it were done now, the local authorities would have 12 months' start. They should not be asked to wait until a consolidated local government Bill is finalised by Parliament next year. Surely the Minister for Transport does not think that the local government Bill will be passed in a few minutes when Parliament considers it next year! The probability is that it will not be finalised until December next year. A further probability is that it will not be proclaimed and brought into operation until April or May of the year after.

The Minister is most unrealistic in this matter. He states that he is sympathetic; and I do not question his sincerity in that direction. But what is the good of sympathy to the local authorities and to the ratepayers concerned if the Minister does not take the practical action which is necessary to enable the local authorities to act quickly? The granting of authority to the local governing bodies is one thing, and the putting into effect of any project is another. If this amendment is agreed to, the local authorities will still have to confer and work out all the details.

If the amendment before us is agreed to, the other amendments referred to by the Minister will not be required to enable the local authorities to proceed. They will find a way to set up a local committee to manage the pool once it is established.

The Minister states that under this Bill, no pool could be established in time for this summer. He is probably right; but if he waits for the Local Government Bill to be approved by Parliament, then the local authorities will have to wait until the

following summer, or the one after. What the amendment seeks to achieve is to save time; and if it is agreed to, at least 12 months will be saved in putting into effect any project for the establishment of a swimming pool. I regret that the Minister did not take the trouble to have the necessary amendments drafted for our consideration. I support the amendment.

Mr. BRADY: Since the report of Mr. White was read by the Minister, I have examined the Act further. Whilst I was prepared to withdraw my amendment, I am, after my examination of the legislation, more insistent in pursuing the amendment.

What Mr. White did was to refer to the provision in section 480 (4) of the Municipal Corporations Act. When that provision was inserted in the Act many years ago, swimming pools were not as important to the community as they are today. Now that the shortcoming in that section has been brought to the notice of Parliament, we should remove the disability by agreeing to my amendment.

Section 480 of the Municipal Corporations Act states that the council may, with the approval of the Governor, spend 10 per cent. of its revenue on certain projects, among them being any road, pleasure resort, place of recreation, and similar works. It could be argued that swimming pools are not included in those projects. I would point out that only 10 per cent. of the revenue of the council can be expended in that direction within a certain period; but that amount may not be adequate to meet the cost of establishing a swimming pool. Parliament has the authority to permit the borrowing powers of a council to be exercised in certain respects; and it appears to be the desire of members that swimming pools should be included in the section of the Act to which I have referred.

The provision in clause 7 will enable a council to establish either alone or in conjunction with any other local authority, kindergartens, community centres, maternal health centres, infant health centres, creches, day nurseries, dental clinics and ambulance services. This provision is almost identical with that contained in section 480 (4) of the Municipal Corporations Act. Mr. White apparently has overlooked the fact that swimming pools are essential in many country districts. There is no reason why any municipal council should be deprived of the right to borrow money for the establishment of swimming pools, or be deprived of the right to set up a local committee to manage the pool.

Mr. HALL: We should be aware of one gigantic problem which faces us at this juncture; that is the problem of juvenile delinquency. The amendment before us

is one of the means to alleviate the position by enabling swimming pools to be built in decentralised country areas.

The country people are concerned with the drift of population, and they have approached the town planning authorities to evolve some system which will retain the populace in those areas. The provision of swimming pools is one of the means of doing that.

In the newspapers of yesterday and today, the Commissioner of Police has suggested the formulation of a committee to find means of overcoming the delinquency problem. As the Leader of the Opposition says, a delay of 12 months in the provision of swimming pools could be of consequence. We should not miss the opportunity to take any steps immediately to overcome this delinquency problem. We must tackle it at all times. We are all aware that, in other parts of the world, the problem has grown to an alarming proportion. In this State we have now the chance to do something to prevent its growth. We are regarded as the brains trust of Western Australia, and we should not refuse local authorities the right to provide swimming pools.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: When this amendment was before us previously, I raised a query with the idea of enabling the Minister to obtain further details. He has done so; and, in my view, the explanation given by Mr. White covers the position. I agreed with the member for Guildford-Midland when he said that his amendment should be withdrawn. However, he has now changed his mind and will pursue his amendment.

I feel the idea behind the amendment is quite good, but it is evident that further amendments to the parent Act will be necessary to support it. If the matter is urgent there is nothing to stop the member for Mt. Hawthorn or the Leader of the Opposition from bringing down a Bill which will provide the amendments.

Mr. W. Hegney: It would have a better chance if it came from you.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: It is useless to accept this amendment without further consideration of the parent Act. I feel the amendment should be withdrawn as was originally suggested by the member for Guildford-Midland.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I support the amendment. All it proposes to do is to add the words "swimming pools." I listened carefully to the report from Mr. White which was read by the Minister and in which he stated there would be nothing to prevent a municipality from making a contribution for the erection of a swimming pool in another locality. But it could not set up a proper authority to administer the pool.

To deal with comprehensive amendments, we will have to wait until such time as the local government Bill comes before

the House. However, that matter has been before us for many years and seems to be as far away as ever. I would point out to the Committee that the Perth City Council has made contributions with respect to social services to the Belmont Park Road Board, which is in the district I represent.

I refer to an infant health centre which is almost on the boundary of both local authorities. This clinic is just over the boundary of the Perth City Council, but financial help was forthcoming from that council in the establishment of this clinic. A committee has been formed in the Belmont Park Road Board district for the purpose of establishing an olympic pool. They are adjoined by the Perth City Council; and if the residents in that area were willing to make their contribution towards the establishment of this pool, according to the Minister they would have to wait for 12 months until the local government Bill was introduced.

The Minister has stated that the addition of these words would be quite ineffective. The purpose of the amendment is to make certain things legal which have happened over the years. Road boards have helped each other in the past. If the Perth City Council were willing to contribute towards the establishment of an Olympic pool in the Belmont Park Road Board district, no doubt a committee would be set up in that area and it would be answerable to the Belmont Park Road Board for the purpose of administering the pool.

In one case the Perth Road Board made a block of land available for a health clinic, after which the committee concerned went ahead and raised a substantial sum of money, with the help of the Lotteries Commission. In those days no contribution was made by the Government or the local authority except to make a block of land available. When this clinic was opened it was free of cost, and it did not come under the jurisdiction of the Medical Department but under the Children's Protection Society. The committee subsequently vested it in the local authority. That is the practice which is followed. This is a deliberative Assembly; and if we cannot make up our minds on a simple issue such as this we should not be here.

Mr. FLETCHER: I support the amendment. A certain lord mayor is frustrated about a certain park. He would bestow his blessing on this Government if it gave consideration to this amendment. Assuming there is no pool in the park, and some alternative site cannot be found in the Perth City Council area, it is conceivable that an alternative site may have to be found in close proximity to Perth. As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, the Perth City Council may have to join with some other council for the purpose of making a joint effort to build a pool.

Since we are led to believe that there is some urgency about the establishment of an Olympic pool, I suggest that the

Minister accept this amendment. Like thousands of others, I have my own thoughts on alternative sites for a pool.

Mr. Crommelin: Do you support the establishment of a pool in the park?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will keep to the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. FLETCHER: In that case, I do not have to commit myself on that interjection. As I said, I had in mind that an alternative site should be considered in close proximity to Perth. For example, I would like to suggest the Zoo in South Perth, which is near the Narrows Bridge, and close to transport, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will keep to the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. FLETCHER: With all due deference to you, Mr. Chairman, I feel that my remarks are relevant to the amendment, because it may be necessary for two councils to combine in a hurried effort to establish a pool. That is the whole tenor of my remarks.

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

Ayes—20.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Jamleson
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Moir
Mr. Graham	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Noes—20.

Mr. Brand	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Cornell	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Court	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Grayden	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. O'Neill
Dr. Henn	Mr. Owen
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Nulsen	Mr. Watts
Mr. Rowberry	Mr. Burt
Mr. Evans	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Norton	Mr. Craig

The CHAIRMAN: The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Title put and passed.

[The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Crommelin) took the Chair.]

Report

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

NOXIOUS WEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [3.19] in moving the second reading said: To coin a phrase that has been accepted as belonging to the member for Eyre when he was Minister—

Mr. J. Hegney: I cannot hear. There are too many conversations around here.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Crommelin): I will take note of the honourable member's complaint.

Mr. Brand: Write to him!

Mr. Hawke: What about some action?

Mr. NALDER: As I was saying, when the member for Eyre, as a Minister, introduced legislation, he frequently referred to a measure as being a "small Bill." This Bill comes into that category. It is a small Bill which seeks to give the Agriculture Protection Board power to delegate to any local authority, on request, its powers to control primary noxious weeds on private land. At present, under sections 22 and 23 of the parent Act, the protection board may direct private land to be freed from primary noxious weeds; and if an owner or occupier fails to meet the requirements of such direction, the protection board is empowered to carry out the work and recover the cost.

The Road Board Association suggested that the protection board should—where requested—grant the above powers to various road boards to control, and take measures to eradicate, primary noxious weeds in their districts. The Agriculture Protection Board, after considering the request, favours the proposal, as it is felt that it would be very helpful to be able to enlist the aid of local authorities in dealing with this problem. The matter was referred to the Crown Law Department, which recommended the small amendment contained in the Bill.

The measure provides for the delegation of such authority, subject to the approval of the Minister; and to enable the protection board to retain some authority over the road board concerned, such delegation of power is to be revocable. However, this action would not be necessary unless the local authority fell down on its job and did not carry out the duties imposed on it. Clause 3 of the Bill empowers the local authority concerned to expend money on the eradication of primary noxious weeds on private land, and recover such expenditure from the owner or occupier. Clause 4 makes it clear that the provisions of this Bill are additional, and do not interfere with the present discretionary power contained in section 25A, for a local authority to expend its own finance on control or eradication of primary noxious weeds on public or private land within its district.

I think the position is clear to members. We, in this State, have taken a keen interest in the eradication of noxious weeds; and over the last few years it has become evident that not only local authorities, but also private landholders, must take more interest in this problem.

Over the last few years, the spread of cape tulip has exercised the minds of all members in this House representing country electorates, in particular; and it is felt that every effort must be made to rid agricultural and Crown lands, as well as lands occupied for various other purposes, and those under the control of Government departments—as, for example, the Railway Department—of these weeds. Everyone concerned must co-operate to get rid of cape tulip and other primary noxious weeds.

This Bill is brought before the House in the hope that it will be passed, thus giving the Agriculture Protection Board power to delegate its authority to local authorities, so that they may assist in getting rid of these noxious weeds in various districts.

Mr. J. Hegney: Will the local authorities have to be given financial help?

Mr. NALDER: Perhaps, in some cases. But where the landholder does not do the job required of him, after having been given every opportunity to take the appropriate measures of control, the local authority can do the work and charge it up to him. There is power in the Bill to ensure that, if a local authority does not stand up to its responsibilities in this regard, the Agriculture Protection Board may do the work.

Mr. J. Hegney: Would it then debit the local authority with the cost?

Mr. NALDER: It would not need to do so, because the board would send the bill direct to the landholder, and he would have to pay.

Mr. J. Hegney: But what if the weeds had to be eradicated along roads under the control of the local authority?

Mr. NALDER: Then that would be its responsibility. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Kelly, debate adjourned.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (KWINANA AREA) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [3.27] in moving the second reading said: This Bill contains two provisions, the first being a machinery clause to add to the people eligible to act on the advisory committee

constituted under the parent Act, the chief executive officer of the Department of Industrial Development. In section 6 of the principal Act there is provision for an advisory committee consisting of four members, the first being the Surveyor-General; the second, the Director of Industrial Development; the third, a member of the Town Planning Board; and the fourth, a representative of the Chamber of Manufactures.

In view of the fact that there is now no such office as that of Director of Industrial Development, it is proposed to add the words "chief executive officer of the department," so that it will be competent to appoint that officer in lieu of a director. It is intended that the chief executive officer will be so appointed, if and when this legislation is passed by Parliament.

The second amendment contained in the Bill is the really important one; and it is to provide for the inclusion of some land acquired from the Commonwealth in 1954, within the provisions of the Industrial Development (Kwinana Area) Act. Members who were in the Chamber at that time—back in 1952—will recall the legislation then passed, bringing into being the Industrial Development (Kwinana Area) Act.

When the Kwinana refinery agreement was signed, there was a threat of rapid inflation of land values within some miles of the refinery site. In order to prevent that inflation getting out of hand, an Act entitled the "Industrial Development (Kwinana Area) Act, 1952," was proclaimed; and, among other things, it fixed the price of land over a wide area, for a period of time, and gave the Government wide powers of resumption and usage of land so resumed.

Included in the area defined in the Act was a large amount of land then owned by the Commonwealth Government; and this was expressly excluded from the provisions of the Act. Of course, the reasons for that would be obvious, because in 1952 this land was the property of the Commonwealth Government, and not the property of the State.

Mr. Jamieson drew attention to the state of the House.

Bells rung.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Crommelin): There is a quorum present. I could not see some members who were standing at the back of the Chamber.

Mr. COURT: In 1954, after lengthy negotiations with the Commonwealth Government, this land was purchased by the State. It was then placed under the Land Act—not under the Industrial Development (Kwinana Area) Act—and it will be apparent to members that the Land Act is not a suitable Act for handling land

of this kind, which is intended for a very definite purpose; namely, for industrial development in the Kwinana area.

The Commonwealth land under discussion comprised 2,478 acres, and the price—£50,000—at which it was transferred to the State was a very favourable one; and the object of the acquisition was to enable the State to utilise the area for industrial and other purposes.

In 1955, the Lands Department created a number of reserves on a section of this land between the old Rockingham Road—that is, the Naval Base Road—the Rockingham Road south of its junction with the old Rockingham Road, and the ocean. These reserves were created for the purpose of recreation, parking, campsites, and public utility. The effective area now to be included in the Act is approximately 1,880 acres.

I appreciate the difficulties of trying to comprehend the significance of the verbiage set out in the second schedule, because so many words are difficult to appreciate without a map. Therefore I shall arrange for two maps to be placed on the Table of the House, with your permission, Mr. Deputy Speaker. One sets out the total area under discussion, in respect of the land purchased from the Commonwealth; and the other sets out in detail the reserves that have been set aside by the Lands Department.

From these maps members will be able to appreciate more readily the significance of the second schedule, and will be able to see from the maps the exact areas that the Government proposes shall be incorporated within the principal Act. Members will also be able to see the orientation of this area being taken over, in relation to established industries such as the B.H.P. rolling mill and the Kwinana refinery.

The transfer of this land from the Land Act to the Industrial Development (Kwinana Area) Act is very important, because without it the Government cannot get on with the job of developing the Kwinana area in accordance with the original concept. Members will have read of the concern expressed by residents and others at Medina. The problem that confronts the township is the need for a more diversified and greatly increased amount of industry. It follows that with young men and women growing up in that district, if there is not a greater diversity and a greater quantity of industry in the area, it will be increasingly difficult for them to obtain employment within reasonable proximity of the townsite.

If the industrial development at Kwinana is to remain at its present level, it follows that the township of Medina will not have very bright prospects. On the contrary, I imagine that all members would want to see the township of Medina,

and other townsites in that area, develop to such an extent that they could take their rightful place as originally conceived in the overall development of the metropolitan region of this State.

Not only is there a demand for more employment and more opportunities for young men and women, but there is also a demand for the employment of female labour. It is quite apparent that the industries at present developed in the area will not provide a great amount of employment for female labour. They do provide a degree of employment for young men and women just launching on a career and they do provide a small amount of employment for female labour; but there is not a great prospect of employment for female labour, which is essential if we are to have a well-balanced employment opportunity for a community such as we hope to develop at Medina.

Therefore it is important that the Government have at its disposal this land from the Commonwealth Government, which was originally intended to be part of the overall industrial development of the Kwinana area. It follows that if we can attract industry to the Kwinana area, it makes the build-up of the townsite so much easier; and it justifies the establishment of better educational facilities, better hospital facilities, better transport, better amenities, and, in fact, better everything necessary for the build-up of a proper community.

That is the objective of the Government, and we want to achieve it as quickly as we can. We have some industry in prospect for the area, and it is not practicable to negotiate with such industry unless we have the land purchased from the Commonwealth in 1954, incorporated within the Industrial Development (Kwinana Area) Act.

I remind members, particularly those who have not been mixed up in the original 1952 legislation, that in section 6 of the Act there is provision for an advisory committee. Section 6 (b) reads—

Before the Minister exercises any power conferred upon him by paragraph (a) of this section he shall refer his proposal to exercise the power to the advisory committee referred to in paragraph (e) of this section.

Mr. Jamieson: Has the committee been called upon to function as yet?

Mr. COURT: Not during my term as Minister can I recall any occasion when it would have been necessary for it to meet. On reflection, there was one small piece of land that was under discussion when I took over from the previous Minister; and I am not certain whether the committee made a decision before or after I took over. Section 6 (c) states—

Unless the committee approves the proposed exercise of the power the Minister shall not exercise it.

So it will be appreciated that when the Bill was originally drawn and originally accepted by this Parliament, provision was made for this advisory committee; and the Minister cannot act without referring the proposal to the committee. If the committee does not approve of it, the Minister cannot exercise his power. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Hawke, debate adjourned.

Maps of the Cockburn Sound and Kwinana area were tabled.

STATE HOTELS (DISPOSAL) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 8th September.

MR. MOIR (Boulder) [3.40]: This Bill has been introduced for the purpose of disposing of six State hotels. The Minister, in a fairly lengthy speech, did not give any valid reasons why the State should dispose of these hotels except to say that it is the policy of the Government.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Not a bad reason.

MR. MOIR: The Minister for Health may think so, but there are many people in the State who think otherwise.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson. Mr Chamberlain thinks so, too.

MR. MOIR: It seems that the Minister is intent on enjoying himself during the debate on the second reading of this Bill. I was going to say that when he introduced the measure he did so almost gleefully; if one can describe any mood of the Minister's as being gleeful. I do not think the Minister knows a great deal of the background of these State hotels; because if he did he might have been a little more circumspect when introducing the Bill, and probably he would have made a different speech from the one he did make.

Judging from the Minister's remarks, one could come to the conclusion that the establishment of these State hotels was a move of a very socialistic nature by some previous Labour Government, and that most serious-thinking people of the State would be saying that this anti-Labour Government was taking the first opportunity it could to dispose of these concerns.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I did not say any one of those three things that you have just said.

MR. MOIR: I am saying them. This is my speech. The Minister has made his. He can make all the remarks he wishes when he replies to the debate.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You said that I said that.

MR. MOIR: I said that the Minister's remarks held that implication. I am entitled to draw any inference I wish from the Minister's remarks; and that is what I inferred from what the Minister said when he introduced the Bill. In outlining the reasons why these State hotels should be disposed of, the Minister also said they were not giving the service they should, or would, give if they were conducted by private enterprise. Among other things he said, "We think that private enterprise can give a much more efficient service than has been given hitherto." There are many people who would join issue with him on that statement.

When I asked, by way of interjection, how the Gwalia State Hotel compared with the privately-conducted hotels at Leonora, he either did not hear me or he ignored my question. For his information I point out that the management of the State hotel at Gwalia is far superior to that of the privately-owned hotels at Leonora. Anybody who has travelled in those parts will know that to be true.

Mr. W. A. Manning: Would the Leonora hotels be a tourist attraction?

MR. MOIR: Unfortunately, the towns of Leonora and Gwalia offer very little in the way of tourist attraction; and I doubt very much whether anyone would journey such a great distance to be attracted to the Leonora hotels.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.5 p.m.

MR. MOIR: As I was saying, before the afternoon tea suspension, the standard of the particular hotel I mentioned is very good by comparison with those in the adjacent town. In my opinion the Minister was most unjust in making the remarks he did about the way these hotels cater for the public. I have been in other centres where there are State hotels, and although there has not been an adjacent hotel from which one could draw a comparison, the standard at those hotels was reasonable; and, by comparison, as good as the standard of hotels in other country towns.

One could quite easily hold the opinion that the standard of all country hotels—and, indeed, quite a lot of city hotels—could be far better than it is. But, from the Minister's remarks, one would get the impression that the accommodation provided at the State hotels, and the manner in which they are conducted, is of a very low order indeed. I know the State hotel at Gwalia very well indeed. I have, for many years past, stayed at that hotel whenever I have been in that district. All

I can say is that the various people who have conducted the hotel have done a very good job indeed; they have been given quite a lot of praise not only from the residents of the district, but also from visitors who have had occasion to stay there from time to time.

The present House Comptroller and his wife were at one time in the position of managing that hotel; and, from the manner in which they do their work here, it will be obvious to members that they would not do other than a good job no matter where they were.

Mr. Perkins: They were not impressed, however, with the overall management of the State Hotels Department.

Mr. MOIR: That may be so. The Minister for Transport may have had that opinion expressed to him, but I cannot say that I have had the same opinion expressed to me. In any case, I do not think the Minister for Transport would be conversant with the position in regard to the State hotels.

Mr. Perkins: I had three of them in my electorate.

Mr. MOIR: That is possible; but the Minister for Transport could have these hotels in his electorate and still not know very much about them. The Minister would be more likely to enjoy a cup of tea than a glass of beer. I know there is a very fine hotel at Bruce Rock which would compare favourably with any of the hotels in other country towns. In recent times I have not stayed there, but some years ago I did; and I found the hotel provided a reasonable service to the people.

The impression which the Chief Secretary is endeavouring to create does not appear to be realistic. It is probably true that a great deal of money could be spent to improve the State hotels; I do not deny that. If one were to look around the country centres, one would see many instances where money could be spent to bring private hotels into first-class condition.

From the Minister's speech, one would gain the impression that it was a socialist venture which brought about the establishment of State hotels; but nothing is further from the truth. Years ago a provision was inserted into the Licensing Act for the holding of a referendum in any district to enable the people to determine whether or not they required a hotel. They could decide by referendum whether a State hotel should be built in the district, or whether a State hotel should be conducted there. In every case where State hotels have been built, the people of the districts concerned requested that to be done.

I refer now to the statutes of Western Australia, 1910-11, which include the Licensing Act. Part V. of the Act refers to local option, and section 77 states—

Except where resolution D of this section has previously been carried, and is in force in a district, the following resolutions shall be submitted to the vote of electors:—

- (a) That the number of licenses existing in the district continue. (Resolution A.)
- (b) That the number of licenses existing in the district be increased. (Resolution B.)
- (c) That the number of licenses existing in the district be reduced. (Resolution C.)
- (d) That no licenses be granted or renewed in the district. (Resolution D.)

Further on in that section the following is stated:—

At the taking of every local option vote the following questions shall be submitted to the electors, namely:

Do you vote that all new publican's general licenses in the district shall be held by the State?

Are you in favour of State management throughout the district?

Section 87 of the Act states—

If at any poll of the electors taken under Part V. of this Act resolution B is carried in any district, and on the question "Do you vote that all new publican's general licenses in the district shall be held by the State?" a majority of the votes given is in the affirmative, the Minister may, with the approval of the Governor, but subject to the provisions of this Act—

- (a) Establish State hotels in the district; and
- (b) Carry on, by his authorised agent in any such State hotel, the trade and business of a person holding a publican's general license;

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: When was that repealed?

Mr. MOIR: It was repealed in 1922. To enlighten the Minister, the Government which in 1922 had hotly contested those sections of the Act and repealed that part of the legislation, was the Mitchell Government. I want to refer to what that gentleman had to say during the debate as to whether the Government should build a State hotel at Dwellingup.

A local option had been conducted at Dwellingup, and evidently there was some apathy on the part of the populace. When the Government subsequently introduced the Bill, it was contended that insufficient

publicity had been given by the Government to the question, because when the referendum was held 44 were in favour and 66 against. The people of the district decided that that was not the true indication, so 600 of them sent in a petition to Parliament requesting that a State hotel be built there. When the debate was taking place another petition was circulated; and it was confidently stated that the signatures would amount to 1,000. The demand was so great that the Government of the day decided, despite the decision of the local option, to introduce a Bill in Parliament to enable a hotel to be built at Dwellingup.

Mr. Mitchell—who later became Sir James Mitchell and the Premier of this State—said on page 497 of the 1911 *Hansard* the following:—

I would just like to say that I believe it would be a good thing for the State if the freehold of every hotel in Western Australia belonged to the Crown. My policy has always been to prevent the building of hotels in any new townships. In this industrial centre I fought against an hotel being established, but, if hotels are to be built in the future, I hope they will be built by the State. I do not care if they are in the metropolitan area or in country towns, or in industrial centres; if hotels are to be built, they should be State-owned.

That is rather a remarkable statement from Mr. Mitchell, who later became Premier. Evidently the pleasantries which were exchanged in those days between members are carried on today, because in reply to an interjection by Mr. Underwood who said, "It is pleasant to know that you have an idea," Mr. Mitchell replied as follows:—

It would be difficult to persuade the House that the honourable member has an idea; he may borrow a few from the *Bulletin* or some other authority he admires, but beyond that he has never shown in this House that he possesses an idea of the smallest description. However, since the Government have decided on establishing a hotel here, I am glad that it will be conducted by the Government.

Mr. Mitchell was emphatic that State hotels should be conducted by the Government.

Mr. Lewis: That was before he saw the light.

Mr. MOIR: Evidently it took him a long time to see the light. Quite a number of members in the Party which sat on the Government benches held the same opinion as Mr. Mitchell, because on the division list I noted the name of Mr. Newton Moore, who subsequently became the Premier of this State; and later, the Agent-General in London.

Mr. Roberts: He represented a good electorate.

Mr. MOIR: There are other names which I do not think it is necessary for me to read at this moment. It is rather interesting to notice that this view was not always held by people who came from industrial towns. The member for Kattanning at that time, Mr. Piesse, had this to say—

I have no opposition to offer to the Government establishing State hotels at certain places provided it had been proved that there is a necessity for their establishment.

Mr. Harper, the then member for Pingelly, said—

I rise to support this measure in so far as it relates to Rottnest.

That was when the debate was taking place as to whether State hotels should be provided at Rottnest and Wongan Hills. Mr. Harper went on to say—

If the Government puts up a substantial building and makes of it a good residential hotel I do not see that any great harm can come of it.

These remarks can be found in vol. 3 of *Hansard* 1912. The Bill was introduced as the result of requests that State hotels be built in those centres. The late Sir James Mitchell—then Mr. Mitchell—said—

I believe every hotel should be State-owned. To that extent I agree with the Premier. I think if hotels are to be opened, they should be built by the State, and I think the income should be taken by the State. I urged previously that the Licensing Act should be amended to make it impossible for licenses to be granted to any private individual in the future.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Do you agree with that?

Mr. MOIR: Mr. Mitchell went much further along the road of Government control than any Labour Government has been prepared to go.

Mr. Roberts: What was the date of those speeches?

Mr. MOIR: They appear in *Hansard* of 1912. It also must be remembered that at that time Mr. Mitchell's Party was in opposition in the House.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You do not agree with that proposition now, do you?

Mr. MOIR: At the moment, I am not giving my opinion; I am simply quoting from *Hansard* to give members the views of the people I have mentioned.

Mr. Hawke: The Minister for Health is not enjoying it.

Mr. MOIR: That is obvious, as I predicted in my opening remarks.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: He is having a great time.

Mr. MOIR: Mr. Mitchell stated that if hotels were to be opened, they should be built by the State, and the income should be taken by the State. He went on further to say—

I urged previously that the Licensing Act should be amended to make it impossible for licenses to be granted to any private individual in the future. I was told that the time was not opportune.

We have heard that word before.

Mr. W. Hegney: We heard it this afternoon from the Minister for Transport.

Mr. MOIR: I think we heard it this afternoon. Evidently, the same attitude prevails today as existed on the 19th November, 1912. It is rather extraordinary that the people in opposition in those days, who would be regarded as ardent Tories, agreed that the State should do these things.

Mr. Lewis: What about Wongan Hills?

Mr. MOIR: It is all the more remarkable when we take notice of what transpires today. The member for Moore just mentioned Wongan Hills. It might interest him if I read an extract from *Hansard*, vol. 2, 1912, dated the 5th September. The extract commences with an interjection by Mr. Monger, who said, "What about an hotel for Wongan Hills?" To this the then Premier replied—

In that case we have a petition signed by every adult resident within three to five miles of the town, urging that we should establish a State hotel there in preference to a private hotel. We provide that if a petition in opposition be lodged by a majority of the adults residing within three miles of where the hotel is to be established, it will prevent a State hotel being established despite the wishes of the Government to do so.

He went on to say—

Let me give an instance of where the Bill will be put into operation. There have been continual applications to the Licensing Bench for an hotel at Wongan Hills, but the people in that district have shown that they are averse to an hotel being established there if it is to be held by a private individual, and they have petitioned to the Government several times urging us to establish a State hotel there. We have given consideration to the matter and we have had a report by the manager of the State Hotels Department, and he urges that an hotel should be established at Wongan Hills, not because it is a good proposition, but because, unless the State establishes one there, the Bench will undoubtedly give a license to some private individual against the wishes of the people in the district.

Is it not rather extraordinary that back in those days the wishes of the people were paramount?

Mr. Lewis: Evidently they have changed their mind there, too.

Mr. MOIR: In reply to that interjection by the member for Moore, I point out that the people of Wongan Hills do not want private enterprise to run the hotel; they want to run it themselves. Therefore, they are still opposed to private enterprise running the hotel.

Mr. Lewis: They are opposed to State hotels, too.

Mr. MOIR: When they desired a State hotel in 1912 they were opposed to an individual getting a license; and the Premier of the day stated, "Unless the State establishes one there, the Bench will undoubtedly give a license to some private individual against the wishes of the people in the district."

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Nearly 50 years ago!

Mr. Hawke: You must have gone to school some time or other.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I did for a while.

Mr. Hawke: Surprising!

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I sometimes doubt whether the Leader of the Opposition did.

Mr. Hawke: Now, now!

Mr. MOIR: If we take into consideration the remarks made by the Minister for Railways last night, when he quoted that Sir James Mitchell was totally opposed to State ownership, the remarks by Mr. Mitchell are rather interesting. This indicates to me that at the time of which the Minister for Railways was speaking, the Liberal Party had become regimented—big business had got hold of it.

Mr. Hawke: The Beaufort Street butcher.

Mr. MOIR: The members of the Party were told then, just as they are today, what they should do.

Mr. Hawke: By the Beaufort Street butcher.

Mr. MOIR: Back in the days of 1910-1911 and 1912, apparently members were able to use their own discretion and were evidently in a position to come to Parliament to do whatever they considered to be in the best interests of the people. Later, we saw where other influences were brought to bear, and these various members were told what they had to do. Then we saw a complete somersault.

So this is all very interesting. The Chief Secretary would have us believe that these hotels were run so badly that they were a frightful encumbrance on the State and the people of the State. Nothing could be further from the truth. Although in his speech the Chief Secretary made some qualification, it does not alter the effect of what he said, which is as follows:—

We feel that private enterprise can give a much more efficient service than has been given hitherto.

He went on to say—

For one reason or another, Government control of business ventures is inept.

That is quite a serious reflection upon the people who have been charged with the responsibility of conducting these businesses, and it is a completely unjust reflection. When we look at the figures in relation to these hotels, we realise that they must have been run reasonably as business propositions; because, far from being encumbrances—as the Chief Secretary tried to convey—and concerns which should be disposed of at the quickest possible moment, we find that they have been very lucrative businesses—very lucrative indeed.

Mr. Fletcher: And thereby hangs a tale!

Mr. MOIR: We can readily understand why this Government desires to dispose of these businesses, with the possible exception of two hotels which are unfortunately situated. Evidently the Government of the day yielded to the pleadings of the people and established a hotel at these two places, and over the years they have not proved business propositions. I refer to the Kwolyin and Bolgart hotels. However, I would say that over many years, they must have been quite a boon to the people in those districts and to the travellers who had occasion to use them.

Apart from those two hotels, the others have paid handsomely and have done so through the years. If they are now in a state of disrepair, there should be plenty of money available from the profits earned by these concerns, to restore them to first-class order.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Why didn't your Government do so?

Mr. MOIR: The hotel at Gwalia was established about 1902. The earliest information I have been able to obtain in regard to this hotel is from *Hansard* vol. XXV. The Honourable S. J. Haynes, a representative of the South-West, had the following to say on the Address-in-reply:—

Another matter referred to in the Speech is the establishment of State hotels. One has been established. So far as State hotels are concerned I am dead against them, and I do not

think the State should touch them. I am dead against the State control of industries generally. I am a true believer in private enterprise.

Mr. Hawke: He should have stopped when he said he was dead.

Mr. MOIR: He continued—

It seems to me that what we have to contend against is what I may term a wave of socialism which is running not only through Western Australia—it is, to a certain extent—but through the other States.

It is indicative of what type of a man he was when we find that he continued—

To my mind the great curse to this State, and also to Australia, consists of two things, one being manhood suffrage, and the other payment of members. I may be charged with conservatism in saying that, but I believe that those two things have been detrimental to Australia.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What year was that?

Mr. MOIR: It was in 1904. Although the figures I have here are of some length, I think they are of sufficient importance for me to read them in order that they may be on record in *Hansard* so that if some question is raised as to whether these hotels are paying propositions, the figures can be referred to.

The Gwalia Hotel from 1903 to 1911 showed a profit of £11,809. With the addition of the Dwellingup Hotel, the profit from 1911 to 1913 was £4,526. I might add that the profit in all these instances is the net profit after overhead, interest, and sinking fund charges had been paid. This is not the case in regard to the figures quoted by the Chief Secretary when he said those charges had not been taken into account.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: When did you get these figures?

Mr. MOIR: Today, with the Minister's kind permission.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: When?

Mr. MOIR: This afternoon. The Minister may remember I asked his permission to obtain these figures from the State Hotels Department.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You did not get them this morning or yesterday?

Mr. Norton: While the bells were ringing this afternoon.

Mr. Hawke: Are they up to date enough for the Chief Secretary?

Mr. MOIR: The next year, the profit from the State Hotels was £4,352. The next year, the Kwolyin and Bruce Rock Hotels were established, and the profit for 1914-15 was £3,070. The Corrigin and Bolgart Hotels were established; and in 1915-16 there was a loss of £270. In 1916-17

there was a profit of £1,180; in 1917-18, £3,821; and in 1918-19, £4,250. The figures for the subsequent years were as follows:—

Year.	Net Profit.
	£
1920	5,889
1921	7,175
1922	8,769
1923	7,502
1924	7,374
1925	7,923
1926	8,293
1927	9,362
1928	12,007
1929	10,634

Then follow the depression years, and the effect will be noted. To continue—

Year.	Net Profit.
	£
1930	8,619
1931	3,166
1932	3,623
1933	3,911
1934	5,310
1935	5,818
1936	7,309
1937	7,969
1938	7,733
1939	6,121
1940	5,193
1941	3,001
1942	166
1943	3,502

I was informed that that was due to a higher excise being brought in at that time. To continue—

Year.	Net Profit.
	£
1944	2,941
1945	2,179
1946	8,309
1947	9,967
1948	8,684
1949	7,242
1950	6,622
1951	6,944
1952	8,295
1953	5,540
1954	4,905
1955	4,979
1956	2,458
1957	1,505
1958	7,843
1959	6,887

Those figures give a total net profit of £285,616.

Mr. Jamieson: Those hotels have paid for themselves 10 times over.

Mr. MOIR: The other night the Chief Secretary mentioned the sinking fund and depreciation having to be taken into account; but I would say that these hotels have paid for themselves many times over.

Mr. Roberts: How much taxation did they pay?

Mr. MOIR: All this money has been paid into Consolidated Revenue and, presumably, has been used in the interests

of the people of this State, in providing other things for them. The Hawke Labour Government believed that if the people of a district wished to take over the State hotel in their area, they should be enabled to do so. It is obvious that the bulk of the profit made from State hotels has been made from local trade, although it is true that a certain amount would come from travellers or visitors to the area.

However, we believe that if the local residents wish to run these hotels and use the proceeds for the benefit of their districts, they should be allowed to do so. I would quote Cunderdin, as an example, where the local people took over the hotel from private enterprise, and have conducted it on a community basis, using the proceeds to provide some wonderful amenities for people of that district.

The hotel at Cunderdin is a credit to the people of that area. It is a very good hotel and is very well run. On an approach being made by representatives of the people of Wongan Hills—among them the late Mr. Ackland, then member for Moore—the State hotel in that centre was made available to be run on community lines by residents of the district. The Hawke Labour Government readily agreed to that proposition.

It is the opinion of the Opposition that the principle I have mentioned should apply to all State hotels; and, if the Government wishes to dispose of them, the people in the areas concerned should be given the first opportunity to purchase them. To that end I have prepared an amendment, which I will place on the notice paper, to be dealt with when the Bill is in Committee; that is, if the Minister will hold the Committee stage over until Tuesday, so as to enable members to become conversant with the amendment. The proposed amendment reads—

Add after subclause (1) of clause 3 the following:—

Provided the Governor shall sell or lease any of the hotels only to a community company until the expiration of eighteen months from the coming into operation of this Act and if within that period a community company makes an offer to purchase or lease an hotel at a satisfactory price, or on satisfactory terms, the Governor shall accept that offer.

A community company means a company formed by residents within the district and registered under the Companies Act, 1943-1954, whose aims and objects shall be to purchase or lease, operate and maintain an hotel within the district for the benefit of that district. Any profits accruing

from such undertaking shall be used to provide and/or maintain any public amenities within that district.

I hope the Government will give serious consideration to my proposal; because I think everyone will agree that it is a laudable suggestion that, if State hotels are to be disposed of, the people of the districts concerned should be enabled to take them over, if they wish to do so.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [4.47]: I am not keen on the idea of the State losing control over the State hotels because, for many reasons—among them those mentioned by the member for Boulder—I feel that these hotels have served a useful purpose in the community over the years. The schedule to the Bill makes reference only to a certain number of hotels; and does not refer to that at Medina. At Medina there is what is in effect a State hotel, although it has only a bar trade at present. What is the intention of the Government in regard to that hotel?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: No decision has yet been made.

Mr. JAMIESON: I think that hotel is and always will be a lucrative source of revenue; and that the Government should be prepared to retain it, even if it leases or sells the other State hotels. I make that suggestion to the Government because the hotel at Medina has been built and maintained by the State and, while it remains in the hands of the Government, any profit accruing from it will go to the Government.

The Kwinana area has been an extremely expensive project for the taxpayers of this State. No doubt it will pay for itself in years to come; but in the meantime there will always be something cropping up in that area which requires financing; and for that reason I think this source of revenue should be retained. I oppose, in principle, the proposition which the Government has put forward in this Bill.

MR. HAWKE (Northam) [4.50]: Unless the Minister in his reply to the second reading debate on the Bill gives an assurance of the willingness of the Government to accept in principle the amendment foreshadowed by the member for Boulder, I would certainly vote against the second reading. The member for Boulder has pointed out the history of the establishment of these hotels. He clearly showed that in the majority of instances, if not in every instance, the hotels were established by the State at the special request and wish of the local people concerned.

From my own particular point of view, which is one mainly concerned with social welfare, I would much prefer to see the State continue to run these hotels as against their being handed over to private companies or private individuals, thereafter to be run by them. However, should

the Government indicate a willingness to make these hotels available to local co-operative community organisations, I would support such a move. I think there would be no argument at all in favour of selling hotels to private individuals or companies as against making them available to local community co-operatives.

Obviously a local co-operative would run a hotel in its particular district along the best possible lines; it would run the hotel on the most respectable basis possible; it would give to the customers of the hotel the best possible value for their money, and would employ the most reputable trading methods possible. In every way it would conduct the hotels in a satisfactory fashion; and that, in my opinion, is very important.

However, in addition—and quite as important—all of the profits accruing from the running of the hotels by a local community would be used to benefit the particular town and district, and therefore would benefit the local community in many ways. If we are frank and honest, we must all admit that hotel trading does a considerable amount of harm in any community. If we do not admit that, we are deliberately shutting our eyes to things which are obvious.

So it is in every way desirable—and particularly from the angle of the social welfare of the community—that these hotels, if they are to pass from the ownership and management of the State, should pass to the ownership and management of local communities which would be organised on a co-operative basis to own and carry on the operation of the hotels with which we are concerned.

The member for Boulder was good enough to mention the community hotel at Cunderdin, and to pay a compliment to all of those who have been associated with its ownership and operation on a community basis. As you, Mr. Speaker, would know, the town of Cunderdin is in my electorate. I was associated at the beginning with the move by the local community to take over this hotel; and every word which the member for Boulder said in praise of the efforts and results which have come from it is thoroughly justified.

I do not know how many members of this House have had the opportunity to visit Cunderdin in recent times, and have a look around the town. Those who have been able to do so have been fortunate, and doubtless would have been favourably impressed by the wonderful community assets and advantages which have been created there in recent years. I am not saying for one moment that all of these things have been financed out of the profits of the community hotel. But a considerable amount of money from these profits have been made available to assist in the establishment of these wonderful

community facilities; and they are indeed a great credit to the people of the town and district, and of great benefit to them.

Therefore, in my judgment, Parliament has a wonderful opportunity to do the right thing in this instance. To that extent, provided the Government agrees with our point of view, we would compliment it on having created a situation out of which great good would flow in the future. However, if the Government sticks to this Bill as it has been introduced, it could easily do a great deal of harm. I say that because where the State at present conducts these hotels—and conducts all of them on a reputable standard and on as clean a basis as it is possible to conduct a hotel, especially on the side of selling beer, spirits, and so on—there could be no guarantee, once these hotels were sold to private companies or individuals, that the same reputable standards would be consistently maintained in the future.

I make a special appeal to the Ministers of the Government, and to their supporters in this House, to give careful consideration to the points of view which we are putting forward. I would not think that many members on the Government side, if any, would prefer to see the State-owned hotels sold to and owned in future by private companies or individuals as against making them available to local community co-operatives. I am satisfied that if the amendment which the member for Boulder has foreshadowed does find a place in the Act as finally passed by Parliament, the local communities concerned will thereby be given great encouragement and incentive to get moving for the purpose of working on a basis which will enable them to take over these hotels and operate them in the future for their own benefit, and the benefit of everybody who lives in the particular localities concerned.

This has a very great amount of merit. It could not only lead to a great increase in the number of community assets and facilities, and the expansion of those which already exist, but it could also develop a more lively standard of citizenship in the areas which are concerned in this Bill.

I am as convinced as it is possible for anybody to be that the community at Wongan Hills, which has recently taken over the local State-owned hotel, will, as a result of that action, benefit considerably. Wongan Hills is already a progressive township; and from the substantial profits which will accrue to the community by its ownership of this hotel, we will certainly see practical evidence of the growth of communal assets at that centre in the future.

Instead of the Government rushing ahead to sell these hotels to Bill Smith, Jones, the Swan Brewery, or someone else, the local communities should have the first opportunity to purchase them. If we put

in the Bill a provision that these communities—provided they organise on a co-operative basis—shall have the first opportunity to purchase the hotels, I think we will be doing the right thing in the true sense of the word, because we will be safeguarding the social welfare of the community of the centres in which the hotels are located; we will be giving the local people the opportunity to ensure that the hotels are operated on the best possible lines in every way; we will be giving them the opportunity to use local money obtained from the hotels which produce substantial profit from year to year; and we will be giving them the chance to make certain that this money will be used to establish those community assets which play such an important part in every town and district.

If, after the Bill has gone through Committee, there is no provision in it to give local communities a prior right to take over the hotels and to manage them, I will not have anything to do with giving the Bill further support. That would be a retrograde step because the Bill would accomplish, when it became an Act, only a change of ownership from the State to private interests. After all is said and done, the main incentive for a private individual to conduct a hotel is to make as much money as possible out of it.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Through giving service.

Mr. HAWKE: Yes, through giving services; but most of us know what can be done in the management of a hotel to get more profit out of it than might be available otherwise. However, I do not desire to go into details in that regard because I am sure every member of the House knows something of that aspect.

Finally, I appeal to Ministers of the Government to realise that here is an opportunity for them to do something really helpful, in a practical way, for local communities; provided they agree to give those communities a prior right to acquire these hotels—for a period of 18 months or two years—as against private interests. I think the people of each community would require a reasonable time to discuss the question and to decide whether they would or would not take over the State hotel in their district. Such a question cannot be decided in a week or a month by a local community.

If a check were made on how long it took the community of Wongan Hills, from the time the idea was first developed to the time the people authorised its committee to agree to purchase the hotel, it would be found that it was a period of 12 months or more. Therefore, the period of 18 months, mentioned by the member for Boulder in his foreshadowed amendment, would appear to be quite reasonable. However, the question of the period could be the subject of detailed discussion when

the Bill is in Committee; and I hope that all members will be able to agree that the local community should have the first opportunity; and should have a reasonable period of time, from the date the Act is passed, to make up its mind on whether it will take over the State hotel in its own centre and run it for the community on a co-operative basis.

I sincerely hope the Minister will be able to give me the assurance that I seek when he replies to the debate; that assurance being that he and his colleagues will agree to include in the Bill, when the House goes into Committee, the principle of giving local communities the first opportunity to obtain the ownership of these State hotels.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Chief Secretary—in reply) [5.7]: There have been several interesting speeches on this measure. The member for Boulder quoted a good many figures which he said represented the profits of individual hotels over a number of years. He said the figures referred to net profit.

Mr. Moir: No; net surpluses.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The words that the honourable member used were, "net profit." When I introduced the Bill, I gave the figures for the last three financial years for the six State hotels, and I made the point that the figures I quoted were not the profit figures but trading surplus figures. It will be found that the figures that the member for Boulder gave referred to trading surpluses. There is a great deal of difference between the two. The point is that no consideration has been given to depreciation, interest on capital, head office charges, head office expenses—

Mr. Moir: That is completely wrong; I made that quite clear!

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: —and the like.

Mr. Moir: The figures that I quoted related to a period long after that. That is what the accountant informed me.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: When was this?

Mr. Moir: This afternoon.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: These figures have no relationship whatsoever to the small capital improvements that have been made to these buildings.

Mr. Moir: I think you need to consult the accountant.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: They have no relationship to repairs and maintenance charges at all. These are facts that were given to me by the same organisation.

Mr. Moir: When?

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: When I had these figures prepared.

Mr. Moir: When was that?

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: In the last two weeks.

Mr. Moir: I am referring to the information I got at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I cannot see how these items could change in such a short time. I submit that the profits are not half as lucrative as the figures make them out to be.

I am quite prepared to admit there has been a return from the State hotels. I submit, however, that it is not the State's business to engage in these trading ventures; and therein lies the great difference between the political thought of those of us who sit on this side of the House and those who sit on the other side of the House. We believe they are ventures that can be better engaged in by private enterprise, and that the State should not intrude. That is the marked difference between our respective schools of political thought; it is the main difference.

On many counts we stand on common ground. There is much common ground, I believe, for the two Parties; but this issue of private enterprise or State control is the one thing that marks the difference between the two Parties; and it was on this point that the present Government was elected to power.

Mr. Jamieson: Rubbish!

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The fact remains that we happen to be on this side of the House, and we went to the people on the issue I have mentioned.

Mr. Jamieson: It has nothing to do with the issue.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It has. The member for Beeloo is a socialist and I am a private-enterprise man.

Mr. Hawke: I think you can leave out the word "enterprise."

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I do not think the member for Beeloo would deny that he is a socialist.

Mr. Jamieson: No.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The member for Beeloo's Party should not be called the Labor Party but the Socialist Party.

Mr. Jamieson: That would not do any harm, either.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Why does not the honourable member's Party follow the example of its confreres in England?

Mr. W. Hegney: We do not have to change our name every few years. The Liberal Party changes its name more often than a leopard does its spots.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I will now return to the reason for the disposal of State hotels. Firstly, it was the expressed intention of the Government, if elected, to dispose of these hotels. It is the policy of the Government because we believe that Governments cannot efficiently manage

private-enterprise businesses—trading ventures. We believe that the control is so remote from the actual business as to make the method of business unworkable.

Mr. Moir: Why do not you take over the State Electricity Commission?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: In these Government trading ventures the Government itself ties up the management so much that it cannot effectively and efficiently manage its own business.

Mr. Hawke: Piffle!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I think one might have regard to that in the matter of State hotels themselves. On the one hand, the Leader of the Opposition suggests it is not correct; on the other, I suggest it is. The trading surpluses of the State hotels have been paid into the Consolidated Revenue of the Government, and all the expenses—maintenance and repairs—appertaining to these hotels have had to be paid from the Treasury; they have not had the opportunity to properly manage their own business; they have not been able to work out a basis for proper and efficient management. For those reasons the Government should not have the task of managing business ventures.

Mr. Lawrence: You will be selling the railways next.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: We believe the Government should not intrude into these fields. Some speakers mentioned there was a doubt about these hotels and their management being changed. As I pointed out, the Hawke Government decided to get rid of the State hotels; and that, despite opposition from Trades Hall.

Mr. Hawke: To local communities.

Mr. Jamieson: You always forget that.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I am not likely to forget it if the member for Beeloo continues to remind me. The member for Boulder spent a great deal of his time—probably 80 per cent.—in delving into dusty tomes and quoting words from long ago. He went back 40 or 50 years and quoted the speeches of members at that time. He made great play on the fact that Sir James Mitchell said he was not in favour of hotels being run by private people; that the State should have control of them. The simple fact is that at the present time we do not believe in that at all. We believe that the State has no right to manage hotels.

Mr. Hawke: Sir James Mitchell did not believe that either; he believed the State should own them.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: That is so. If we pose the question: "Why does the Opposition oppose the sale of these hotels to private enterprise?", the answer we get is—as the Leader of the Opposition said he believes—that these hotels are best run by

the State. We believe otherwise. We believe that individuals should have the right to conduct these businesses. It is not the function of the Government to engage in these trading ventures. If it were the right of the Government to do so, it might as well engage in other businesses—for example in the butchering business and the baking business. Why do we not nationalise the wheat industry, the wheat farms, and the sheep farms?

Mr. Brady: The wheat farmers run their own community.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: If the manifold blessings which it is alleged are derived from community hotels were drawn from community wheat farms we can imagine the enormous profit that would accrue! If the claims of members opposite were put into effect this type of business might be used to improve amenities in country wheatbelt towns. The same principle applies.

Mr. Oldfield: Don't you agree that the wheatgrower is socialised?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: To revert for a moment to the difference of thought between members on the Opposition benches and those on the Government side: In short, the Opposition does not believe in private enterprise handling business ventures of this sort, or of a great number of sorts.

Mr. Jamieson: That is a mis-statement.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Labor Party does not like private enterprise at all; it embraces, completely, the principles of socialism.

Mr. Hawke: More piffle!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The whole trend of Labour politics in recent times has been to try to gobble up private enterprise.

Mr. Hawke: The Minister for Piffle.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The people of the State realised this fact prior to the last election.

Mr. Hawke: I bet this Minister looks under his bed each night before he sleeps.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The way in which the Leader of the Opposition acts makes him out to be a very childish member of Parliament.

Mr. Hawke: More piffle.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: He gets so small at times as to make himself infinitesimal.

Mr. Hawke: More piffle again.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The Hawke Government, by its policy of expanding State trading concerns prior to the last election, condemned itself in the eyes of the people. As a result, it experienced a severe loss.

Mr. Hawke: Which ones did we expand?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The State Building Supplies. The honourable member's Government built up the day-labour force to an enormous extent.

The SPEAKER: The Minister should relate his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: You, Mr. Speaker, permitted members opposite to make remarks which led me to reply.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will resume his seat. He should not cast a reflection on the Chair. He will apologise.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: I must apologise for having spoken in that tone. I am afraid I was led to making those remarks by the manner in which you allowed members opposite to speak in a similar frame of mind on occasions.

The member for Boulder has outlined an amendment which he proposes to move. Before resuming my seat, I must say that I cannot agree to it. The debate on his amendment might take place at a subsequent time. It is too restrictive and will only hold up proceedings. Giving the community concerned the first opportunity to buy the hotel would result in a much lower price being obtained for it than the price which would be obtained by tender. That was the position in regard to the Wongan Hills Hotel, where the purchase price was £40,000. It is believed that upwards of £70,000 could have been obtained for it.

Mr. Hawke: What a miserable outlook! The welfare of the community does not mean a thing to you.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: We on this side believe that under private enterprise the public get a better deal. We also believe that under a socialistic form of Government the public get a very bad deal, and do not get a proper service. The public are not efficiently served at all.

Mr. Hawke: You are just ranting.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: If we are to agree in principle to any of these concerns going to the community, then we might as well agree in principle to any trading ventures being offered to the community. That is the line taken by the socialist Government, which is trying to intrude further and further into the field of private enterprise. It does that very cleverly. The member for Beeloo referred to Medina; and, by interjection, I told him that was not being considered at all at this stage.

Mr. W. Hegney: What about Yanchep?

Mr. Lawrence: Do you want to sell the farmers' co-operative as well?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The member for Mt. Hawthorn mentioned Cave House. Final consideration has not been given

to what will be done in that respect. The honourable member ought to know what is happening in regard to Yanchep. I make one final point.

Mr. W. Hegney: You have not made any yet.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: There is the clown of the Opposition on the front bench. I wonder who prompted him this time. Did someone touch him on the shoulder?

Mr. Jamieson: See that nobody touches you on the shoulder.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: The honourable member had better not try. A great deal of play has been made on trading ventures being passed over to community interests, with a view to the community being able to use the profits for amenities and such like. Various places have been named in which that has been done. What is not commonly realised, when discussions of this sort are raised, is that private enterprise pays for the amenities, and pays quite heavily, through taxation, into revenue in very many ways.

The more times that private enterprise is absorbed into a socialistic structure the more is taxation cut down and the more will the benefits to the people be reduced. I suggest that this principle of the sale of State hotels to private enterprise is one which marks, and marks very definitely, the division of opinion and political philosophy between the Opposition, which holds its outmoded tenets, and Government members supporting private enterprise.

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

Ayes—20.

Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Court	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. O'Neill
Dr. Henn	Mr. Owen
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Mann	Mr. Wild
Sir Ross McLarty	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller.)

Noes—18.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Moir
Mr. Hall	Mr. Norton
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Watts	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Bovell	Mr. Evans
Mr. Burt	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Craig	Mr. Graham

Majority for—2.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Roberts) in the Chair; Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Chief Secretary) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Progress reported.

MOTOR VEHICLE (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) ACT AND TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENTS BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 8th September.

MR. BRADY (Guildford-Midland) [5.34]: In the main, I feel that there can be no objection by members to the amendments contained in this Bill, with the exception of those relating to penalties. The measure provides that a person shall be absolved from being prosecuted twice for virtually the same offence; once under the Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act and once under the Traffic Act. The way these two Acts are framed at the moment, that could be the case. A person could be prosecuted for not having third party insurance, and could also be prosecuted for not having licensed his vehicle under the Traffic Act.

I do not think that was ever intended; and this amendment will get over the difficulty. Therefore, if a person is prosecuted under one Act, he will not be subsequently prosecuted under the other. To that extent, I support the amendments as proposed in the Bill.

The only matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the House is that under the Traffic Act the maximum fine for a first offence is £20; and for a second offence, I think, £50. Under the amending Bill the fine for a first offence will be stepped up to £100; and for a second offence, to £200.

If it were not for the fact that third party insurance is tied up with this measure, I would strenuously oppose the idea of penalties being increased to that extent in regard to any person who may be prosecuted for a breach of the Traffic Act. As everyone knows, in order to get third party insurance, one has to license one's vehicle; and I would be the last one in the world to encourage people to drive their vehicles without being covered by third party insurance.

If, under those circumstances, a person were maimed for life, there would be no chance of his being compensated; or, if he were killed, of his dependants being compensated. I feel I should draw the attention of the House to the fact that in future, if one is caught for not having a traffic license for his vehicle—which is virtually third party insurance—he will be prosecuted and probably fined £100 for a first offence and £200 for a second offence.

To some extent, a person who deliberately puts himself out not to license his vehicle deserves to be prosecuted and fined £100; but the anomaly is that some people may forget to renew their licenses. That is most important, because it is not unusual for busy businessmen, professional men, or working people to omit to renew their licenses. If they did so, they could, under this measure, be fined £100; and I am not sure whether that is desirable. I feel that should not be the case.

Apart from bringing this aspect of the Bill to the notice of members, I am prepared to support it in so far as it absolves a person from being prosecuted twice for the same offence.

MR. PERKINS (Roe—Minister for Transport—in reply) [5.40]: I would like to make one comment. I feel the member for Guildford-Midland has made a fair appraisal of the Bill. I would like to point out that it is most unlikely that the maximum penalty would be imposed by any court unless the offence was an extremely aggravated one. These are maximum penalties provided for in the Bill, and I believe we can rely on the discretion of the court to make sure that no penalty is imposed out of line with the offence that has been committed. I wish to thank the member for Guildford-Midland for his fair comment on the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

STATE ELECTRICITY COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 27th August.

MR. TONKIN (Melville) [5.43]: As far as I can judge—not having given close consideration to this Bill, as the Leader of the Opposition intends to discuss the matter—the idea is that an addition shall be made to the commission so that another country representative shall be included. It is only a comparatively short time ago that the personnel of the committee was increased by two. This made it much larger than was originally intended. These two extra members provided, firstly, for a representative of the manufacturers in the metropolitan area; and, secondly, for an additional representative of consumers, nominated by the State executive of the A.L.P.

Personally, I do not see the necessity for enlarging the commission in this way. I have heard arguments from time to time against the appointment of large

commissions and boards. I recall the argument raised by the present Government, when in Opposition, in connection with the Swan River Conservation Board. I must admit that although I attempted to deal with those questions which were raised, and opposed the point of view expressed, I was not completely happy with the fact that the board was somewhat larger than I would have liked it to be. However, I could not see—in view of the basic principle I had in mind—how I could avoid that situation.

Nevertheless, where it is possible to restrict the number of members of commissions or boards, I think it is most desirable to do so; and I personally cannot see that any great advantage is going to accrue in any way from the amendment which is proposed; because the present member on the board, representing the country districts (Mr. Low), is a particularly good member. He is most assiduous and efficient, and always gives the greatest consideration to the requirements of country districts.

I cannot see that there would be any special problem which could arise in the farming areas—the wheatbelt, for example—which would differ in any material way from the problems of the South-West. As I see it, it is a question of what is desirable in the metropolitan area and what is desirable in the country districts, and whether the conditions are identical. I fail to see that there would be very much difference between the wheatbelt and the South-West; because, after all, it is a question of the length and type of extensions that are to be carried out; the people who are going to be given an opportunity of having the current supplied to them; and the conditions under which they live. Unless I can be given some substantial reason why these additions should be made, then I will not be particularly happy about the Bill. The Leader of the Opposition is now here to undertake the task for which he has prepared himself. I will give way to him.

MR. HAWKE (Northam) [5.47]: We seem to be getting plenty of Bills this session dealing with boards and commissions and similar organisations. I take my mind back to the last Parliament, and the one before that; and I remember that whenever our Government introduced a Bill to deal in any shape or form with a board or commission, we were usually met with a salvo of strong opposition from the present Premier, the present Minister for Railways, and the present Minister for Works. I cannot apply the same criticism to the present Country Party Ministers; because they, on nearly every occasion, were in favour of boards and commissions, as long as the boards or commissions in question had something to do with the products which were produced on or from the land.

The State Electricity Commission is a very big commission already, in point of numbers. I think it is probably the biggest commission, numerically, that we have in Western Australia. Why the Government would want to add to the present number, I cannot imagine!

The Minister put up no case at all in favour of the addition to the commission. In fact, if I had not already been convinced that there was no justification for this Bill, the Minister's speech would have convinced me. Among other things, he said that when the request first came under his notice, he did not think it was justified, and said so. Then he went on to say that further and repeated representations were made to him in the matter; and finally he gave way, or could see some merit in the representations that were being made to him.

I would like to know who made those representations or requests to the Minister or the Government. It would be interesting to know. We have not been told who made them; and I guess we will not be told. We probably will not be told because, I imagine, the request was made by next to nobody. It may have been made by one road board, or one organisation; or perhaps even by a few individuals; or by only one individual who might hope that, if the Bill became law, he would become the additional member of the commission.

The State Electricity Commission has done a splendid job over the years. It has administered the affairs of the department in a progressive and satisfactory way; and its activities, in regard to the generation and distribution of power, have gone ahead in a wonderful manner; and have been acceptable to the consumers generally. The price of current has been kept down remarkably well; but now we are asked to muck around, by increasing the number of commissioners. Surely no one could think that would help the affairs of the commission.

Once we start giving additional representation to this or that section of the community, we will find other sections, already represented on the commission, seeking further representation. We could easily find organisations, which at present are not represented at all, demanding representation on the commission. I think the Government would be well advised to drop the Bill altogether, because it has no merit; and it seems to me that it has been introduced to satisfy one organisation or possibly one individual.

It might be that the measure has been introduced at the request of one individual, who might feel that his standing in the community would be raised if he were to become a commissioner on the State Electricity Commission. There cannot possibly be any argument in favour

of this Bill; and I can hardly believe that the Minister was finally convinced about the desirability of introducing it. I am sure that his first reaction, on being approached and having the request placed before him, was the right one; because he said he could then see no justification at all for the granting of the request.

Surely a State Electricity Commission of eight members is sufficient! If we increase the number to nine, we will then be asked to make it 10; and, eventually, the commission could become so large in numbers as to be cumbersome; and, instead of being a very efficient and progressive organisation, it could become one which would simply drift into the doldrums. I oppose the Bill.

On motion by Mr. I. W. Manning, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 15th September, 1959

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :	
Road transport, subsidies for North-West industries	1551
Crown land, Elleker-Denmark district	1551
Canning district police station, commencement and site	1552
Roads in the south, expenditure and details of improvements	1552
BILLS :	
Town Planning and Development Act Amendment—	
Deputy President's ruling	1552
Order discharged	1580
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, returned	1560
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act and Traffic Act Amendments, returned	1560
Filled Milk, 3r.	1560
Fire Brigades Act Amendment, 3r.	1560
Railways Classification Board Act Amendment, 3r.	1560
Main Roads Act (Funds Appropriation) Act Amendment, 2r.	1560
Tourist, 2r.	1561
Motor Vehicle (Third Party Insurance) Act Amendment—	
2r.	1563
Com., report	1569
Nurses Registration Act Amendment, Com.	1569
Health Act Amendment—	
2r.	1571
Com., report	1574
Land Agents Act Amendment, 2r.	1574
Industry (Advances) Act Amendment—	
2r.	1576
Com.	1579
Report	1580

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (the Hon. W. R. Hall) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

ROAD TRANSPORT

Subsidies for North-West Industries

1. The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Mines:

Which industries located in the North-West received road transport subsidies until payment of these subsidies was terminated prior to the 17th March, 1959?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

During the years 1942 to 1947 the Transport Board subsidised the road transport of bananas, beans, and tomatoes from Carnarvon to Geraldton. This is the only occasion upon which road transport subsidies have been paid by the board in respect of North-West transport.

CROWN LAND

Elleker-Denmark District

2. The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Mines:
 - (1) Is it a fact that the Government intends to make available for selection, Crown land in the Elleker-Denmark district as a pretext to restore train services on that section of railway?
 - (2) If the land is to be opened for settlement, what is—
 - (a) the total area involved;
 - (b) its exact location;
 - (c) the number of farms to be established within the project;
 - (d) the nature of produce envisaged;
 - (e) the type of land settlement scheme proposed?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) No. However, Crown land between Elleker and Denmark, northwards from the main road, is being planned and surveyed for settlement.
- (2) (a) Approximately 60,000 acres.
- (b) Mount Barker-Marbellup-Hay River.
- (c) 100.
- (d) Fat stock and dairying principally.
- (e) Conditional purchase.