

year the club received £117 as its proportion of the tax; this year under the estimated proportion of the new formula, it is proposed that the club shall receive £1,609. The Government paid the Ashburton club £19 last year, and this year we expect to pay it £169. The Moora club last year received £21, and this year it is proposed to pay it £193. These clubs hold one race meeting a year; and in spite of its wealth, the Moora club would be happy to receive £193 this year.

The Northampton club last year received £36, and this year it is proposed to pay it £337. Last year the Northam racing club received £212, and it is proposed to pay it £1,926 this year. The Pinjarra club received £190 last year, and this year it will receive £1,728. The Port Hedland club received £45 last year, and this year it is anticipated £412 will be paid to that club. The Kalgoorlie-Boulder club last year received £385, and this year it is proposed to pay £3,495 to that club. The Bunbury club last year received £392, and this year it is anticipated £3,562 will be paid to that club. So it goes on throughout the racing and trotting clubs in the country.

The Pinjarra trotting club last year received £156 and this year it is anticipated £1,149 will be paid. I mention these figures, and those relating to the payments made in the other States, to indicate that, under the legislation in Western Australia, 75 per cent. of the investment tax is to be returned to the clubs in order to give them some assistance to solve the problems they face as a result of the falling off in attendances—a factor which they contend has resulted from the licensing of off-course betting shops in the metropolitan area and the country towns.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 12.55 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 12th November, 1959

CONTENTS

ASSENT TO BILLS	Page
3015	
MOTION :	
Petrol stations, restriction on building	3046
NARROWS BRIDGE OPENING :	
Invitations, personal explanations	3038
RESOLUTION :	
State forests, to revoke dedication	3040
BILLS :	
Marriage Act Amendment Bill, assent	3015
Main Roads Act Amendment Bill, assent	3015
Companies Act Amendment Bill, assent	3015

CONTENTS—continued

BILLS—continued	Page
Katanning Electric Lighting and Power Repeal Bill, assent	3015
Supply Bill (No. 2), £19,000,000, assent	3015
State Hotels (Disposal) Bill, assent	3015
Argentine Ant Bill, assent	3015
Oil Refinery Industry (Anglo-Iranian Oil Company Limited) Act Amendment Bill, assent	3015
State Housing Act Amendment Bill, assent	3015
Hire-Purchase Bill, report, 3r.	3015
Licensing Act Amendment Bill, 2r.	3016
Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Bill, 2r.	3027
Entertainments Tax Act Amendment Bill, Assembly's amendment	3033
Betting Control Act Amendment Bill, 1r.	3034
Metropolitan Region Improvement Tax Bill, 2r.	3034
Bookmakers Betting Tax Act Amendment Bill, 1r.	3041
State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment Bill, 2r.	3041
Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 3)—Further recom.	3044
Report, 3r.	3045
Road Districts Act Amendment Bill (No. 2), Com., report, 3r.	3045
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment Bill (No. 2), Com., report, 3r.	3046
Builders' Registration Act Amendment Bill, 2r.	3046

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

BILLS (9)—ASSENT

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1. Marriage Act Amendment Bill.
2. Main Roads Act Amendment Bill.
3. Companies Act Amendment Bill.
4. Katanning Electric Lighting and Power Repeal Bill.
5. Supply Bill (No. 2), £19,000,000.
6. State Hotels (Disposal) Bill.
7. Argentine Ant Bill.
8. Oil Refinery Industry (Anglo-Iranian Oil Company Limited) Act Amendment Bill.
9. State Housing Act Amendment Bill.

HIRE-PURCHASE BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the previous day.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [2.35]: The licensing Bill looks to be the occasion for just about as many words being said both inside and outside Parliament as when the Act was introduced. Yet in the main I feel that even the amendments that have been brought down, and the points which have been discussed are purely minor matters.

We have had a terrific amount of debate on the question of whether hotels should open at 9 o'clock in the morning and close at 9 o'clock at night; or whether the hours should be from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m., or from 11 a.m. to 11 p.m.; and on all sorts of details of a similar nature. It is naturally thought that there would be a considerable amount of conflict with regard to the times at which hotels should be open or closed for the simple reason that there are very few towns which have exactly the same conditions. Indeed, within the one town we can often find hotels which operate under different conditions. For example, take a port town. There may be one hotel in a residential suburb of the town, and it would probably do no business prior to midday—the bulk of the business would be done late in the afternoon. In the same town there could be a hotel situated near the harbour, and there would be considerable demands made on that hotel's services from 9 o'clock in the morning. Indeed, the demand could be made as early as 8 o'clock.

Whether or not it is desirable that people should drink beer at 8 o'clock in the morning is quite beside the point. If we are going to license hotels and allow beer to be served, then if people want it badly enough, they will buy it and drink it at home. In any case it was not so long ago when beer and cheese were considered, in England, a perfectly wholesome breakfast for children; in many institutions it was the standard breakfast served.

Members can see from the illustration I have given of two hotels in the one town, that it is quite possible to get a wide variation in the demand for hours, even within the one town. So it is understandable that the people who represent a dormitory suburb should be more interested in hours that range from 11 o'clock in the morning until 11 o'clock at night, whereas a member representing an industrial suburb, in which the people work but do not necessarily sleep, would be far more interested in seeing that the hotels were open between the hours of, say, 8 a.m. and 8 p.m.

Particularly if it happens to be an area in which there is a considerable number of shift workers, and men might be knocking off duty at 8 o'clock in the morning; in other words, their day is virtually the reverse to the normal; they are going for their after-work meal at 8 or 9 o'clock in the morning.

There has been, and we heard an indication of it yesterday, a considerable amount of talk in regard to the way in which the later opening of hotels will aggravate the evils of alcohol. In this Chamber there is a considerable number of men who have knocked around quite a lot, and who have not led protected lives—some by virtue of the activities they followed as younger men, and some because they went through one or, perhaps, two wars. A person who has had any experience of that nature knows full well that laws relating to age, hours, or anything else will not stop a determined person from getting alcoholic liquor if he has a craving for it.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Even in the dry states of America.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes, even in the United States of America. We could instance narcotics, which are even more difficult to obtain, the control of which is rigorously enforced, and the penalties for the supply of which are very much more severe. The people who are addicted to narcotics get them just the same. If consideration is to be given to the person who is unfortunate enough to suffer from the trouble known as alcoholism, it would be infinitely preferable to make sure that good liquor was available 24 hours a day. I think the greatest lesson we learnt from prohibition was that if a man cannot get good liquor he will drink bad liquor.

I think most of us who have had some experience of the war's privations, and who were cut off from all forms of alcoholic liquor or anything of that nature, found that among every group there were some who would drink anything remotely resembling an alcoholic beverage.

I suppose everybody has heard stories of those beverages which had a conglomeration of names—jungle juice, and so on. Some of those beverages were methylated spirits and boot polish, or a dash of torpedo juice and other ingredients that go to make up the worst type of liquor. I would say that there were very few camps in which some efforts were not made by different persons to manufacture an alcoholic liquor. The worst experience we had, in the camp of which I was an inmate, was when they used an extract from a grass known as lallang. The juice of the grass had a very excellent effect on those persons who were starting to lose their sight; but some bright boy discovered that the residue, together with some sugar, caused a fermentation and produced quite a good spirit after being distilled.

It had a variety of uses; one could fill a cigarette lighter with it and it worked satisfactorily, and one could add coconut milk and it made a reasonable cocktail. The only drawback, of course, was that it had a high wood alcohol content, and anybody who drank much of it was in real trouble.

I think the same sort of problems were in evidence during the American experiment in prohibition, when their mental institutions, homes for the blind and the like were filled to overflowing, and became a serious burden upon the people. The main cause was the bad quality beverages which were being drunk. I believe that any person who has drunk alcoholic liquor—and, with all due respect, I think only those who have done so, have the right to speak—knows full well that good liquor has a far less harmful effect than cheap, bad liquor. The general term given to the cheap rarer types of wine is “plonk”, or “round the world for sixpence,” or “see the world for a bob,” and that sort of thing.

The Hon. J. J. Garrigan: “Bombo.”

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: All those derogatory terms are given to the cheap, rarer spirits; and the moment we restrict—sufficiently restrict—the legitimate trade of reputable hotels or saloons there is, automatically, a rapid upsurge in the consumption of sly grog, or the sale of illicit liquor.

Because the cheaper, rarer types of spirits are easier to obtain, and show a bigger profit margin for the type of human scum which engages in that type of activity, there is an increase in its consumption when we make it more difficult for people to obtain decent liquor. But when we consider the licensing hours set out in this measure, we must consider those types of people who use the various establishments where one can purchase liquid refreshment, and the hours which suit them.

After considerable discussion with a number of men interested in running hotels, it is my understanding of the position that the person who keeps the hotel industry going is the wages employee—the manual worker—who has his pound or 30s. a week to spend on beer because of the social atmosphere that he gets from drinking at his favourite hotel—the friendly talks and the game of darts that he can have. I thought the hours originally set out in the Bill for a publican's general license, of 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. in the winter and 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. in the summer, were good for that type of drinker, who is the backbone of the hotel trade. In the winter time he is home by half past eight. But in a lot of the discussion that has taken place on this measure, it has been forgotten that once the Bill becomes law

—and I sincerely hope it does—people will be able to obtain liquor at a restaurant up to midnight so long as supper or a meal is served.

Therefore the hotel hours become a matter of convenience to the public who generally use them. We must consider these hours bearing in mind the places in which we can now purchase liquid refreshments. I know that a number of people say that liquor is evil; that we should not have it. On the other hand we hear people say that whisky is all right but that brandy is not. They get down to such fine distinctions as between one type of liquor and another. Some even say that beer is good but that brandy is a terrible drink. I have never been able to imagine how a completely inanimate substance which is placed in a bottle is able to stand up and force a man to drink it! That is beyond me. Alcoholic liquor is very refreshing.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: It all depends on your palate.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That is so; and whether one becomes a slave to it is of course one's own affair. It is up to the individual to overcome the temptation presented in exactly the same way as it is for a child or anybody else to stop biting its finger nails or indulging in similar weak habits. In any matter relative to licensing, the sum and substance is the authority that controls the licences. That relates to this Bill, and to any other measure that might be brought down.

In short, the sum and substance of any Bill of this nature should be the Licensing Court. I have no intention of offering an amendment to this measure, because I consider its provisions to be a worth-while improvement. I would like to see it go on to the statute book. I do, however, intend to offer one or two suggestions which I hope might provoke some thought, and which might constitute the substance of a later amending Bill.

I do feel that because of the obvious divergence of views on all the little details within this Bill, the only solution is for far greater powers to be given to the Licensing Court; and for far greater tolerance to be shown by that court in its findings and decisions. I mentioned earlier, at some length, that members speaking for their various districts were probably quite right in each and every one of their submissions. The only way to overcome the difficulty is to establish fairly clearly that hotels shall be allowed 12 hours trading a day.

Because of the monopolistic control they have, we should establish that they must provide certain minimum standards of accommodation and so on; and further

establish that the Licensing Court—which as I mentioned earlier this session when speaking to the debate on the Address-in-reply—shall consist of a lawyer with the same standing as a judge of the Supreme Court—and paid as much—an accountant, and an architect. If it were thought advisable, the accountant could have experience of hotels.

I think the ideal Licensing Court should consist of a lawyer of seven years' standing, who would be paid as much as a Supreme Court judge, so that we could ensure that there would be present a thorough understanding of the law relating to licensing; an accountant who would know the details of the business side necessary for the running of an hotel; and an architect who would know completely the building requirements.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Would not you need a man with hotel experience?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I do not think so. A hotel is much the same as any other business, and we can get over that aspect by making sure that the accountant has had business experience. I think most of the accountants in Perth have done enough hotel work to know all the ramifications of the industry; they would be able to supply the necessary information as to whether licenses should be granted to particular areas.

For the provision of appropriate accommodation, nobody would be better suited than the architect; while on the law side we would have the lawyer. I suggest that the court be granted a considerable amount of discretion; and that when it issues a license it should determine the location of the hotel, and should then decide whether it should operate from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m., or from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m., or from 11 a.m. to 11 p.m. Members representing the Goldfields area tell us that their conditions are such as to warrant 11 p.m. closing. If there were sufficient justification for that, they would have no difficulty in convincing the court that they needed an extension of hours. If a greater spread of hours were needed, it would be necessary to introduce an amendment to permit of earlier trading.

In some towns it may be found desirable to keep hotels open from 9 a.m. until mid-day and then to close them for three hours. But we should give the court discretion to decide what these hours should be. The bulk of the arguments put forward on this Bill has been based on local requirements, and the way they differ one from the other. I am quite sure that the wintertime requirements of Albany are quite different from those of Geraldton. The other criticisms that have been levelled have, in the main, been levelled in the tragically mistaken belief that a restriction on the sale of alcohol will automatically restrict the evils of alcoholism.

I would suggest to the people who put forward such arguments that they read some history of American prohibition, together with some of the more recent findings of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in America on the growth and world-wide ramifications of the Mafia which rose to its full strength because of the prohibition era. I suggest that people who argue in the fashion to which I have referred should take some time off to study the health reports of the mental institutions and blind institutions of the United States of America during, and just after the prohibition period. I hope I have made it clear that I intend to support the second reading of the Bill.

THE HON. G. BENNETTS (South-East) [2.59]: I do not propose to support the Bill. I think I mentioned earlier that the hotel hours which operate in the State at present are quite fair and reasonable; and I do not think this Bill will help to improve the situation.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It will reduce the hours on the Goldfields.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: We know that in different States there are different hours in operation. I would not like to see the South Australian hours adopted here, because I think six o'clock is too early for hotels to close. About three years ago I went to a hotel opposite Adelaide railway station to obtain an idea of the effect of six o'clock closing. It was a disgraceful scene. Some of the railway employees themselves, and other workers off the trains, would rush across to the hotel at any time up to about 5.45 p.m. and would order drinks. Sometimes they would order two each and drink them one after the other. It was just one mad rush. If a longer time had been allowed, it would have had a better effect on the people.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: How would you be able to know the effect?

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: I have never had a drink, but I do know the effect because I have taken a drop of brandy as medicine. I know that after having a tablespoon of that I would not be able to get in my car and drive, because it goes straight to my system. I do not know how I would fare if I drank beer. However, having witnessed what has taken place on the Goldfields, and the hours that are kept there, I am satisfied as to the effects of longer hours. As we all know, the hours on the Goldfields were extended for an express purpose. It was recognised that the men working in dusty places underground consumed the drink as a medicine to overcome silicosis and tuberculosis, which were suffered as a result of the dust.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: They loved their medicine, too!

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: It has also been recognised that the climate of the Goldfields warrants the longer hours.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Don't you think the Collie coalminers should be entitled to the medicine, too?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: I am speaking as a pioneer of the Goldfields, and I have never seen drunks about the streets at night-time such as can be seen in the city. People from Germany and Paris have told me that their drinking places are open for 24 hours a day. I have never seen those places for myself, but I have been told that the people do not suffer from intoxication.

In Sydney the situation is different. When I visit that capital I nearly always stay at the same hotel. Because a bar has been built on the first floor near the dining-room, it has the privilege of extended hours of trading. At this hotel there is a limited amount of accommodation available to the public, which I think is a shame. It has the accommodation but will not let it unless it is known that the guest is known personally to the licensee, or is a friend of someone known to the licensee. Very seldom are there more than six guests at the hotel. Recently one floor of the hotel was converted to make private accommodation for the family, which does not exist. In that way the proprietor has made sure there is no extra accommodation available for guests.

It is absolutely disgusting to see the way that premises, which have the privilege of extended hours, are run, and to see the number of young teenagers who frequent them. They are nothing but beer houses and, the owners have no respect for youth or anyone else; they only care about getting the cash in the till. These premises install a piano, singers, and loudspeakers, so that no one can sleep till midnight, anyway.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Where is this?

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: Sydney.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: They must have a bad Government over there.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: If we extend the hours it could happen here, too; that is, if we not keep an eye on the situation. Dr. Hislop made mention last night of the restaurants from the health point of view. We know that although the health authorities should ensure that these places are conducted so as not to endanger the health of the people, in many cases the premises are neglected.

If restaurants were granted a license, a lot of them could be put out of business because not all of them would be granted a license. Therefore people who wanted to drink would go to the place which had a license to enable drink to be taken on to the premises. Some of the restaurants which will be granted a license will not be within the means of the ordinary working-class person or the basic wage-earner. They would be so dear to attend that only the big money-earner would be able to frequent them.

I have been watching some of these places, which I believe are pretty well conducted, and I have seen people go into them with bottles of liquor which they drink with their meal, and then leave quite happy. I would not like to see any alteration in that set-up. There are one or two high-class places now where I believe, if a bottle of champagne is taken to be drunk with the meal, the patron is charged 10s. to have the bottle opened. Other places charge for the use of glasses, and again to open the bottles.

Since Parliament has been in session, I have asked certain people who visit many of the hotels—both women and their husbands—to keep their eyes open and give me their opinion of the premises. They tell me that the hours which exist today are quite satisfactory; with a few exceptions they have heard no growls about them. The majority of the people are in favour of the 9 o'clock closing. They say that it gives them a chance to get home early and be able to work properly the next day. The wives say it gives them a chance to get their husbands out of the hotels, and home.

I have heard members say that if people want a drink they will get it. That is so, and we will not be able to do anything to stop them. However, if they want a drink they have till 9 o'clock to obtain it. I did think that perhaps in the summertime the 10 o'clock closing might be a good idea, but owing to the remarks which have been made to me and the picture of the situation which has been painted, I believe we should stick to the present hours.

If restaurants are going to be permitted to serve drink, I hope they will have to do so in bottles and not by the glass, as in hotels. I also hope that it will be served with meals and not just with sandwiches, because I have seen people, where that is the rule, buy a plate of sandwiches, which has stayed on the table all night, so that they could obtain a drink or two.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: The Bill covers that.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You should have had a look at the Bill first!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: These laws can be abused, so they need to be strictly controlled otherwise they will have an ill effect. It can be seen by the upward trend in the sale of beer that there has been an increase in drinking—an increase which is steadily progressing, partly due to the rise in population. This upward trend is playing into the hands of a certain few—the breweries—and a lot of hotel proprietors are not getting much more than the basic wage for all the work they do and the worry involved.

I believe we have too many hotels. But what are we going to do with the proprietors? The Licensing Court should investigate the matter and see whether a provision could be incorporated in the Act to enable some hotels to be closed and the proprietors compensated—

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Do you think there are too many clubs?

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: —even if the money had to come from Government revenue.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Instead of spending it on schools, hospitals, roads, and that sort of thing?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: Some of them should be closed down, and the proprietors should be compensated for the amount of money they have spent on the premises. I am not referring to the brewery-owned hotels, but the privately-owned ones. This would enable the remaining hotels to provide better accommodation.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I would rather build schools with the money!

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: Yes; I agree that there is a shortage of schools and hospitals.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Do you think there may be too many clubs?

The PRESIDENT: Order! This is not question time.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: Members know that dart boards are provided at a lot of hotels; and dances are run; and all those sorts of things are provided to try to attract the crowds. Because of the competition, a terrific amount of money is being spent to provide these social amenities.

If these practices were not allowed, and the hotels were all put on a commonsense basis, there would be fairer competition. I do not think all hotel proprietors are keeping their premises up to the standard which we would like to see; and I think the Licensing Board should look into that aspect of the matter. Perhaps the Act should be amended in some way, so as to ensure that anyone who is a hotel proprietor is a person capable of conducting the premises at a proper standard.

I know that many hotelkeepers are a credit to the State and conduct their establishments properly; but there are others whom I would not allow to manage my fowlhouse, let alone a hotel. The accommodation provided for the public is another important aspect of the hotel question; and I would have liked to see in the Bill provision to enable the court to control the price of hotel accommodation. Mr. MacKinnon made references to the quality of the beer sold. I recall the early days when the Commonwealth Railway was being built. I was in charge there, and about half-a-dozen breweries were operating. On occasions, when the barrels were being cleaned out ready for another brew, I counted as many as 12 or 20 pennies being tipped out of a barrel; and that shows the sort of liquor that can be brewed in the backyard; and it was good fighting beer.

I see nothing wrong with present conditions, but I would not complain if the proposed trading hours of 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. were agreed to. I have not seen many people in hotels early in the morning, with the exception of the man who had too much the night before, and needed a quickie next morning to revive him. The general public do not need a drink before 10 a.m., and so the proposed change would cause no hardship. I do not like to see children running about in hotel lounges, or sitting in prams in front of hotels. That sort of thing is a disgrace, and I am glad to see that the measure will prevent playgrounds being part of hotel premises; because hotels cater only for people to drink on the premises. I have no objection to a playground being provided for the children of the licensee, or those of his guests or employees, but I feel that playgrounds should certainly not be provided simply for the convenience of people who wish to dispose of their children while they drink. I have noticed that, in my electorate, at least, the State hotels have higher prices than the other hotels; and that might be looked into.

THE HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [3.20]: I do not wish to cast a silent vote on this measure. I support the Bill, although I am not thoroughly happy with it. I feel that, if one voice of disapproval at some stage, seeds may be sown in the minds of other members, and before another 12 months have passed further amendments to the Act may be found necessary. The main changes to the Licensing Act sought by this Bill are to alter the trading hours from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. to 10 a.m. to 10 p.m.; and to allow liquor to be served with meals in hotels and selected restaurants.

The measure contains many other amendments, but none, I believe, as important as those I have mentioned. It has always been my contention that if we make liquor or anything else hard to get,

or restrict the hours in which it may be obtained, the people seem to want it more than they otherwise would. I can recall the time I spent in the Air Force, in South Australia. While there I saw the bad effects which result from limiting the trading hours to the period from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. When we take into consideration the quantity of liquor consumed in South Australia, as against the consumption in this State, we find there is in fact very little difference.

In South Australia one finds a great number of men knocking off work at, perhaps, 5 o'clock and joining in the rush to have as many drinks as possible before the hotels close at 6 p.m. I can recall coming into town from the air force station and joining the boys; and we used to do our best to get all the drink we could before the doors closed at 6 p.m. I have often seen men leaving hotels there rolling drunk, and I am convinced that that was due to the early closing. I often left the hotel at 6 p.m. feeling that I could have done with a couple of schooners less than I had had. I have seen it all too often in South Australia; and the same position obtains in Melbourne, where there is the same swill between 5 p.m. and 6 p.m.

I think it is a very good move to spread and liberalise the drinking hours in hotels, but I would have liked to see a period from perhaps 6 p.m. to 7 p.m. set aside as a tea break, so that management, and barmaids and barmen could have a reasonable tea hour. Such a break might also have the effect of causing to go home to their dinner many men who would otherwise remain at the hotel, perhaps, until closing time.

I think it is wise to allow hotels to serve liquor with meals, and I can remember thinking how ridiculous our present law was when, about three years ago, I was a guest of the Geraldton municipality and road board. At that time the Road Board Association was holding its conference in Geraldton, and it was entertained by the two bodies I have mentioned. The publican, on whose premises the dinner was held, had obtained an extended license to permit drinking to continue until 11 p.m.; but it transpired that, at that hour, the speeches and toasts had not been completed. However, the local sergeant of police walked in and prevented any further drinking. As it happened, we had some liquor in our hotel rooms; and we took it to a restaurant about 100 yards away, where we were able to consume it. I can recall asking myself "How silly can we become?"

I am glad to see that, with the passing of this measure, hotels will be permitted to serve liquor with meals and cater for affairs such as that I have referred to. They will be able to continue serving liquor until midnight, which is a reasonable hour, and the same will apply to

drinking in restaurants. I have always thought it wrong that a person could take liquor to a restaurant and, with the consent of the management, drink it with his meal, but could not purchase liquor from the proprietor.

On occasion I have taken wine to a restaurant and have drunk it with a meal. Under such circumstances strangers might come in and ask the management for wine, only to be told that they could not be served. Then they might ask, "What about those people over there?"; only to be informed by the proprietor, "Those people brought their own liquor." If we are permitted to drink liquor in a restaurant, we should be permitted also to buy it there.

I am concerned, however, at the possibility that hotels and restaurants supplying liquor with meals may be permitted to make an undue profit out of it. Are we to allow them to charge what they like for providing liquor, or are we to restrict them in some way to a reasonable profit? I have visited restaurants and clubs in Melbourne and Sydney, and I venture to say that some of them make prohibitive profits on the liquor they sell.

Such a state of affairs should not be permitted here; and the public should not be allowed to be exploited in that way. I would like to see the Licensing Court given power to set down what are considered reasonable prices for the serving of liquor.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: A menu and a price-list?

The Hon. A. R. JONES: Possibly; but the price-list should be within the range of the average customer. I am making these suggestions so that we may take cognisance of what we see in the ensuing year; and we may be able to make any necessary amendments to the Act next year. I believe the Bill is a step in the right direction. Perhaps not many of us here have travelled overseas; but I think we have all taken a great deal of notice of what Dr. Hislop has told us in regard to what happens in other countries. We do not hear of drunkenness, overseas, to the extent that we see it in this country.

I can well recall the time I spent on the Goldfields; and I agree with Mr. Bennetts that one does not see much drunkenness there; but I cannot understand his attitude in accepting liberalised drinking conditions on the Goldfields, while wanting to restrict the rest of the State to 9 p.m. closing. That is not his usual attitude.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: They are very special people on the Goldfields.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I concede the right of various people to write to us and express their views; and I suppose all members have received letters, as I have, from the Women's Christian Temperance Union and from church organisations in

regard to this measure. Those people are entitled to their views, and are entitled to express them to us; but I feel that perhaps they have been wrongly advised. The views they express seem very narrow because, surely, if they observe the customs of this country as we do, they must realise that if we restrict the availability of anything to the people, the public only want it more; while if we broaden hours of trading and so on, the average person takes things much more leisurely.

I know from my own experience, as a boy, that if my parents forbade me to have anything or to do anything, my desire to have or to do that very thing became much greater. For example, for this reason I was all the more anxious to have a taste of liquor or to smoke the forbidden cigarette, so that I could enjoy the experience for myself. It seems to be a human weakness that if we are forbidden to have something we seek it all the more. That weakness can be traced back to Adam and Eve.

Instead of holding such narrow views, some churches and organisations would achieve more good among the community if they broadened their views and directed their efforts towards such work as was outlined by Professor Saint the other evening. There is plenty of room for these organisations to get behind some movement to assist the unfortunate people who are addicted to drink, instead of writing numerous letters urging members of Parliament to restrict the licensing hours in an endeavour to keep liquor from people who are too weak to control themselves.

It is wrong for any organisation to request members of Parliament to vote for legislation that will withhold from 95 per cent. of the population an amenity that can be enjoyed if properly used, merely for the sake of 5 per cent. of the people who cannot be helped anyway. If we restrict the trading hours so that hotels will close at 9 p.m. or 10 p.m., this small minority of the community will always find some way to obtain drink. If they cannot get it in hotels or wine saloons, many of them go to extreme lengths to satisfy their craving by purchasing methylated spirits.

I am not particularly happy about the provisions in the Bill relating to Sunday trading. At present hotels are open for two short sessions; namely, from noon to 1 p.m. and from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. I am not sure whether those hours of trading are absolutely necessary. Are we to limit the hotels to two short sessions or to one session with the hours slightly increased? It seems to me that we could do away with Sunday trading altogether; or else, if we consider that people should be permitted to have a drink on Sunday, we should liberalise the trading hours to permit hotels to serve liquor at any hour and on any day, or to observe normal business trading hours.

If we restrict the sale of liquor on Sunday to one hour, I think it will be found that the patrons will rush in and consume as much liquor as they can in that limited time. In the small towns that I represent—I except Geraldton because that is a fairly large centre—I have often observed the effect of these Sunday drinking sessions on the members of cricket and football teams; especially the younger players. I have seen young men going to the hotel for the mid-day drinking session and consuming five or six schooners of beer. By that time they are feeling fairly merry and they adopt the attitude that they do not want to play cricket or football as they intended to do before they visited the hotel. The result is that they let their teams down. That is no idle chatter, and for that reason I am not very happy about the mid-day drinking session on a Sunday.

On the other hand, if the trading hours were liberalised, the people who patronise the hotels would not drink so much in a hurry. Also, those who feel that they must have a hair of the dog that bit them would be able to have a leisurely drink or two instead of swilling under restricted hours. Further, those who are away from their home centres and who have to make their way back at the end of the day would be able to have a drink when they so desired, instead of having to wait until, say, 9 p.m. when they arrived home. There again, in those circumstances, I think the Sunday hours of trading should be altered to 6 p.m. to 7 p.m. In my opinion, this is a question that should be left to the discretion of the sergeant of police who is in charge of the district, because conditions vary from one part of the State to another.

I think I have said enough to indicate that there is much good in this measure, but there is also a great deal which is lacking. Therefore, the best plan would probably be to give this legislation 12 months' trial and review the results at the end of that period. As the Bill seeks to liberalise the trading hours to permit people to consume liquor with their meals in hotels and restaurants, we should carefully study the penalties that are provided in the Bill to ensure that the privileges to be granted by it will not be abused. Alcohol is a good thing if taken in moderation. I have found that when I am extremely thirsty I thoroughly enjoy a drink of ale. However, in normal circumstances, alcohol is something that should not be consumed in the middle of the day when it is extremely hot, but rather in the evening when it can be enjoyed to the full.

That is one of the main reasons why I think the trading hours should be liberalised. If they were, people could enjoy a drink of ale or any liquor they fancied whenever they felt like it, and, what is more, in company with other members of their families. I know that there are often many arguments created in domestic circles as a result of excessive drinking, but that is a question that must be decided by the people themselves. This is another instance where those church

organisations which seem to have so much to say, and which go out of their way to tell us what to do with this legislation, could take a hand. Any Minister in a parish, who feels that one of his parishioners is drinking to excess and is not doing the right thing by his family, could perform excellent service by taking some action to help that man mend his ways.

Drunkenness should not be allowed. If people are inclined to abuse the privileges that are granted to them they should be fined very heavily for any breach they commit. I hope the police will take the necessary action to ensure that the licensing Act is properly administered.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: We are increasing the penalties.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I have noticed from the Bill that some of the penalties will be increased, but I am hoping that there will be no need to impose them to any great degree. However, if it is found that the Act is being abused, I hope that no hesitation will be shown in enforcing the penalty.

I now wish to refer to the provision relating to the granting of licenses to restaurants. In one of the paragraphs of the relevant clause the following is the definition of a meal:—

For the purposes of this section, "meal" means a meal of at least two courses at which the persons partaking of the meal are seated at a table and one course of the meal consists of fish or meats other than in sandwich form.

That is a provision which could quite easily be overcome if it were so desired. One could enter a restaurant and order a couple of sardines, together with an ice cream, and the restaurant owner would thus be permitted to serve that patron with as much liquor as he liked to order. I therefore hope that something more substantial than what I have instanced will be regarded as being a meal by those who will be required to police the Act. The police should be requested to keep a close watch on restaurants to ensure that people do not abuse the Act in that respect.

I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill. I think that some of its provisions are still wanting and, on the other hand, other provisions seek to legislate for something which I do not consider is necessary. However, we can review the legislation after 12 months and make further amendments that are considered necessary. As recommendations in regard to this legislation have been obtained from a committee comprising members of two political Parties, and as the Bill has been introduced by a coalition Government, the clauses contained in the measure represent a fairly mixed grill in thinking. Therefore, I hope it will be considered by us as individuals, and that we will vote as individuals and not along Party lines.

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [4.5]: This Bill is a fairly lengthy one, and although emphasis has been laid by previous speakers on one or two particular points, there are several others which, in my opinion, contribute to make the Bill a very interesting one indeed.

Mr. Cunningham, in the course of his useful comments, pointed out that since the Licensing Act was first enacted in 1911 there have been in the vicinity of 30 amendments made to it. This however, appears to be the first effort to give the Act, what might be termed, a comprehensive overhaul. As I said in the first paragraph of my remarks, in my opinion the Bill is a very interesting one, and if enacted in some way or another will achieve considerable improvements to the Act.

No doubt members have read the report which the Parliamentary Committee compiled last year, and which is dated the 24th June, 1958. Members will recall that among the five members of that committee, Mr. Roche and I were included from this House.

In the introductory paragraph, the report mentioned one or two matters which I shall read out as a preface to the remarks which I intend making on this measure. The paragraphs I am about to read were unanimously subscribed to by the five members of the committee. We started off by pointing out the following feature:—

It will be readily appreciated that the whole subject of liquor and its control is a controversial and complex one. There are so many conflicting interests and contradictory points of view involved. Also it is so easy to say what should be done and to ignore certain inescapable facts. Your Committee however has endeavoured throughout its deliberations to deal with conditions as they exist in Western Australia and as they seem likely to develop in the future, keeping in mind the welfare of the public generally rather than those of any sectional interests concerned.

Then the report went on to point out that the committee dealt with certain controversial subjects, but we had to approach our task on the hypothesis that over the years the sale of liquor in Western Australia had been controlled, and that its production and consumption were facts accepted by the public generally; because throughout the inquiry we found intruding the point of view that the only way to deal with the Licensing Act and the liquor question was to scrap the Act altogether and abolish liquor. We thought that was quite impracticable and we stated as follows in our report:—

In this connection it may be worthwhile quoting from the "Report on Alcoholism" submitted to the United

Nations World Health Organisation on the 30th August, 1957, by Dr. A. Cavaillon, Director General of Health Minister of Public Health, France. In dealing therein with the fight against alcoholism he states:

The grave economic disturbances that would be occasioned by prohibition together with the likelihood of social unrest such as it caused in the United States are sufficient reason, we think, not to dwell upon the consideration of this solution.

If that is a sound and wise point of view, as I think we must accept it to be, we have to face up to the fact that quite a big section of the people desire to partake of liquor. They are agreed that its control, production and distribution should be the subject of legislation. The report goes on to state as follows:—

It is the considered opinion of your Committee that remedies to most of the problems associated with the liquor trade lie not so much in the realm of restrictions and prohibitions, but rather in the realm of wise laws which should be revised from time to time in the light of research and experience; improvements to premises and amenities and the cultivation by means of education of a healthy public outlook and attitude on the subject. We stress the latter because it is realised that the passing of laws will achieve very little in the way of reform unless they have the enlightened support and respect of the community. This will come about when there is a permanent body of citizens actively interested in educating the public and in the promotion and achievement of better standards all round. Evils of a serious nature are undoubtedly associated with liquor and it is somewhat surprising that in the past more has not been attempted in the field of education where such a tremendous responsibility lies.

Some interesting contributions have been made concerning this Bill. I have been very impressed by some of the arguments and points of view that various speakers have put forward. Emphasis seems to have been placed on the question of hours. However, in my opinion, this is a relatively minor matter. I am convinced, not only from the research that I have made into this matter, and not only from my own point of view, but also from the long experience I have had of living on the Goldfields where extended hours are enjoyed, that liberal hours do not conduce to more drinking.

We had restricted hours during the war years; and the experience then convinced me that the more we restrict hours the worse the conditions of drinking become. I think anyone who has lived on the Goldfields and who patronised hotels during

the last war could not possibly disagree with that assertion. As I said before, the question of hours is a relatively minor one; but I would strongly oppose any restriction of hours.

We have to bear in mind that in New South Wales the trading hours are from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m.; in Queensland they are 10 a.m. to 10 p.m.; and in Tasmania they are 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. In the report, I subscribed to the proposition that 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. would be the best hours. Anyone who cares to read the arguments both for and against, which are set out in the report, can form his own conclusion.

I formed the opinion that 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. would be reasonable trading hours; that they would convenience a lot of people; and that they were suitable for our climatic conditions, especially during the summer months. Our Licensing Act is in such a muddle that there is another consideration to be noted. We have licensed hotels and we also have licensed clubs. They both serve a useful purpose in their particular spheres; but my point of view is that hotels and clubs should trade on an equal footing as far as is possible. I am a member of four clubs in Kalgoorlie. My family used to own a well-known hotel at Esperance, but I have not a shilling interest in any hotel premises and have not had for the past five or six years.

In all fairness, it seems to me that clubs and hotels should trade on an equal footing as far as is possible. It is worth appreciating that the present hours give a distinct advantage to the clubs, particularly in a town where there is a hotel and a club—and there are plenty of such. The ordinary member of the public cannot get a drink after 9 p.m., but the considerable proportion of the public which now belongs to clubs can go and drink at the clubs until 11 p.m.

Once upon a time the ordinary person did not belong to a club, because clubs were too restricted; they were out of the social ambit of a lot of people; and they were expensive to belong to. But over recent years, clubs have grown up in all directions. They have attractive premises; their membership fee is very little; and a big section of people have joined them and can drink in those premises until 11 p.m. That is all right.

Clubs have lovely premises and nice amenities. One can play billiards, obtain supper, or use a reading room; and the modern club has provided an attractive way of life for a lot of people. Clubs are established where people can play bowls, golf, or tennis. There are also R.S.L. clubs. I can say that some of the most pleasant times I have spent at Kalgoorlie have been in the clubs.

However, we have to appreciate this: Hotels have to be maintained as they are public houses. Every member of the community can drink at a hotel provided he

is over 21 years of age and does not suffer from any of the disabilities placed upon him by the law. Every member of the community can go into a hotel and demand meals and accommodation; and the courts impose fairly rigid standards on hotels; and these standards have to be complied with. In the State of Western Australia we have to go out for business; and one of the most attractive businesses these days is the tourist industry.

I think I read somewhere that last year £10,000,000 was spent in Australia by overseas tourists. It is only right and proper that we should go in for that business and try to attract some of that money here. As the Director of the Tourist Bureau (Mr. Miller) pointed out to the parliamentary committee, hotels are a most essential adjunct as far as the tourist industry is concerned. So if we place hotels at a great disadvantage as compared with clubs we will not only be doing an injustice to the hotels, but something which will be a handicap to our State.

I think that is an angle which has to be borne in mind where the question of hours is concerned. I think 9 p.m. closing has considerable merits; but it is no good alongside the 11 p.m. closing of the clubs. If both clubs and hotels could be closed at 9 p.m. I would be in favour of that, but club life would be uninteresting if one could not get a drink after 9 p.m. If one is logical, one must admit the argument that simply because I can go down and get a drink up till 11 p.m. if I am a member of a club, it might be a bit unfair that my friend who is not a member cannot get a drink after 9 p.m. That is the position which we have today.

This sort of thing is the cause of a lot of the poor standards which exist in a number of hotels. The proposal to license restaurants is, in my opinion, a proper move. It is not generally realised that at the present time a group of people of any age can take drink along to these restaurants in a case, and they can sit at a table and drink until any hour of the night or morning. Even if those people are under 21, or if they are there until 3 a.m. or 4 a.m., the law cannot interfere at all. I am sure that that state of affairs is not generally realised, so it certainly calls for some regulation and control.

I am very glad that this new type of license is proposed. It will be essential for the court to insist on proper standards because, during the course of our inquiry, we visited a number of these so-called night clubs or restaurants, and the lack of amenities in the way of toilet facilities was staggering. How they managed to pass the local health authorities surprised us very much. One could see dozens of people either eating or dancing in these restaurants; and the lack of toilet facilities and other amenities was simply staggering.

If we bring these restaurants under the control of the Licensing Act we will at least see to it that the premises are decent; that the people who hold the licenses are of decent repute; that the liquor will be of a decent standard; that they will be open for inspection; and that they will be properly controlled.

That is a good move because people these days do a lot of dining out. On such occasions as weddings, wedding anniversaries, and 21st birthday parties, people like to dine out; and when people have friends from the East they like to take them to a picture show and then on to a nice restaurant afterwards for a meal. Those people should be able to buy Australian wines or beers for consumption at the table, in decent conditions, and without being robbed in the way of price. The Bill provides that the prices shall be set out; and I am sure that if anyone starts playing up by over-charging people, the court will attend to him.

The proposed restaurant license is a good idea. Some absurd situations exist at present. For instance, the people at the Charles Hotel may get a special license for a dinner. A party of 20 decide to have dinner, and they go to the hotel which applies to the court for a special license. Those people are allowed to have liquor at their table after 9 p.m., but no one else in the dining-room can have it.

The Bill is an interesting one, and it contains a number of worth-while provisions. But what is most needed, as Dr. Hislop and Mr. Cunningham pointed out, is a new approach to the subject altogether. In our report, we paid tribute to the work of the personnel of the Licensing Court and to the work carried out by the previous members of the court. It is easy to criticise some of our city and country hotels, but we have to remember that Western Australia is a relatively small State of long distances. The hotels in places like Catherine Valley, Yalgoo, and other such places have a struggle to keep going; but they cater for the people pretty well in all the circumstances.

We have to embark on a new order, and I entirely agree with the proposition that the status of the court should be lifted as much as possible. Everyone has a high respect for the judges of our courts; and the various courts are held in high esteem. They are estimated largely by the calibre of the men who control them.

If we can raise the status of the court, we will be starting right at the top. The court will have fairly wide powers, and it should insist that hotels shall be properly managed; that the public shall get a good deal; and that the many abuses that have been tolerated in the past shall cease to exist. In our report we have recommended that the status of the court be raised. We then come down to the next rung and

suggest that the status of the people controlling the hotels be raised. In the past anyone who applied for a license and put in two testimonials stating that he was a person of good repute, could get a license. A person cannot get a license to be an electrical engineer, a winder-driver, a baker, a carpenter, or anything else, without qualifications; and I think that in this new order the public should be entitled to insist that the people who control hotels shall be not only men whose characters are beyond reproach, but men who have ability in that particular sphere.

It is a good thing that money is to be made available for the improvement of premises. Hotels are public houses, and they have a big part to play in our community life; and they should be of a proper standard. Many of the new buildings and homes that have been built in recent years make the old buildings and homes alongside of them look out of date; and we have to bring our hotels up to modern standards. I cannot see anything wrong with the Government lending money, in proper cases, so long as it gets correct security. Building is an expensive matter. In the past many owners of premises have been faced with the utter impossibility of raising the thousands of pounds necessary to bring their premises up to a proper standard. They will not have that excuse in the future; and if premises are brought up to a proper standard, the public behaves in them. If proper amenities are provided, the conduct of the people is much better than otherwise.

The public has to be educated. It is a good idea to do more in this regard in the schools than has been attempted in the past. Anyone who was privileged to hear Professor Saint the other night will quickly realise how the public has to make a new approach to this matter. Let everyone combine. If we are not going to wipe out drinking—I think we all agree that that is impracticable—let us have a court of high standing, and hotels and amenities of the highest standard where people will behave properly, and not the dirty dingy places that we have had, on occasions, in the past; and let them be open to strict supervision and inspection. In these circumstances I think that half the abuses associated with liquor would be done away with.

There is one interesting provision in the Bill, namely, the provision which increases the penalty on anyone supplying liquor to intoxicated persons. I have seen people obviously under the influence of drink, but with plenty of money, drinking themselves into insensibility. They have been just wasting their money, doing their health considerable harm, and becoming a bad advertisement for all concerned. The Licensing Court, the police, and the licensees themselves have to contribute to stop that sort of thing. At present it is an offence to serve a person who is under the influence of liquor. Last year there were

seven convictions under section 141 of the Act, and two convictions under section 142. In the whole of Western Australia there were less than 10 convictions under those sections.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: When is a person under the influence of liquor?

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: It is a very hard thing for a licensee to determine.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: If a licensee is not capable of determining when a person has had sufficient to drink, he should not have the job.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The Traffic Act lays it down.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: It is hard to tell; a line cannot be drawn; but in the course of my travels I have seen men, obviously under the influence of drink, going out of hotels with bottles of liquor. I am not speaking so much of the city.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It would be very easy to be unjust to the publican in such matters.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Of course he cannot be 100 per cent. correct. The point I am trying to make is that the problem of alcoholism and excessive drinking is one that we all have to face. In the past there has been a loose outlook on it.

I see the value of hotels, and I see the value of clubs. Dr. Saint, himself, said he enjoyed a drink in moderation. But alcoholism undoubtedly is on the increase. The temperance organisations are gravely concerned about the problem; and we have to do something towards helping. Practically everyone these days drives a motorcar. If a man who has a wife and children to support goes to a hotel and drinks too much, and then goes out on the road and kills himself or someone else, that is no good to the community. The licensees of the future must be men of such calibre that they will be able to help to protect a man of that sort. That is what I am trying to achieve by suggesting that we lift the status of the court and the hotels, and by inculcating a new point of view. I think it will be to the advantage of all concerned.

During the course of our inquiry we went to wine saloons; and it would break members' hearts to see the poor derelicts sitting there spending their pensions and drinking wine—drinking themselves into oblivion. A community should not permit that sort of thing. Some of the wine saloons that we have tolerated in the past should not be tolerated in the future. As Dr. Hislop pointed out, no-one can look into them from the street; and when one goes inside one finds little cubby-holes.

In South Australia I saw, in the main streets, lovely shops with modern shop fronts, almost all constructed of glass. From the street one could see that the counters and tables were clean; that the wines of the country were for sale; and

that decent respectable people were going into buy them. That is the sort of thing that the Court and all concerned with the Licensing Act have to aim for in the future. We should not have hotels with dingy bars and parlours; we should have hotels and wine saloons where people's behaviour could be seen by all. In that way most of the excesses would be avoided.

I do not know whether there is a provision in the Bill to cover this aspect, but in places like Kalgoorlie and Fremantle there are far too many hotels, and the majority of licensees are not making a decent living. Consequently some of them have to stoop to certain practices to encourage people into their premises and so build up their takings. That sort of thing should not be tolerated. We should de-license a number of them and make the remainder conform to higher and better standards. Places like Toodyay and York used to be a day's journey from Perth in the old days. People stayed there overnight, and the hotels were needed. But that is not the position today and, consequently, there are too many hotels in these towns.

I believe there are four hotels in Toodyay whereas probably two would do. It would be better to wipe two of them out and keep two decent ones, and make them conform to better standards. In Manjimup there is only one hotel; but that is not a good thing, either. In some cases like that publicans are apt to adopt a take-it-or-leave-it attitude, and hold the public to ransom.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Not at Manjimup. The licensee there has always done a good job.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I do not wish to imply that that state of affairs exists at Manjimup, but it could; and human nature being what it is, it is apt to apply. I am sure members have read the report of the parliamentary committee. The five members of that committee worked very hard and studied the Act through and through. We travelled throughout the State, and it is most encouraging from our point of view that the Government has seen fit to follow a number of the recommendations that were made.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It was a very good effort.

The Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The measure is not a perfect one, and it will not achieve all the goals we hoped for. But I think it will be a step in the right direction; and, as other speakers have pointed out, though weaknesses will be revealed we can attend to them from time to time. I support the second reading.

On motion by the Hon. J. D. Teahan, debate adjourned.

METROPOLITAN REGION TOWN PLANNING SCHEME BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 10th November.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY (West) [4.50]: I should like to mention one or two matters that Professor Stephenson commented on in the report he presented to the Government and the people of Western Australia. Professor Stephenson said that the need for a plan for the metropolitan region of Perth and Fremantle had been obvious for a long time; and that Parliament, the local authorities, and the public were concerned with the rapid outward expansion of the metropolitan area. He went on to say that the congestion in the metropolitan area could reach a stage where, if some plan were not formulated, it would become embarrassing to both Parliament and the local authorities.

I believe that the Government was fortunate in being able to get such a splendid report presented to it by such an authority as Professor Stephenson; and I compliment the Government on bringing forward this Bill. I believe the time has come when some decision has to be made so that the ordinary property-owner—whether he be a large or small owner of property—and the industrialist will know where they stand, and what their position will be in the future. I congratulate the Government on introducing the Bill but I regret that similar legislation was not passed last year. Everything I have to say this afternoon will be of a constructive nature. Firstly, I would like to quote from page 2 of Professor Stephenson's report—

It is quite impossible to prepare a Plan with any hope of its successful adoption and application if it is not the result of collective effort—

That is the important point. To continue—

—or, put in another way, a combination of many conclusions and plans. Some of these, it is true, might not previously have been formulated even in principle. Our role at times has been that of a catalyst. But now conclusions concerning the future are assembled in one document embodying and relating ideas of many individuals and organisations.

I think everyone will agree with those remarks because they are the crux of the whole plan. I now quote from page 6 of the report—

With or without a comprehensive plan the region will continue to grow. Every year building and population sufficient to establish a substantial country town is added to the whole. With a plan, and adequate governmental machinery at State and local levels, great waste of time, money and

effort could be avoided, and telling economies effected. The cities and communities in the metropolitan region could grow in a spacious and orderly arrangement on either side of the broad Swan River as convenient, happy places.

Decisions taken now will mean much to this as well as succeeding generations. It is a time for practical men, but also for bold and courageous action. Western Australia has had its full share of audacious, farsighted men. What they achieved is truly remarkable. It is nothing compared with what could be achieved in the future.

I knew our ex-town planner, Mr. Hepburn, quite well; it was my pleasure to meet him on several occasions when I discussed various problems with him. Irrespective of whether we agree with certain parts of the plan for the metropolitan region, its implementation must be for the benefit of the State as a whole. However, there are one or two points I would like to make; and I want to offer some suggestions which have been put to me by people who have discussed the matter with me. The first suggestion I wish to make is in respect to that sticky question whether the Perth Road Board should be represented on the committee.

I agree that the committee as proposed in the Bill should be agreed to, but where investigations are being made into anything that will affect the Perth Road Board, I suggest that that board should appoint one of its officers to discuss the position and put the board's point of view to the committee.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Wouldn't the district planning committee cover that aspect?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The honourable member probably has a better word for it.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: It is provided for in the Bill.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: The Perth Road Board is one of the major local authorities in the metropolitan area. But the district of Fremantle has also been omitted from the discussions, and no local authority in that area has a representative on the committee, even though the district is a major one. My opinion is that when certain work has to be done in Fremantle, a representative of the Fremantle City Council should be seconded to the committee for the purpose of discussing the whole question. The same thing could be done, as I have said, with the Perth Road Board, or any other road board which may be affected from time to time. The officer who is seconded would not have a vote; but at least, if an authority is affected, it should be able to put its point of view to the committee.

Let us take the case of the Cockburn Road Board. There are large areas of vacant land in its territory, as can be seen from the plan. If my suggestion were followed I feel sure it would overcome the stalemate in regard to a representative of the Perth Road Board being on the committee.

If a representative of a local authority were seconded to the committee when work had to be done in the district, he could advise the committee and perhaps suggest alternative sites where practicable. The previous Government received many complaints when it decided to locate the new gaol south of the Coogee School. The Cockburn Road Board did not say, as many other boards would have done, "We don't want the gaol anywhere in our territory; someone else can have it." The board told the Government "We have a better site for it, but it will still be in our territory." Therefore I believe that this committee, when it is formed, should give consideration to that aspect. Instead of the local authority being told, "This is where the gaol is going to be built, whether you or the people like it or not," it would be better to have a discussion with the authority affected so that some arrangement could be made which would be satisfactory to all concerned.

If we are to have such an authority with an all-embracing power—which I believe it should have—then I think there should be a certain amount of mutual understanding and agreement between it and the various road boards; it should take the road boards into its confidence and let them know what is proposed. I consider that the Cockburn Road Board had good grounds to say that the proposed gaol—whether it is built now or in 30 years' time—should not be built in the area decided on, because it is a very good food-growing area; and because of the fact that from the plans envisaged the metropolitan area could have a population of 1,000,000 by 1975 or 1980.

If that is to be the case, then we must provide good food-producing areas; we cannot afford to use such areas for the erection of gaols; particularly when by moving into the Jandakot area we find many thousands of acres which would be very suitable for the proposed scheme, but which would cost a great deal to bring into production. If a prison could be built in such an area it would be far better to build it on a site which could produce food and provide a source of water supply for itself. I believe that would be a far better scheme under the town planning proposition we are considering.

I would also refer to the areas south of High Road, around the Riverton district. On the plan we find those areas marked as agricultural areas. As the Minister knows, a great deal of that land would be first class from a building point of view although very poor agricultural land. So

while the plan at the moment does suggest that they should be agricultural areas, before any decision is taken or money spent in effecting drainage, etc., further consideration should be given to the fact that there is an area at present which has a main water supply from the Serpentine Dam passing through it. There is also a high-powered line from East Perth to Bunbury. It will be seen, therefore, that in that area we now have both water and electricity.

I want to bring this matter before the attention of the Town Planning Committee because I am not expressing my personal opinions, but the opinions of those who have been talking to us for the last three years, and waiting for such a measure to come before the House and be put into operation.

I wish to congratulate the Government for bringing this Bill forward. I hope that in its planning it will afford the same consideration and treatment to the man who has a 2-acre block, as it will to the man who has vast amounts of money, and is concerned with big business.

I know that resumptions have to take place at times; and I also know that such resumptions took place a couple of years ago for housing purposes, when a number of people lost their properties after having lived in them for 25 or 30 years; and when the compensation they received was far below that which they considered to be right and just. From their point of view the valuations placed on their properties were far from satisfactory. These people would have been content to continue to live in their places, which were resumed, for a number of years to come. But of course we must have progress, and one only has to look at the bridge that has recently been constructed over the Narrows to see how much progress has been made. I wish the Government well, and support the Bill.

THE HON. L. C. DIVER (Central) [5.51]: I dealt with certain aspects of this Bill in a speech I made last Tuesday on a taxing measure associated with town planning. I make that observation so that anyone who wishes to follow what I have to say today can first look up my previous remarks in *Hansard*. I wish to deal with the alterations that have already taken place in town planning as was envisaged by Professor Stephenson; especially in the creation of a bulk port in the Kwinana area, together with a railway and a road to service that district.

Large tracts of land have been taken over for main road and railway purposes; and if they have not actually been taken over they have been shaded with a stay-off sign. It is of the people who are affected by this that I now speak. Members know that all the humbug that went on in recent times as to what would actually happen in relation to the bulk installations at Kwinana—whether they

would revert to North Wharf—is now history. North Wharf has won. Millions of pounds are to be spent on facilities at North Wharf. I would make a considered guess that there is no man in this House today, and perhaps none of his children, who will see the day when bulk facilities will be established at Kwinana on the scale envisaged under the Stephenson Plan.

Nevertheless, a lot of this land has been shaded with a stay-off sign, because in the distant future it will be required for the greater metropolitan region plan. The livelihood of the people who are the owners of that land has been greatly disturbed; they have not been able to carry on with certain developments apart from a statement to the effect, "You can go on with those buildings and make these improvements, but just remember that when it comes to compensation for your land, such improvements will not be considered in valuing that land. The improvements will be done at your own risk."

It is of that very disturbing position that I speak now. Even now I do not know how a great number of people in the Welshpool district will fare in the years to come. Their future is not assured, even under the legislation with which we are dealing today—legislation to form a body to administer town planning—because this body will not have sufficient finance to make the purchases in the lifetime of the people concerned. In the next session of Parliament I am sure we will still have legislation brought before us by the Minister for Town Planning, and recommended by this body, as it will realise the great disturbance that has been created. That is only one aspect.

Another feature of the Stephenson Plan was to do away with the marshalling yards in central Perth and to shift them to Welshpool; and to provide overways at considerable expense to take the north-bound traffic. What will happen to all that? I am not sure who is responsible; whether the present Government can be held responsible or whether, when it assumed office, certain steps had already been taken to bring about this lamentable position. No matter where the responsibility rests, there is no doubt that the position is most lamentable. Great numbers of industrial people in the metropolitan area are expanding their businesses south; they are opening branches on the southern highways; and they will now find that their activities are 50 years too early, because, in anticipation of this legislation, they felt the Stephenson Plan would have been put into operation at least two or three years ago.

But we have had to wait until today. This body that is to be established should be free from political expediency or influence. In the past, town planners have been subject to political expediency and their plans have been altered to suit the pocket of the Government, or to fit in with

certain expenditure in order to overcome a temporary disability. No thought has been given to the future. I think history will show that we have treated the plan put forward by Stephenson and Hepburn in a not very intelligent manner.

Parliaments and Governments have gone to great lengths to get this comprehensive plan drawn up, and while it was adopted by an all-Party committee, it was thought that minor alterations would be made. But I do not think it was ever envisaged that such major alterations would have to take place. I feel sure that what has been done will be very confusing to the people charged with the responsibility of implementing this plan. With those few comments I give this Bill my blessing, and I trust those people who are charged with its implementation will get some tangible results out of the wreckage that has already been created under the proposals that were originally envisaged. I support the Bill.

THE HON. E. M. DAVIES (West) [5.15]: I rise to support the second reading of this Bill. Most people will recognise that if we are to plan and zone, particularly the metropolitan area, the sooner we start the better it will be for all concerned. It cannot be denied, of course, that when we attempt to plan for an area that is already occupied by housing, industry, and business and shopping centres, some difficulty is experienced in carrying out the plan without hurting someone. We must realise the hardships we may impose on certain people; and we should make some effort to compensate them for the inconvenience they will suffer.

We can readily understand that those people who are to be affected most as a result of the planning will have something to say in defence of themselves.

Certain people in the area covered by the Bill have acquired property and now they find that that property is to be resumed and utilised for the purpose of carrying out this plan. The Government should ensure that not only will proper compensation be paid to these people— which compensation I understand will be based on valuation plus 10 per cent.—but that they will be given the replacement value. These people are being uprooted from where they have lived for quite a number of years and are being compelled to seek fresh pastures. They should not suffer as a result of this planning which will benefit people in the next generation and in generations to come.

These are some of the main points that have to be considered. We have had talks for many years now about planning and, as I said, the longer we leave it the harder it will be to bring our planning to fruition. Therefore, as we have to make a start some time, I am pleased that this

Bill has been introduced. Except for one or two points which I wish to raise in Committee, I am going to support the Bill.

Most people realise that this plan was accepted in principle by the Government although it was understood that it might be necessary to amend it in certain respects. There are one or two matters which might not be regarded as very important but which should be given some consideration.

I know the Minister for Town Planning has already been down to the Cockburn Road Board area, which has been mentioned today. The Minister knows my views on this subject because when certain facts were pointed out to me I mentioned them to him. I am referring particularly to the fact that there are certain areas in the district I have just mentioned that are zoned as the green belt. I cannot see any great advantage that will accrue in the future as a result of having a minimum of five-acre subdivisational lots. There are quite a number of people who own such properties, but are not able to work them themselves; but they can only dispose of them in five-acre lots because the town planning scheme will not permit a subdivision of them.

Therefore, we find that there are certain people holding land in the green belt and not using it for the purpose for which it was zoned. They would be prepared to dispose of half of it and retain 2½ acres themselves as they are able to work that much. If they were able to dispose of the remaining portion it would result in the whole five acres, or approximately the whole five acres, being used for the production of vegetables. However, for some reason the Town Planning Board remains adamant, and so five acres is the minimum that can be sold. Quite a number of people are suffering hardship because of this law. If the Town Planning Board were to permit a subdivision of the lots, they would be brought into production instead of lying idle as at present.

Another point I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister is that there is some land within the green belt zone which is not fit for agricultural purposes, and yet these people cannot use it for building. I ask the Minister whether he would be good enough to go down to the Cockburn Road Board area again and confer with the members of the road board, the parliamentary members for the district, and other people who have a good knowledge of the area. Together with these people, the Minister could make an inspection of some of the areas, and he could see for himself the land which is not fit for agricultural purposes. He would then, I am sure, recommend that it be used for some other purpose.

I know the desire is to have this measure passed as quickly as possible so that it can be put into effect, but there is one

other question about which I would like to say a few words. I refer to the proposal to utilise Welshpool for the general distribution of cargo which will arrive in ships at Fremantle. We have been told, and I am led to believe—I was a member of the non-political advisory committee which endeavoured to advise the Government, not very successfully, in regard to this matter—that Welshpool will be used as a railway centre. The cargo will be taken from Fremantle and will be distributed from there. One of the anomalies in that plan is that quite a large amount of the cargo which is landed at the wharves is for Fremantle and districts. Surely it is not suggested that that cargo will be taken to Welshpool to be sorted and then sent back by rail or road transport to Fremantle. I feel that that is a most important point which should be considered. It is silly to think of cargo being transported from Fremantle to another centre, sorted, and then returned to the place from whence it came.

I am sure that the Minister will give his attention to both this matter and that of the green belt area in the Cockburn Road Board area, and that he will, if necessary, meet the respective bodies with a view to overcoming some of the difficulties before this actual planning takes place. I support the second reading of this Bill.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland—Minister for Town Planning—in reply) [5.27]: I thank members for their approach to this Bill. No-one appreciates more than I do the difficulties of town planning, as I have experienced them for the last eight months as Minister; and no-one realises more than I do that during the process of town planning, someone has to get hurt. That is inevitable if progress is going to be made and a region such as this is going to be planned.

Mr. Lavery said it was a collective effort. That is quite true. It has to be a collective effort. Therefore, those who are going to be inconvenienced by the implementation of this plan will have to be citizens enough to realise that in the ultimate the whole community will benefit, and that they will have to play their part, distasteful though it may be. Time will tell whether Mr. Diver is correct in regard to the grain terminal at Kwinana. I do not know; but I think he submitted quite a sound argument on the matter.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: He sure did!

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: However, that was not the order of the day, and whether we will have to pay for that mistake, only time will tell. But I can appreciate that had it been possible at this time, to proceed with that particular scheme, we might have been saved a lot of money in the long run.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: I am sure of it!

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: While the remarks made by Mr. Davies are fresh in my mind, I would like to say that

the provision in regard to five-acre subdivisions does not apply to the Cockburn Road Board area alone, but to all rural lands. At one stage the minimum was 10 acres, but a committee consisting of an agriculturist, University officials, and other people connected with agriculture, recommended that it be reduced to 5 acres. As a matter of fact, the agriculturist wanted the 10-acre minimum retained, but finally agreed to the five acres.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: It still prevents them getting electricity.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes. It stops them from getting a lot of things. But I would like to remind Mr. Davies that if I altered the minimum to 2½ acres in the Cockburn Road Board area, I would have to do the same in regard to all rural land.

Once I break down a five-acre lot to 2½ acres, other people with 2½-acre lots will immediately apply for further subdivisions. That happens every day in the week. Once they have been given one subdivision, they apply for a further subdivision.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: Surely we must have regard to the economics of it!

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: There are a few cases where it is agreed to on a hardship basis; and then somebody next door is certain to ask for a subdivision also. If members had to examine these subdivisions as I do, they would appreciate the difficulty that would be created if the principle were once broken away from.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: But there have been subdivisions of 2½ acres.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I know; and many of those people are now asking for a further subdivision. It must be appreciated that in a scheme such as this it is not feasible to mark each piece of land in an area according to its best use. That is the job of the local authority when it presents its plan; and if any local authority has not yet presented a plan it will have to do so when this authority comes into being.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: But there is some land useless for agriculture.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I know that, but that is the job of the local authority when it presents its plan; and that is when the matter will be considered. It is not the job of the Stephenson Plan to classify every piece of land. It deals only with the overall plan.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: I cannot swallow that. It must deal with the suitability of the land.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I agree, and that is why we have plans such as that on the wall of this Chamber. Mr. Davies also mentioned the port freight terminal. I do not know the full history of that; but I believe the original idea was that as Fremantle was congested, with no room

for expansion, it was essential to have somewhere for the goods to be handled; and the committee which existed at that time suggested that the port freight terminal be included among the works at Welshpool. I can assure the honourable member that that will be a long term plan, if it ever comes into being; and there is no immediate idea of putting a port freight terminal at Welshpool.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: All I am asking is that you look at the matter now.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I have done so, and I repeat that it will be a long range plan if it is ever implemented. But it is necessary to make provision for it now. Dr. Hislop has some amendments on the notice paper; and he has suggested a representative of the Perth Road Board on the authority, despite the fact that I have tried to point out what I believe is the fallacy involved.

The PRESIDENT: I would like to point out to the Minister that these matters should be dealt with in Committee.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I think I have the right to reply to questions raised by the honourable member.

The PRESIDENT: No; this can all be dealt with in Committee.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Surely I have the right to reply to the debate!

The PRESIDENT: The second reading debate deals with the principles; the details must be dealt with in Committee.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I feel that I have to disagree with your ruling, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: Do you wish to move that my ruling be disagreed with?

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: I think I should, on the basis that when we ask questions the Minister should have the right to reply to them. However, I will not move to disagree with your ruling.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister may proceed.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I think it is essential for me to make reference to the setting up of this authority, whose job it is to deal with the overall plan. It has been said that there will be too many public servants on the authority; but when we realise the work that has to be done and the qualifications required by members of the authority, it will be appreciated why the men chosen are to be the ones on that authority. They will have to deal with the preparation and execution of the master plan; the design of the major road system within the framework of that plan, including main roads; the re-design of the railway system to deal with increased passenger and goods traffic; the preparation and execution of a plan for the main

sewerage scheme, in relation to development schemes, thus bringing water supply and sewerage into it; the design and provision of a major stormwater drainage system; the provision of adequate electricity and gas services; the planning of public housing estates; the building of new houses and the co-ordination of re-development schemes; the development of a policy for the unified control of traffic and public transport; the execution of the policy; the provision and design and maintenance of open spaces and recreation areas, including beaches; the provision of major industrial areas so that adequate land will be available for new and expanding industries; and a co-ordinated scheme for the disposal of refuse within the region. It will be seen that it covers practically all public services and utilities. It will be appreciated that if we tried to give everyone representation on the authority we would have 20 or 30 or even more members; but it is essential to limit the authority to a workable size.

When similar legislation was previously before the House, exception was taken to the number of public servants on the authority; because they outnumbered the representatives of the local authorities. On this occasion, I have gone a long way to meeting that objection; I have taken one of the public servants off the authority and replaced him with a man—as chairman—who has to have local authority and planning ability; so it is obvious that he will not be a departmental officer.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: He will be hard to get.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Yes, I realise the responsibility I am taking upon myself to find such a man; but I did that to break down the opposition to the six departmental officers and five local authority representatives. I repeat that the regional scheme is an overall plan; and the local authorities will come into the picture when they are planning their own areas. Surely one representative from those areas is all that is required, because before such a representative comes to the authority they will have had district meetings and discussions with their engineers regarding their local problems.

When such a representative is selected from a district and comes to a meeting of the authority, he will have full knowledge of what is wanted in the area he represents; and surely that is all that is required! If we were to put anyone else on the authority, in my opinion the Perth City Council would want two or three representatives, according to the figure I have given regarding the amount of revenue it is likely to pay; so I hope we will not take too long to decide that question.

Dr. Hislop mentioned the right of the authority to acquire land instead of paying compensation; and that is an essential feature of the Bill. Where a road goes through a man's property, causing injurious

affection, and leaving a bit each side of it, it is no use paying him compensation; and therefore the authority is being given power to acquire the land, by negotiation if necessary, at current market values; and if agreement cannot be reached there is power for compensation to be sought under the Public Works Act.

Reference was also made to the right of appeal of the individual; and that is covered in the Bill. No plan can be put up without the Minister's approval, and he will not approve without examining it. When the authority receives any objections it must study them and pass them on to the Minister.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: And he gets out from under.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: He does not. He can tell the authority that he is not satisfied with the plan and make it draw up a fresh one; so we do not need to worry about the rights of the individual.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: We have no need to worry with the present Minister there, but there might be need to worry if we had a weak Minister.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Mr. Watson mentioned buildings in areas that are being rezoned and their having to be moved after a period to some other area. I repeat that someone must be hurt under such a plan. If we zone an area for a particular purpose and allow people there to carry on with the existing use of the land until such time as they have to make major alterations it will be all right, but if we allow them to rebuild there the plan breaks down.

If we did that we would reach a stage where we had no plan at all. There has been considerable debate regarding the means of paying for the scheme; but that question can be dealt with on the tax assessment legislation, and there is no need to debate that aspect at this stage.

Mr. Lavery pointed out that the Government had not consulted the Cockburn Road Board in regard to the site for the proposed new prison. I would advise the honourable member that I have no knowledge of that, because negotiations were commenced before my time.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That is so.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I should imagine, however, that this matter would have been discussed by the Government with the Town Planning Commissioner who would have been asked to report on a suitable site for the new prison. It is hard for me to believe that the Town Planning Commissioner did not confer with the Cockburn Road Board when he was dealing with this matter.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Mr. Davies and I had to go back with a deputation to discuss the question.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Mr. Mattiske suggested that a member of the Real Estate Institute should be appointed as a member of this authority. If that were done, we would be asked to appoint representatives nominated by the Chamber of Manufactures, the Chamber of Commerce and other organisations. Once we opened the door we could go on appointing *ad infinitum*, and we would finish up without any authority.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: I think the figure could get up as high as 120.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I hope we can leave such a decision to the discretion of the Minister. When the members of the authority are being appointed, he will ensure that all sections of the community will receive justice. I do not think there is anything further I can add. I am assured that the members of this House will support the Bill, and for that I will be thankful. I believe it is later than we think, and the sooner we commence to implement our town planning scheme the better it will be for all concerned.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

ENTERTAINMENTS TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Assembly's Amendment

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had been informed by the Clerk of the Parliaments, under Joint Standing Order No. 12, that a clerical error had been found in the "Entertainments Tax Act Amendment Bill," namely, that the word "including" in line 11, page 2, clause 4, appeared in place of "excluding"; and that to rectify this error, the Legislative Assembly had accordingly made an amendment in which it desired the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (the Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; the Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The following amendment has been made by the Legislative Assembly in adjustment of a clerical error as reported by the Clerk of the Parliaments:—

Clause 4, page 2, line 11—Delete the word "including" in the left-hand column of the heading to the Schedule, and insert in lieu the word "excluding."

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to. It is surprising that no matter how vigilant members of both Houses are when considering legislation, errors are still overlooked. We should be grateful to the Under-Treasurer because, as a result of

his making a further examination of this Bill before passing it on to His Excellency the Governor for assent, it is not too late to rectify the error that has been pointed out.

Question put and passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

BETTING CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), read a first time.

METROPOLITAN REGION IMPROVEMENT TAX BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the previous day.

THE HON. G. E. JEFFERY (Suburban) [5.53]: I oppose the second reading of the Bill. It is a very small measure, but, like the scorpion, the sting is in its tail. If we turn to page 2 it will be found that the real intention of this Bill is to impose a tax of one halfpenny in the £ on the unimproved value of land in the metropolitan area, the boundaries of which have been defined under this measure. One could be excused, on looking at the various statutes of this State, for believing that the original concept of the metropolitan area was all that land that one could see from the top of the General Post Office. However for the purposes of this measure one can easily realise the extensive area that is to be included. I feel sure that all the land that is to be embraced by the provisions of this Bill will be that which one could see with a pair of binoculars standing on the top of the TV mast at Bickley.

In defining the metropolitan area, as proposed to be recognised by this Bill, I suggest that the boundaries would be—taking the Perth Town Hall as the centre—a point 19 miles distant in a north-westerly direction; 23 miles to the north-east; nine miles to the west; 25 miles east; 24.25 miles south-east; and, in a south-westerly direction, to a point 44 miles distant as the crow flies. Not being an ornithologist, I do not know whether a crow flies very well, but we could easily substitute an albatross or a homing pigeon for the crow.

From that description, members will realise that, for the purposes of this measure, the metropolitan area represents an extremely large slice of this State. Although I am opposed to the Bill, I fully subscribe to the belief and the knowledge that the Stephenson Plan should,

of necessity, be implemented. Unlike other members, however, I am not quite confident that Professor Stephenson has recommended that his plan should be carried out to the letter. I agree with the details with which the Minister has acquainted us and with some of the alterations which his advisers have made to the original plan.

I suggest that, with changing times and circumstances, further amendments will be made to the Stephenson Plan. Professor Stephenson, who is a very competent town planner, would probably agree with me that since he was last in Perth and drew up his town planning scheme for the City of Perth, the circumstances surrounding that plan have changed considerably. One has only to read the Press reports in the last few days on the ideas that Professor Stephenson has for the extensions to the W.A. University, to realise that circumstances have changed, and that Professor Stephenson himself is one of the first to acknowledge these changes.

In my opinion, any tax that is struck for the improvement of the metropolitan region should be carried by all people in the State. I am one of those unfortunates who live in the metropolitan area. I say "unfortunate" because when introducing any taxing measure, the Government never seems to look further afield than 12 miles from the Perth Town Hall when considering the area that is to bear the tax to be imposed. The other evening, the Minister was expounding his opinion and suggesting that the metropolitan area should bear the full burden of this tax. I suggest, with all due respect to Professor Stephenson and his knowledge of town planning, that anyone can express an opinion on the subject of payment.

I point out that the land values in the metropolitan area have an unfortunate habit of increasing rapidly from year to year.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: Not only in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: The rate at which the increases occur are far more rapid in the metropolitan area than in the country. I can quote clear and typical examples of what I am talking about. I reside in Bassendean, which is not included in the fashionable suburbs of the metropolitan area. Yet, in the last five or six years the land tax on my block has increased by approximately 100 per cent. I will now go further afield and cite the seaside resort of Rockingham. In that area the unimproved value of a block of land, over the past five or six years has risen from £50 to £370, which represents an increase of nearly 750 per cent. The figures I have quoted in regard to the land values in those two places are not unique but are common to all suburbs in the metropolitan area; and, in some instances, the increases would be even greater.

I suggest that it would be very hard to convince a person living in Queen's Park that he would, because he would be adjacent to the proposed Welshpool railway marshalling yards, gain any advantage from the improvements made in the metropolitan region. He would not gain any benefit from that improvement any more than would a farmer living in Hyden or in some other country centre.

I was interested in the comments made by the Minister when he said that there were no surplus funds in the State Treasury. I suggest that there never will be if the Government is going to ignore the advice of experts on these particular subjects. I point to the advice that was given to the Government by experts on the question of reopening the closed railway lines. The opinion expressed in this instance was that to reopen any of the lines would not be a payable proposition.

Having taken the opportunity to express my views on these subjects, because they are of real importance to the State, I suggest that the Government should look to the rural interests to contribute to this scheme because, in my opinion, the cost should be borne by people throughout the State. I have studied the map which sets out the boundaries of the various road boards; and if there are any discrepancies in what I am about to say they are because of the size of the map as, unfortunately, it was the only one I could obtain.

The honourable member who advanced the argument that the ratepayers in the metropolitan area should pay for these improvements, will have great trouble in convincing a resident of Keysbrook, which is in the Serpentine-Jarrahdale Road Board district, that he will gain more benefit from the scheme than a resident in Mandurah, which is in the Murray Road Board district. The former will have to contribute to the cost, but the latter will not.

Similarly, a person living in Wooroloo, within the district of the Mundaring Road Board, will have to pay this tax; whereas his neighbour living in Wundowie, in the Northam Road Board district, will not have to pay the tax. It will be very hard to convince the resident of Wooroloo that he will receive greater benefit from the scheme than will his neighbour at Wundowie.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Is not this argument like the one on country water supplies?

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: A person living in Bullsbrook, within the Swan Road Board district will have to pay the tax, whereas a person living in Muchea, in the Chittering Road Board district, will not have to pay. Any benefit to be gained from the scheme will be a State-wide benefit, and everyone should contribute towards the cost. Either that, or there should be no tax at all and the funds for this purpose should come from the Treasury.

It is all very well for members representing rural districts to say that the people in the metropolitan area will derive a benefit, but I suggest that the farmer will gain a greater benefit from the establishment of the marshalling yards at Welshpool because of the greater efficiency that will be apparent in the handling of his produce. In the vast majority of cases, a person lives in the metropolitan area because his work demands it. The stake he has in land in this State would be one quarter of an acre in most instances, and less in others.

I have heard a lot of reference to the dead heart of Australia. We conjure up Alice Springs in the middle of Australia as being the centre; but the dead heart, or the back of Bourke, from the economic point of view, will be the city block of Perth, bounded by St. George's Terrace and Wellington Street, by Parliament House on one side and the Causeway on the other.

I find it very hard to understand why this tax is to be imposed only in the metropolitan area. I am not suggesting that the amount to be raised under the Bill will be the straw that breaks the camel's back; but that the taxpayer will suffer a couple of severely displaced discs, at the least.

Another feature of this land tax is that the Minister stated he did not know how much the scheme would cost. Surely the Government has some idea of its commitments! The people affected by this measure in the Welshpool area are waiting for the settlement of their claims for resumption. I suggest this is one of those taxes that will go on for ever. The improvement of the City of Perth will continue *ad infinitum*, because every extension of the city will create new problems.

Once imposed, this tax will never be removed. With the growth of the city, a greater amount will be collected from this tax because there will undoubtedly be a steep increase in land values. The person who is told blithely today that this tax will cost only 8s. will find that in a couple of years' time it will be increased to £1 or more. I suggest that our views regarding the financial impact of this measure are not immediately obvious, but with the passage of time the public will realise that the City of Perth is not all that it might be for people to live in.

The present Government is increasing taxation in a number of fields, but Governments do not always introduce a Bill into Parliament to increase taxation. They can achieve the objective by increasing land values as a result of departmental revaluation. Looking back at all the taxing measures introduced in the Commonwealth and State fields and at the measures recently introduced by this Government, one must agree that the tax proposed under the Bill before us should not be imposed on the people of the metropolitan area.

I am not altogether happy with some of the exemptions which are contained in the Bill. I find it very hard to reconcile the fact that a person living in Mount Street, Perth, or Parker Street, Bassendean, or in any other street in the metropolitan area will have to pay this tax; whereas any person whose land is to be used principally for the purpose of agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, apicultural, viticultural, grazing, pig-raising or poultry-farming purposes, will not have to pay the tax.

In considering the effect of taxation, it is strange that the average individual, after a lifetime of work, does not leave a great deal of money; yet many of the people proposed to be exempt from the tax under this Bill will leave very healthy estates. If land is used for production and for earning an income, it should pay the tax, the same as land which is non-productive. I oppose the second reading.

THE HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [6.5]: I did not intend to speak during this debate, but after listening to the comments and criticisms of the honourable member who has just sat down, to the effect that all land-owners in this State should pay the tax, I felt I must voice my disapproval of those remarks.

In the province which I represent, two or three towns recently advanced town planning schemes, but I am not aware that the residents of those towns asked the honourable member for any financial assistance in the implementation of those schemes.

The Hon. G. E. Jeffery: The honourable member pays it in the constituency in which he lives.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: I know that the authorities in Wongan Hills have gone to great expense to bring about a change in the planning of the town. Recently the first changes under the plan were implemented at considerable expense to the people in the district. We all know that the town of Dowerin is doing likewise. We know that the Moora Road Board has expended a great sum of money in complying with the plans set out under the new scheme. Surely the honourable member was not really honest when he put up the proposition—

The Hon. G. E. Jeffery: I ask the honourable member to withdraw the remark. I was completely honest when I made the statement.

The PRESIDENT: An objection has been taken to the statement made.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: The honourable member may have misunderstood me. I had not finished the sentence when he interjected. I consider him to be a thoroughly honest man. I would not mind him owing me money because I know I would get it back. I feel that he has not taken an honest consideration of all the facts.

The PRESIDENT: Has the honourable member withdrawn the statement to which objection has been raised?

The Hon. A. R. JONES: If I made a statement to which objection has been taken, I withdraw it. Surely the honourable member has not made an honest appreciation of the situation which exists in the country! The ratepayers of Wongan Hills will contribute considerably more towards the implementation of their town planning scheme than the ratepayers in the metropolitan area will pay towards the metropolitan region town planning scheme, because of the small population of Wongan Hills.

I hope that members will not take the same view as Mr. Jeffery. The implementation of the metropolitan region scheme will confer a benefit on 99 per cent. of the people living in the city, as against 1 per cent. of the people living in the country. Many of the country people will not derive any benefit from the scheme. Others, coming down to Perth, may save a few minutes when crossing the city, or when they travel from Fremantle through to Midland Junction. In the overall result, the country people will not gain anything. I appeal to members not to be selfish in this regard. Let the people who are to derive the greatest benefit from this development make the contribution towards it.

The people in the country who are implementing town planning schemes will pay the costs themselves. They do not ask the people living in the metropolitan area to contribute to those schemes, and I feel proud that they do not. I ask members representing the city and near-city districts to try and feel the same way about their ratepayers.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [6.10]: During the debate on the related measure, I expressed the thought that a reduction in land tax in the metropolitan area was envisaged. Instead of imposing a new tax, the cost involved in this tax should be adjusted in the previous measure. If my information is correct, surely that can be done this year!

It is my belief that the information which I have obtained is correct, and that such a proposal is on the planning board. It could bring about a considerable reduction—one that would be in excess of the amount which will be collected under this measure. It will be a reduction in the metropolitan area.

Even if the Government imposes this tax, and later introduces a reduction of the existing tax, I do not think it will overcome the dislike of the citizens towards paying a new tax. The fact that the citizen will receive a reduction later on will not remove his idea that a new tax has been imposed. This matter should

be looked at in a broader aspect than it has been up to this stage. Surely that can be done by the Treasury officials!

The fact that money is to be obtained for some purpose does not mean the imposition of a particularised tax for that purpose. The land tax can be divided to meet the needs of the people; that should be done rather than that the tax should be reduced on the one hand and raised on the other. Those of us representing the metropolitan area are not at all keen on this measure; and we may find the vote in this debate against it.

I suggest the Minister should give further thought to the Bill and consult Cabinet in regard to the suggestions I have advanced. A great benefit will be conferred if a withdrawal of this tax can be arranged, and if alterations can be made in the legislation. I agree with the comments of those who say that people living in the farflung corners of the metropolitan area will benefit as little from the development under this Bill as the people living in small suburbs they will be called upon to contribute to their local development scheme, just as the people in Wongan Hills have been called upon to contribute to theirs. Therefore the resentment of both groups of people will be just as great.

The important feature to which we must give consideration is that if this tax is agreed to, we will be agreeing to its continuance and to its increase. We must give thought to that factor. If this matter is readjusted in the way I have suggested, then we can come to a common arrangement, at least for this year, that there shall be no direct tax imposed.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: There is another clause of this Bill to which I find myself unable to give unqualified approval. That is the one which exempts from taxation those people who are holding within the metropolitan area agricultural land which is virtually not classed as agricultural. The result is that these people will be paying taxation on the basis that their land is fit for subdivision. Apparently this Bill is destined to give these people relief from land tax; but it does not do so. If we really want to give them relief, we should bring down a measure to exempt from the provisions of any town planning Act land which is now held under these terms and which is regarded as fit for subdivision—land on which land tax is paid on that basis.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: And municipal and road board rates.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Yes. This Bill does not do justice to people who own such land. They should get justice by a measure which would exempt them and which would put them back on the basis

of only owning purely agricultural land which would be taxed as such, both for land tax purposes and by local authorities. Simply to exempt them from the halfpenny in the £ tax cannot be justified as a means of giving them relief. Therefore this whole measure needs reviewing.

Despite the fact that I might be voting against my own Government, I still believe that the correct method of approach to town planning is by neglecting this measure; and when another Bill is introduced I feel it must be as a promise that the land tax will be considerably reduced; and that it will be reduced not by the amount proposed, but by the amount less the tax that would have come to the Government through this measure. Then, I think we would get over the question of principle. We will not establish a principle this year, although we might have to later, that the metropolitan people will pay for the whole of the town planning improvements in the metropolitan area. It may still come to that, but what I have suggested would delay it for one year.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: When you will be in a better position to measure it.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: At the moment it is anybody's guess as to what it will cost. I visualise that the large sums of money which we anticipate receiving for the next five years will go a considerable way towards providing roadways that will be necessary through planned areas. Many of these will go out a considerable distance from the actual heart of the city; and it seems to me quite extraordinary that even the Metropolitan Province that I represent goes as far as 14 miles up the coast to a place like Waterman's Bay.

Under this Bill the metropolitan area extends over the huge area which was pointed out by Mr. Jeffery—more than half way to Pinjarra, and down, I think, to Long Point, which is a tremendous area and quite divorced from the metropolitan zone as we know it today. It will be years before any town planning need take place in those areas. Therefore, I appeal to the Minister to ask Cabinet to reconsider this measure and to adopt the suggestion I have made. I do not believe the Government will gain any kudos from reducing land tax on the one hand and imposing a new tax on the other, because the public realises that once a tax is imposed it is never done away with; and town planning will go on and on. It will be necessary to alter the lay-out of the city as the city expands.

One can see that in almost every one of the big cities of the world today. I admit that the neglect of town planning could lead to considerable trouble; and it is extraordinary how people only a few years ago failed to realise the impact of town planning. One has only to look at the city of San Francisco, which forgot to build a civic centre. Now the civic centre

of San Francisco is about the same distance away as Mount Lawley is from the city of Perth. Those things will happen. Even the site of the town hall, as envisaged today, will be quite inadequate in 50 years' time. The next generation will probably then be faced with the problem of redesigning the town hall site and redesigning the town hall. In our planning we have not been relatively big enough in regard to how the city will grow.

Therefore, some idea as to what the city can afford to spend must be reached by the Government. At this stage we cannot introduce the principle that the metropolitan area pays for the whole of its town planning, because town planning may envisage such things as have been discussed. The question, for example, of wharfage will affect not only the people in the metropolitan area but every citizen in the State. We will require such things as railway terminals, bus terminals, and all the rest of it; and these things will extend far beyond the metropolitan area. However, if we keep to the principle of this Bill, we will be maintaining that the centre of the city will pay for town planning development in the future. I appeal to the Minister to give us at least one year in which to think this matter over.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: What are the individuals going to do in the meantime? Are they going to suffer as they have done during the last three or four years? You want to prolong their agony.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I am not an aggressive type of person and I do not appreciate aggressive replies.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: That is what you are doing; prolonging the agony.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: It is completely stupid to talk in that way and I am sorry to have to speak to a Minister in the way in which I am going to. If he fails to realise that what has been put to him is a sensible suggestion, I am sorry he is holding his present portfolios. What has been proposed is simply that a different method of taxation shall occur without one penny being lost to the Government. I understand that it is proposed to reduce land tax by the sum of about £250,000.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: There is no notice of that in the Bill.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: There is not the slightest notice as the Minister knows. I have suggested that the amount of money be reduced by the amount of money which would be obtained under this measure. It is incorrect to say that this will make the people suffer as they have done in the past.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It is correct.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The Government will have exactly the same amount of money in hand as it will receive from the

proposal in this Bill. If that is not apparent to the Minister, I cannot help it. My intention at the moment is to oppose this measure.

On motion by the Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government), debate adjourned.

NARROWS BRIDGE OPENING

Invitations—Personal Explanations

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND: Mr. President, under Standing Order No. 383 I desire the indulgence of the Council to make a personal explanation.

The PRESIDENT: The Honourable member may proceed.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It has come to my notice, Mr. President, in reading the *Votes and Proceedings*, of the Legislative Assembly, No. 53, dated Wednesday, the 11th November, 1959, that a question was asked in connection with invitations to the opening ceremony of the Narrows Bridge. The question was as follows:—

(1) How many members of—

(a) Legislative Assembly;

(b) Legislative Council;

asked for invitations to attend the opening of the new bridge?

(2) Who are they?

The responsible Minister replied—

(1) and (2) Lists with the following names thereon were forwarded by the Clerks of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council.

The name, Mr. President, of H. C. Strickland is included in the list from the Legislative Council. I made no personal request for an invitation to attend the opening ceremony. As a matter of fact, I will be 1,000 miles from the bridge when the ceremony is being performed. I desire to protest at the information the Minister has submitted in another place, and I would like you to advise me as to what action can be taken to advise the Legislative Assembly that the information is incorrect.

THE HON. R. THOMPSON: I also register my protest. I did not at any stage apply for an invitation to the opening of the Narrows Bridge. Indeed, I have never asked for an invitation in my life, and I am sure I am not going to start now. Like the leader of this side of the House, I register my protest at the answer given in another place as I did not make any application. I also would like some action taken as suggested by my leader.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE: The question read by the Leader of the Opposition is perfectly clear, and the answer can only be said to imply, if not wholly state, that

the names given were of members who applied for an invitation. My name is on the list, and I did not apply for an invitation.

THE HON. A. L. LOTON: I find that my name is also included in the list. I did not put my name on the paper that was on the notice board; and I made no application to the Minister for an invitation to the opening ceremony.

THE HON. R. F. HUTCHISON: I did not put my name on the list. I thought everyone would have got an invitation.

THE HON. G. E. JEFFERY: I associate myself with the remarks that have been made. I did not make an application for an invitation to attend the opening of the Narrows Bridge. I received an invitation, and I thought that it was given to me as a matter of courtesy, because I represent one of the provinces connected with the new bridge.

THE HON. W. F. WILLESEE: I associate myself with the remarks that have been raised. I did not realise that not everyone had received an invitation in the same manner as I had. I cannot attend the ceremony because a fortnight ago I made an appointment for tomorrow. When I received an invitation I thought that it was a normal invitation given to me along with invitations sent to my fellow members of Parliament.

THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am in exactly the same position as my leader; although I did ask the Minister for Mines this question last Tuesday—

In view of the fact that I have received an invitation to the opening of the Narrows Bridge next Friday, when can it be expected that all other members of the Legislative Council will receive their invitations?

I did not apply for the invitation I received.

THE HON. L. C. DIVER: I was rather surprised to hear what the Leader of the Opposition said. My attention has been drawn to the fact that my name is also included amongst those who applied for an invitation. I did not do so.

THE HON. E. M. DAVIES: I have received an invitation, but I did not make any application, either in writing or verbally. I will be attending the function as a representative of the City of Fremantle.

THE HON. H. K. WATSON: In my time I have attended openings of the House of Commons, Armistice Day celebrations in London, and various other functions, and on each occasion it has been necessary for those who desired to

attend to make application for an invitation. On this occasion I did so by putting my name on the list which was on the notice board.

The PRESIDENT: I did not even see the notice; I did not look at it, and I know nothing at all about it. I shall ask the Leader of the House whether he can give us some information on the matter.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I draw attention to the fact that a personal explanation is not open to debate.

The PRESIDENT: Does the honourable member want to reply?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: No. I understood the Minister was about to reply, but I draw attention to the fact that under Standing Order No. 383, such matters may not be debated.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH: Under the same Standing Order, I, too, ask for your indulgence, Sir, to make a personal explanation covering the circumstances of this matter. I might say that I have heard some things in this Chamber, but I have never heard anything as petty as this in all my born days.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I draw attention to the fact that the Minister is debating my explanation.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I apologise; I shall stick strictly to the point of explanation. On the notice board there was pinned this document headed, "Narrows Bridge Official Opening on Friday the 13th November." Then followed these words, "Members who desire to attend the above function are requested to sign hereunder before Friday, the 6th November. Invitations, when issued, will include the member's wife." Then occur the names of Mr. Mattiske, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Watson and Dr. Hislop. They had placed their names on the list. I am informed that the Clerk of the Legislative Council in a genuine desire to protect the interests of members, who, he thought, might like to attend the proceedings, typed their names on the notice paper in order that they would have an opportunity to attend the function; and because he knew full well, as I had explained to Mr. Lavery the other day when he told me he had received an invitation, that accommodation would be available for 40 members and their wives.

So that the members who attended the opening would not all be from the Legislative Assembly, and so that the Legislative Council would not be neglected, Mr. Roberts thoughtfully typed the names of the following people whom he thought would be here tomorrow—

Mr. Diver, Mr. Hall, Mr. Heenan, Mrs. Hutchison, Mr. Jeffery, Mr. Jones, Mr. Lavery, Mr. Loton, Mr. Murray, Mr. Roche, Mr. Strickland, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Willesee, and Mr. Wise.

All I can say is that the Clerk has received small reward for his efforts on behalf of members.

The PRESIDENT: I hope the Minister will not discuss that point.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The question asked in the Legislative Assembly is as follows:—

Mr. Graham, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Works:

(1) How many members of—

(a) Legislative Assembly;

(b) Legislative Council;

asked for invitations to attend the opening of the new bridge?

(2) Who are they?

The answer is as follows:—

Mr. Wild replied:

(1) and (2) Lists with the following names thereon were forwarded by the Clerks of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council:—

Assembly—

I W. Manning.

W. H. Sewell.

E. H. M. Lewis.

J. J. Rhatigan.

Council—

R. C. Mattiske.

J. M. A. Cunningham.

C. H. Simpson.

H. K. Watson.

J. G. Hislop.

L. C. Diver.

W. R. Hall.

E. M. Heenan.

R. F. Hutchison.

G. E. Jeffery.

A. R. Jones.

F. R. H. Lavery.

A. L. Loton.

J. Murray.

H. L. Roche.

H. C. Strickland.

R. Thompson.

W. F. Willesee.

F. J. S. Wise.

E. M. Davies.

Three of the above names were submitted since yesterday.

Nothing is said in the question or answer about an invitation being issued.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND: On a further point of explanation, I am not complaining about who was responsible for the action taken at this end: I am complaining that *Hansard* in reporting the proceedings in another place will show that I asked for an invitation to attend the ceremony. I want to make it perfectly clear that I did not ask for an invitation, and that I will be in Wittenoom Gorge when the ceremony is being performed.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: I wish to withdraw my remarks. I had no idea that our Clerk had done that.

The PRESIDENT: I think what was done by the Clerk was done in good faith, and I hope members will accept it as such. The Clerk did this so that members of this House would not be deprived of an invitation simply because of an oversight. I hope members will accept that.

The Hon. W. F. Willesee: Certainly.

STATE FORESTS

To Revoke Dedication

Message from the Assembly requesting the Council's concurrence in the following resolution now considered:—

That the proposal for the partial revocation of State Forests Nos. 4, 9, 14, 16, 22, 28, 32, 33, 47, 49, 51 and 52, laid on the table of the Legislative Assembly by command of His Excellency the Governor on Tuesday, the 10th November, 1959, be carried out.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [7.55]: I move—

That the resolution be agreed to.

This is the usual resolution submitted to both Houses of Parliament towards the end of the session. It is moved in compliance with section 21 of the Forests Act, which provides that Parliament must give consideration to any proposal to revoke in whole or in part the dedication of any State forest. Members have had an opportunity to study the proposals in these resolutions because yesterday the particulars, including the plan of each proposed revocation, were tabled. There are 12 areas concerned in the resolution; and Area No. 1 is adjacent to the Collie town-site on the North-East. Approximately 240 acres are required for industrial purposes. The second area is about two miles north of Wilgarup where approximately 160 acres of poor forest has been applied for by a landholder in the locality.

Area No. 3 is about five miles north-east of Waroona. Here approximately 27 acres of dieback country has been applied for by an adjoining landowner. Also applied for by an adjoining landowner is area No. 4. This is approximately nine miles west of Cookernup. Approximately 32 acres of poor forest land is to be exchanged with the landholder for approximately 30 acres of undeveloped timbered country.

Comprising approximately four acres, which has only a very small quantity of timber is area No. 5 which is about half-a-mile north-east of Carilla. This also has been applied for by an adjoining landholder. At Pickering Brook, area No. 6 covering approximately 66 acres is required as a recreation reserve for a golf course.

Area No. 7 is about six miles south-west of Donnybrook. Approximately 8½ acres of land were cleared many years ago in error by the then adjoining landholder, and this piece of land has now been applied for by the present adjoining holder.

In area No. 8 there are 31 acres of poor forest which, together with an area of 20 acres of Crown land, is to be exchanged with the adjoining landholder for approximately 60 acres of undeveloped timbered country. This area is about 12 miles south of Busselton. About three miles north of Walpole is the location of area No. 9. Here approximately 130 acres of non-timbered land has been applied for by an adjoining landholder. Area No. 10 is about three miles north of Kirup. Here approximately 28 acres run along a gully and carry only a small quantity of timber. This area is to be exchanged with an adjoining landholder for 20 acres of undeveloped freehold land surrounded by State forest.

About 12 miles north-west of Cuballing, area No. 11 comprises approximately 105 acres of poor timbered land which has been applied for by an adjoining landholder who is to cede approximately 30 acres of mallet country for inclusion in State forest. The last area, No. 12, is about 11 miles south-west of Highbury. Approximately 143 acres of open flat carrying very little timber of value has been applied for here by an adjoining landholder.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [7.59]: I have had an opportunity to examine the schedules and the particulars of the areas to be revoked from existing State forests, and I support the resolution.

Question put and passed, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

BOOKMAKERS BETTING TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. A. F. Griffith (Minister for Mines), read a first time.

STATE TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the previous day.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (North) [8.0]: As the Minister explained, this measure is designed to give the Transport Board power to advise on certain matters; and some of those matters are in respect to transport where rail services are inadequate, where they do not operate, or where they are not provided; and to advise the Government as to the provision of adequate alternative transport, and as to the subsidising or otherwise of that transport.

It seems rather strange to me that legislation of this nature is required when, to my knowledge, the Transport Board has carried out such functions previously. The board may not have been an authoritative body, but I cannot see that, when it is asked to give advice, it necessarily becomes an authoritative body. The functions of the Transport Board have always included inquiries into all matters referred to it in connection with transport, or which come under its jurisdiction as a result of the Act governing the board and its activities. But now we find that there is to be written into the Act some further provisions which will give some authority to the board.

I should like the Minister to tell me, when he replies, why this Bill is really necessary when whatever advice which may be submitted to the Government by the board does not necessarily have to be accepted or carried out. It seems a rather extraordinary measure, and it becomes even more extraordinary when we see that the Governor may by regulation authorise the subsidy to be paid for certain transport services. The Governor, which means the Government or Cabinet, can decide to subsidise any sort of transport. There is no need whatever to authorise that action by way of a regulation, which is proposed by this Bill.

The Bill does not say that that will be done, but that it can be done. Naturally, when one sees this type of proposal one becomes a little suspicious as to the reason behind it. The only reason that I can read into it is that the Government feels that its tenure of office may be no longer than the present term, and certain sections of the Government are very keen to see that some sort of transport subsidy will be provided somewhere, which no other Government in the future will be able to alter, revoke or rescind. I cannot see any other reason for it. So it seems to me that subsidies will be paid in certain areas yet to be defined, and they will be paid, virtually, for an indefinite period.

If a regulation authorising a subsidy in a particular area is gazetted and tabled, its disallowance in the Legislative Council would be problematical, and could become a complicated issue. As I read our Standing Orders, the Legislative Council has no power to interfere with any measure which might or would impose a burden on the people. It does not say all of the people, or some of the people, or what number of people, but simply the people. If by way of a regulation a subsidy is being paid to a district for its transport service, and certain members in the Legislative Council desire to disallow or vary it in any way, it seems to me that there would be some difficulty because some people in the district would be receiving a monetary benefit through the subsidy, and therefore the Legislative Council would have no authority to do anything about the regulation. If the Legislative Council disallowed it, it

would place a burden upon a section of that community, and therefore any move in that direction may be out of order.

If what I presume may be the case, the Legislative Council would be powerless to deal with that type of regulation. Whether it is a fact or not, I am not sufficiently well versed in legal matters to say, but it may be so; and it is a point which has crossed my mind since I have been looking at the Bill.

Dealing with subsidies, generally, it seems that this legislation is the outcome of the action of Parliament in 1956 in deciding that certain railways should no longer operate; and at that time Parliament raised no objection to a reduction in the subsidies which were to be paid in areas where the railway services ceased to operate, or those which were being paid in areas where lines had never operated, or where somebody promised sometime, somewhere, that a line might be built.

I read in *Hansard* a reply to some questions which were asked this year as to what subsidies were being paid, where they were being paid, and for what reasons they were being paid. Without exception the replies were to the effect that the subsidies were being paid in certain districts because rail services were promised to the people in those districts. I know that in some of the districts mentioned, no promise was made by any Government to provide a rail service.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: What districts?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: But the subsidies were being paid possibly because the member for the district, or somebody representing a Party, had promised a railway.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They would not get it unless there was some justification for it.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Whether the justification for it came into the question I do not know; but I cannot remember any Government ever promising to build a railway line to Rocky Gully, and then not carrying out the construction of that railway. I would be pleased if any honourable member could tell me which Government promised such a railway.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Yarramony eastward was one.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: So when this question of a subsidy arises, it seems that an area gets consideration from this Government only if it is in the southern part of the State. The questions to which I was referring were asked in connection with a subsidy for primary producers in the Gascayne area who were hard pressed at the time, and who were losing money. The reply was that no subsidy could be granted because no railway had been promised. If I wrote and told the people there that I would promise them a railway, perhaps that might make

them eligible for a subsidy, because Rocky Gully and a few other places were mentioned in that fashion.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They would not believe you.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I know that this Government would not believe us, and would not subsidise the settlers there, because it has turned them down flat. The question of subsidies is more urgent in some areas in the North than it is in areas in the south. The idea of the rail subsidy is to reimburse a section of the community for the loss of a service, or for a service which others receive and they do not. It does not matter how big the person's income is because there is no means test; and it would not matter if a man had 500 or 5,000 bales of wool, or 1,000 acres of wheat under crop, he could still be subsidised for any extra cost involved in the transport of his goods.

When North-West members recently approached the Minister for Agriculture with a request to subsidise a struggling pastoralist, who was running a pastoral property adjoining the townsite of Broome, the request was turned down flat.

We were given no hope; our written request was turned down, and even though the matter was still under consideration very little hope of success was expressed to the deputation. It seems to me rather strange that this Government wants to make certain that subsidies which are operating today—and which it restored; and it took a lot of kudos for restoring something which Parliament had agreed should be taken away only a few years previously—should apply to its friends in the wheat-belt areas. It is remarkable that the Government can see only as far as the wheat-belt extends; it does not seem to be able to see any further north in so far as primary producers are concerned.

The case at Broome is that of a pastoralist who up till this year shipped all his cattle from Roebuck Plains Station to the metropolitan area by way of the Broome jetty. The Department of Agriculture installed a special spray dip seven miles out of Derby and told the pastoralist living 15 miles from Broome that he could not ship his stock over the Broome jetty; that he must take them 110 miles to Derby.

We can imagine what would happen if we said to farmers within 300 miles of Parliament House, "You will have to take your stock 15 or 20 miles to the next railway line." What a storm we would have in this House! What a storm we would hear from the *Farmer's Weekly*, and every other paper that could bang a tin, or thought it could do something about it! What a calamity that would be considered! Here we have a pastoralist struggling along and trying to sell his cattle to the Broome Meatworks and, because he is in the hands

of the agents, being told that he must send them to Robb Jetty via Derby. He is put to the expense of transporting his cattle. We must not lose sight of the fact that there is no water supply between Derby and Broome. It cost about £700 to comply with the instructions of the Department of Agriculture; and when this man asked to be subsidised he was turned down flat.

Today we find a Government, which cannot see past the wheatbelt, prepared to subsidise the farmers; whether they have 500 bales of wool or not, it makes no difference; nor does it matter whether they are wealthy or poor, they must be subsidised, under this Bill, by regulation which no other Government will be able to cancel or alter, unless it is invalid, without the consent of the Legislative Council. I said before that the Council may have no power under its Standing Orders, but I imagine that the Government would have looked carefully into that aspect, and, perhaps, assured itself in the following strain: "We are going to subsidise our wealthy friends down here for ever and a day. Should the people of the State change the Government in 2½ years' time, that Government will still have to subsidise our friends."

That is my interpretation of the position. In my opinion, it is wrong for any Government or any Treasurer to take from itself or himself the direct control of Treasury funds; subsidies come from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and when a Treasurer parts with control over that fund it is a very dangerous precedent. It is absolutely wrong that such a proposal should ever become law; because, after all, surely the Cabinet and Treasurer should have full control over the finances of the country, and not be subject to Parliament in relation to subsidies; the Treasurer should not be told whether they should be altered, reduced or continued. That should be the prerogative of the Government, and the Government—any Government and all Governments—should have the courage and stamina to stand up to its responsibilities in that respect.

The Government should not try to shield itself behind Parliament in the matter of subsidies. I know that we did ask for the opinion of Parliament in relation to the discontinuance of the railways which constituted a very heavy drain on Treasury funds, but I feel it is quite wrong to commit all Governments of the future to the payment of subsidies for all time, unless the Legislative Council thinks otherwise. I feel that, because, the Government of the State is elected on a democratic franchise, whereas the Legislative Council is not so elected. It is elected on a restricted property franchise, and, accordingly, it should have no say in the reduction, or otherwise, of

Treasury funds, any more than it has a say under our Standing Orders in relation to taxing measures or money Bills.

The Legislative Council cannot amend—though it can reject—money Bills; it cannot impose a burden on the people under our Standing Orders. Yet the Government proposes to repose in the Legislative Council final and full control over these subsidies. What these subsidies are, I do not know, but I think it is quite reasonable to state that any subsidy, whatever it may be, should never be sanctioned for an indefinite period; the Treasury should never place itself in the position of losing control in this matter for the simple reason that the time could come, and no doubt would come, when such subsidies were not warranted.

Let us imagine subsidies by regulation being tabled in this House, and the price of wool, we shall say, going to where it went in 1951. It would be too ridiculous to ask the taxpayers in the State to subsidise woolgrowers who were earning big incomes as a result of such prices. Yet the Government of the day would have no say without the consent of Parliament. Once the regulation came into force it would mean that another regulation would be required to alter or vary it. In the last provision of the Bill it has been laid down that whatever subsidy is applied through regulation will continue to apply until such time as Parliament meets again to disallow it. That is how I read it.

Accordingly a subsidy could be applied in the next few weeks, and we may find that the prices of commodities rise to some high level in the following few months; yet the subsidy would still be paid, and would continue to be paid, and could not be varied or altered until such time as Parliament met in the following session. Then of course there would be the usual argument amongst the members, in the Legislative Council, anyway, as to whether the subsidy was warranted or not; and there would be the usual parochial views expressed, and lines of argument pursued.

This measure should not be supported by the Legislative Council, although it could have the effect of doing two things. If my interpretation of our Standing Orders is correct, it would mean that the Council would have no say anyway, because the Council could not place a burden or impose any further tax on the people; and, therefore, it could not increase the subsidy, because it would have to tax some other section of the community to meet the increase. Nor could it repeal or disallow the regulation, because it would be imposing a burden on the people who receive the subsidy.

That is the manner in which I view the situation. If my interpretation were correct, the Council would become impotent.

On the other hand, if my interpretation were incorrect, it could become all-powerful and could say whether it would disallow, or continue, or vary the subsidy. I would like the Minister to give us some authoritative advice, which no doubt he will receive from the Crown Law Department, in connection with the views expressed. It is a complete departure from normal democratic government to run away from the responsibility of subsidising an area, a district, an industry, or an individual. It is wrong for any Government to run away from that direct responsibility because, after all, surely the Treasurer is the Treasurer; and all the people of the State look towards the Treasurer as being responsible for the collection and expenditure of the funds of the State. I oppose the Bill.

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

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Further Recommittal

On motion by the Hon. R. Thompson, Bill again recommitted for the further consideration of clause 8.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (the Hon. W. R. Hall) in the Chair; the Hon. L. A. Logan (Minister for Local Government) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 8—Third Schedule amended:

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I have altered the amendment which appears on the notice paper in my name. I move an amendment—

Page 9—Add after paragraph (a) a new paragraph to stand as paragraph (b) as follows:

(b) adding at the end of Item 1 the following proviso—

Provided that where the license is required by a person who is over the age of seventeen years and in receipt of Social Service Benefits, Age, Invalid, Widows or Blind Pensions and whose total income is less than seventy-five per centum of the State basic wage the fee shall be eighty per centum of the prescribed fee.

I know that some members expressed the desirability of assisting pensioners in some way or other. The effect of my amendment will be that people under the categories mentioned will not be called upon to pay the increased fee. They will be in the same position as they are at present.

Point of Order

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would like your ruling in regard to this matter, Sir. The honourable member has not moved his amendment as it appears on the notice paper. Standing order No. 204a reads—

No amendment shall be made in, and no new clause shall be added to, any Bill recommitted on the Third Reading, unless notice thereof has been previously given.

Members have had no notice of this amendment. My colleague and I have just been handed a copy of the proposed amendment which, as I say, is different from that which appears on the notice paper. I would like you, Sir, to tell me whether it is competent for the Committee to continue to deal with this amendment.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: I think that is quibbling.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It is not.

The CHAIRMAN: It would have been competent for the honourable member to move his amendment as it appears on the notice paper and then have it amended in accordance with the motion before the Chair. However, it is more convenient to have it amended in this way, and I rule that it is in order as far as I am concerned.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Thank you.

Committee Resumed

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr. Thompson could perhaps tell me what percentage of the basic wage an apprentice of 18 years—probably in his third year—would be receiving. Would he have to be in receipt of social services at the time he applied for his license?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I believe that the amendment is quite clear. It does not apply to apprentices. It applies to the persons specified—aged, invalid, widow or blind pensioners.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What about those receiving social services?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: They are the ones receiving social service benefits—aged, invalid, widow or blind pensioners.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: What about unemployed persons?

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I am dealing with pensioners as specified in the amendment, not unemployed people. The four types of pensioners have been specified, and they are all I am asking this Committee to agree to.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Would the Minister please tell me whether a person over the age of 17 in receipt of social service benefits would be included in this amendment? In other words, does the expression "Social Service Benefits" include unemployed? I think it would.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I think it is unfortunate that the honourable member has submitted an entirely different amendment to that which appears on the notice paper, because it makes it very difficult for Ministers, the *Hansard* staff, and members, as they have no copy of the amendment. However, I would not like to be the secretary or a member of the staff of a local authority who had to try to make decisions under this amendment, were it to become law, because I think it is impracticable.

I do not know whether the local authority would be supposed to make these people sign statutory declarations. Such a person might have little or no income one week; and he apply for and receive a reduction in license, and then the following week obtain a job and earn a good wage for the rest of the year. An old-age pensioner couple would receive £9 per week, with an extra 10s. if one of them was paying rent; and such a couple would be entitled to earn another £7 a week between them. I think the amendment would make it necessary to institute a means test under this measure; which would be undesirable. Local authorities would have to ascertain the income of applicants, and I do not know how it could be done.

Under section 11 of the Traffic Act there is already power for the Minister, in certain circumstances, to reduce the license fee; and I think that is how any reduction should be granted. I do not know why blind pensioners are mentioned, because I do not think a blind person should have a license.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: A blind person might have a licensed vehicle and someone else could drive it for him.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I ask the Committee to oppose the amendment.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I do not think the Minister believed a lot of what he said—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Every word of it!

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The Minister said the amendment would be difficult to implement; because in the case of social service pensioners it would be necessary for them to sign statutory declarations; but they already do that to obtain their pensions; and I think that the traffic authorities, like the railways, could grant the concession on production of the pension card. We cannot compare these people with wealthy primary producers who already get half rates for their vehicles; and I do not think the Minister should object to the amendment.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: This refers to the total income. It is all very well to say that pensions and social service payments are set figures; but people could get superannuation in addition.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: They are still not millionaires.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: If they are really entitled to a reduction, they can apply to the Minister under section 11 of the Act. They have to sign a statutory declaration in connection with their pensions, but they do not have to sign a declaration in regard to any extra earnings they may have.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: They have their pension cards.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: If it would remove any doubts in the minds of members I would move to delete the words "social service benefits." That would make the position quite clear. I understood the Minister to say during the debate on the second reading that he was sorry something could not be done for these people.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: I did not.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I think every pensioner in Australia gets a concession on his wireless license, and I feel that the Committee should grant this concession.

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

Ayes—9.

Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. R. Thompson
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. G. E. Jeffery	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	(Teller.)

Noes—12.

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. A. L. Loton	Hon. A. F. Griffith
	(Teller.)

Majority against—3.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Bill again reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time and passed.

ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

In Committee

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time and passed.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

In Committee

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time and passed.

BUILDERS' REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 22nd October.

THE HON. L. C. DIVER (Central) [9.31]: To say the least of it, I am amazed at the Government introducing a Bill such as this, especially when we are informed that we are creating monopolies in regard to other matters such as licensing, which affect the whole population of Western Australia. What will this Bill do? It will merely create a monopoly among those persons who are registered as A-class builders because it will prevent any persons, who hold the necessary practical qualifications, but who are not proficient on the theory side, from obtaining registration. They are the men who originally were regarded as being competent builders; who were encompassed by this legislation; and who became eligible for registration as A-class builders.

This Bill seeks to go a step further by enabling engineers and architects to be registered as A-class builders, but it does not mention what type of engineer shall be eligible for registration. An engineer without any building qualifications could, under the provisions of the Bill, apply for registration as a builder and be able to enter into contracts to construct buildings of any size in this State.

I would like to point out that the principal Act was introduced at a time when there was some doubt about the ability of those men who were operating, because I am sure there were some who could not even use a claw hammer or a saw. These men were permitted to engage in the building industry as registered builders under the original Act, and thus became eligible to enter into contracts for building work. There was some necessity, in those days, to protect the interests of the public. However, those days have passed; but there are now many A-class builders who permit highly competent carpenters—who have perhaps acted as foremen for these builders—to use their names in order that those tradesmen can accept building contracts. Many of these men are obtaining contracts involving thousands of pounds. They are entering the industry by the backdoor but, nevertheless, they are giving every satisfaction to those who engage their services. In fact, many

people seek to obtain their services for various undertakings because they are known to execute work of a high standard. This Bill would bar those men from the building industry.

It is remarkable that the Bill has been introduced to restrict the operations of certain builders within the confines of the metropolitan area. Does it mean that anything is good enough for the people of the country areas? Then again, perhaps this is merely legislation to protect certain individuals who are already licensed as builders and to restrict their numbers as much as possible.

I have been advised that even today a man can obtain an A-class builder's certificate without possessing any professional qualification. Apparently, if one has the ability to swot and learn all the regulations and the theory necessary to pass the examinations set by the Builders' Registration Board, one can obtain a certificate of registration as an A-class builder. A successful candidate may be one who has never laid a brick or served an apprenticeship as a carpenter, a plumber, etc. I have been informed that there are clerks who are registered as A-class builders. Yet, on the other hand, men who have served their apprenticeships as carpenters, plumbers, plasterers and as other tradesmen are refused registration by the board.

If these men are competent tradesmen and have the practical ability to build, why should not they be registered and permitted to enter into building contracts? In any case most of the buildings they would construct would be supervised by qualified architects; and if those professional men are not capable of supervising the work performed by these men, it is a sorry day for this State. I will have nothing to do with the Bill. I hope that this House, which believes in free enterprise, will reject this measure; and, should it do so, I wish to give an undertaking that next session I will introduce a Bill to repeal the principal Act. I think I have made it abundantly clear that I do not intend to vote for the second reading of this measure.

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

PETROL STATIONS

Restriction on Building.

Debate resumed from the 13th October on the following motion by the Hon. L. C. Diver:—

That in view of the alarming rate of building of new petrol stations and the ultimate consequences on the cost structure of petrol to the public, this House is of the opinion that the Government should closely examine the building policy being practised by the oil companies with a view to introducing some effective form of control.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [9.14]: The contribution I am about to make to the debate on this motion will not prevent any other member from speaking to it because Mr. Diver will have the right of reply, and when he replies, that will close the debate.

In introducing this motion, Mr. Diver asked the House to agree with his contention that petrol stations are being built at an alarming rate and that this policy is reflected in the retail price of petrol. Should the House accept this hypothesis, he asks it to request the Government to examine closely the building policy of the petrol companies, with a view to providing some more effective form of control. My object in speaking to the motion is designed to show that the picture is by no means as dark as is painted by the honourable member.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: You are not serious.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: If the honourable member will listen to the remarks I shall make he will be able to judge for himself whether or not I am serious. The points I shall endeavour to make are that the wholesale price of standard grade petrol in the metropolitan area—that is, the price paid by the reseller to the oil companies—is exactly the same now as it was in 1951, when the so-called one-brand marketing scheme commenced; that the present retail price of standard grade petrol is only 1d. more than it was in 1951, and few other commodities would show such a small rise in price; that the number of retail outlets established since the introduction of the one-brand marketing scheme has not lowered the average income available to resellers from the sale of petrol; that the retail price of petrol is in the hands of the resellers in that they and not the oil companies control their margins; that the oil companies do not and cannot afford to build service stations indiscriminately; that the oil companies have complied with the arrangement developed in participation with the resellers covering service station building in the metropolitan area during the two year "freeze" period; and that the oil companies have restricted the opening of new outlets by means of their recent rationalization scheme.

Mr. Diver suggested that an increase in retail outlets has added to consumers' costs. In this regard, I would point out that in 1951, the wholesale price of petrol was 3s. 0½d. a gallon. In 1956, because of an increase of 3d. a gallon in import and excise duties, it rose to 3s. 3½d., while now the wholesale price of standard grade petrol is once more 3s. 0½d., the same as it was in 1951, despite the fact that import duty decreased by only 1½d. The recovery to the oil companies is, therefore, less than in 1951.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: That is too much.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am sure that is very sensible! In that year the retailers margin was 3½d. a gallon. With the increase in wholesale price in 1956, it rose to 4½d. and still remains at the figure, notwithstanding that the wholesale price is back at the 1951 amount.

Not only have wholesale prices been well controlled, but the high capital cost of investment in the seaboard terminals at Geraldton and Albany have provided consumers with much lower prices than would otherwise have been possible for years. The policy of the oil industry in this regard, is exemplified by the building of new seaboard terminals at Bunbury and Esperance. While I was up North in the last four or five days, I got news of some further inquiries being made along these lines in regard to another seaboard terminal along the coast.

The Hon. A. R. Jones: Did you strike oil?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In reply to the honourable member I hope that Western Australia will be placed in a position of oil being struck.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: We struck oil once.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes, but only in a very small way, and, unfortunately, not in commercial quantities.

It would appear that, on the figures which I have just revealed to members, no evidence can be adduced to prove that one-brand marketing has involved the community in added expense.

It is estimated that by the end of this year, there will be at least 100,400 vehicles in the metropolitan area. Based on the number of petrol outlets of every kind, this averages about 195 vehicles per outlet. This is well above the average in 1950, before one-brand marketing was introduced. Furthermore, the average annual petrol consumption per vehicle has risen from approximately 356 gallons in 1950 to approximately 400 gallons. In 1955 the quantity of petrol sold by all retail outlets in the metropolitan area was a little over 28,000,000 gallons. In 1959, about 35,000,000 gallons will be sold. This will be an increase of 7,000,000 gallons.

This indicates that the average potential revenue available to resellers from the sale of motor spirit is higher today than it was in 1950. A prominent feature has been the improvement in the standard of the retail outlets and in the service which they offer. This is approaching that to which overseas motorists have long been accustomed. One has only to go overseas to see what the overseas traveller is accustomed to in the way of petrol station service. This is a credit to the retailers concerned, but could be a reason for dissatisfaction on the part of resellers who have not moved with the times and who

have found that the retailer who is willing to provide service is attracting a larger share of business.

Mr. Diver devoted some time to a criticism of the number of petrol outlets in country areas. He pointed out that the freeze on service stations that was arranged by local managers was confined to the Perth metropolitan area. There was no similar understanding regarding the country, but the new rationalisation plan that commenced on the 1st September, 1959, has been made applicable to the whole State.

In country areas—and I speak more particularly of those outside the larger towns—the possibility of service station operation with maximum facilities is very limited, because of the scattered population. If retail petrol outlets were restricted to the larger towns, the supply position would be most difficult.

In country districts, the convenience of the motoring public can only be catered for by a large proportion of the outlets being developed as adjuncts to other businesses. This has been recognised since petrol pumps first came into operation. Retail pumps have been established for many years with co-operative companies, general stores, eating-houses, tyre retreaders and, more recently, with motels and road-houses. In towns of some size and on main highways, the service station or garage mechanic has received the priority.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That is what they are doing.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This is what the honourable member might think they are doing. On the other hand, the companies deny that point of view.

Mr. Diver referred to the establishment of 70 new outlets. Many of these were in the category I have just mentioned, and a large proportion were the fulfilment of commitments made to private businessmen, which otherwise would be almost impossible to meet in the years ahead while the current plan continues to operate. These outlets will contribute to the convenience of the motoring public in the country districts.

In regard to the retail margin, this was 3½d. from the end of the war until April, 1955, when it was increased to 4½d., at which rate it now stands. Over the past 10 years the basic wage for Western Australia has risen by 90 per cent., power and light by more than 50 per cent., and postage and telegraph charges by about 120 per cent., yet the retailers have raised the retail margin on petrol only once, and then by only 1d., which represented a 27 per cent. increase. Their hourly rate for repairs, of course, increased. It has risen by 7s. since 1950, representing an increase of 46 per cent. One knows how much it costs to take one's car to a garage for repairs. I see Mr. Lavery agreeing with me.

All things being equal, the financial success of any service station, from the point of view of tenant or operator, depends not only on the margin over the wholesale price of petrol, but also the profit from whatever repair work he undertakes, the profit from lubrication and other service work, and the margins he receives from the sale of tyres, batteries, accessories, etc.

It is a matter of interest that the oil companies own less than 15 per cent. of the outlets in operation or being established in Western Australia. The vast majority are financed by other business people who have invested money in the real estate represented by service stations. It would seem, therefore, that a service station is regarded as a reasonable investment for the owner of real estate.

I am advised that each oil company, when proposing to establish a retail outlet, first assesses from traffic counts and its knowledge of business in the area, what gallonage the outlet can be expected to attract. It is then possible to arrive at what return upon capital can reasonably be expected to accrue. Only if these calculations prove that a favourable return can be secured does the building take place, for it is obvious that no free enterprise company, having shareholders to whom a dividend must be paid, can deliberately build a service station which is unprofitable, or which renders others of its outlets unprofitable. I suppose to some extent the charges on both sides would be somewhat hypothetical, because they are difficult to prove. However, it has been suggested during the debate that this is not difficult to prove. For instance, I believe there is no dearth of applications for company-owned outlets and that, so far this year, oil companies in Western Australia have had well over 300 applications from people wishing to be trained to take over service stations. The Commonwealth Reseller Site Rationalisation Scheme announced by the companies in July, was discussed in detail for a very long time before being agreed upon. Similar, although smaller, schemes have been in operation in individual States for a number of years.

Mr. Diver quoted figures intended to show that the companies could not be relied upon to implement this plan of control. He stated that when the Royal Commission of 1956 was considering the question of service station building, it received evidence that in the metropolitan area there was a total of 410 outlets. However, on page 34 of the commission's report, in paragraph 51, the statement is made that at June, 1956, the total number of outlets was 466 and not 410. This is a substantial difference.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: There is a catch in that one. I will explain it.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: At the moment, I am merely pointing out the discrepancy in the report and the honourable member's speech. There may be an explanation for the discrepancy, which I am sure he will give when he has the opportunity of replying. In the meantime, I am satisfied to say that the difference between the two figures is substantial.

The honourable member also mentioned that some of the petrol companies increased their building programmes, following the 1956 commission, because they anticipated that restrictions would be imposed. However, page 34 of the commission's report, paragraph 52, states that "additional stations were either under construction or to be built before December, 1956." These, I take it, would be additional to the 466 retail outlets which the commission recorded as existing in June, 1956.

The total number of every type of retail outlet in the metropolitan area on the 30th June, 1959, including pumps in front of stores, refreshment rooms and the like, was 505. This is an increase of 39 during three years. All of these 39 new outlets were either being built at the time of the Royal Commission, or were started prior to the beginning of the freeze arrangement.

It is difficult therefore to accept the premise that several companies were so concerned about the prospects of restriction that they scattered new stations throughout the metropolitan area to an extent that it materially altered the basis of consideration adopted by the commission. This is especially so in view of the petrol sales over the period. In 1955, according to the commission's report, the total gallonage sold throughout all retail outlets in the metropolitan area was 28,200,000, while in 1958, the figure reached 33,200,000, an increase of 5,000,000 gallons over that time.

The honourable member spoke of a truce among the companies between 1957 and 1959, which, he said, followed negotiations with the retailers' organisation. He also said that there had been an increase of 85 retail outlets during the alleged freeze period and that, therefore, members had the opportunity of seeing just how petrol companies honoured their promise to ration and control the industry. It would appear that misleading information has been given to the honourable member. The truce to which he referred was a local arrangement whereby each manager voluntarily agreed to restrict the building activity of his company for a period. This period began on the 30th May, 1957, after considerable prior discussion in which the retailers' organisation participated. It was arranged that the "freeze" should continue for two years up to the 30th May, 1959.

I am informed that the conditions arranged were clearly understood by all concerned and were followed by each company in every detail. There was not one

service station built or one retail outlet established outside the conditions of this arrangement during the two years of its currency. As I have already said, there was an increase of only 39 retail outlets in the metropolitan area from June, 1956, to June, 1959; and, as no doubt a substantial proportion of these were those that were recorded by the commission as being under construction or intended to be built by December, 1956, a relatively small number remained for development before the restrictions of the two-year freeze became operative in May, 1957.

The new rationalisation scheme will operate from the 1st September, 1959, until the 31st January, 1963, and will continue beyond that date, subject to certain notices of cancellation. From September, 1959, until the 31st January, 1963, no construction of any new service station will be commenced. All construction work during this period will be limited to work commenced before the 1st September, 1959.

The Hon. C. H. Simpson: Where does that assurance come from?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It has been given to me by the oil companies. The maximum number of new sites to be opened in Western Australia during the first three years of the scheme will be 36, being six in the year ending the 31st January, 1961, 12 in the next year, and 18 in the following year. This number will include new retail outlets of any kind throughout the whole State. Transfers or relocation of retail outlets that may become necessary will be strictly limited to exchanges within the same town, or local government boundary. Reselling equipment at the old site will be removed before the new site becomes operative, so that any relocation of sites will not increase the total number of outlets.

Following the end of the local agreement between companies on the building of service stations in Perth, there was a period between the 30th May, 1959, and the 1st September, 1959, during which no understanding existed. During this time, construction of a number of new outlets in Perth was commenced by three oil companies.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That would be the view of the joint companies?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Part of this information was given to my colleague, the Minister for Labour, as he was requested by the oil companies to put forward their point of view in regard to the allegations made by the honourable member.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It is really the joint companies' view?

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison interjected.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I realise that no explanation would satisfy Mrs. Hutchison.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Love one another!

Point of Order

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Mr. President, on a point of order, I ask the Minister to withdraw his remarks.

The PRESIDENT: What was the remark?

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: The Minister said that I would not be able to understand anything and that I would not be satisfied with any explanation. He is always making the point that my understanding is less than his.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member cannot make a second reading speech.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I made no reference whatsoever to any lack of understanding on the part of the honourable member. All I said was that no explanation would satisfy her. If she objects to that remark I will withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister had better proceed with his speech.

Debate Resumed

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I was saying that during this period there were some new outlets commenced by three of the oil companies. In view of the fact that all companies now have a common understanding which limits the building of service stations, and an understanding which all companies have implemented since the 1st September, those companies which have recently built stations or have them under construction in the metropolitan area have undertaken to accept the numbers involved as part of their respective limited quotas under the new plan.

It appears, therefore, that this scheme will provide rigid control over the development of new petrol outlets in this State for the next three years and that a similar type of control may be expected subsequently. Careful consideration of the facts leads to the opinion that the introduction of the one-brand scheme of marketing has not adversely affected the price of petrol. That point has been proved.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That depends on the relative costs.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; but it also depends on the figures I have given during this speech. This has been going on since 1951 and since the Royal Commission sat, and there has been no previous attempt made in regard to control.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Regulations were disallowed in this House.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: On the question of petrol?

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Yes.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister should keep to his speech.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I was saying that it has not been proved that one-brand marketing has had an adverse effect on the price of petrol. I would also say that the question of profitability is in the hands of the resellers themselves; that the companies have completely observed the agreements mentioned; and that the current Commonwealth Reseller Site Rationalisation Scheme should continue to ensure the stability of the industry.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: It has led to the closing of their stations.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not know of any station in the area in which I live that has closed down. I know there are quite a number of stations around me, but I do not know of any that have closed.

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: There are plenty going broke.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I know this: I remember seeing a document issued by the secretary of an organisation which, I think, calls itself the Garage Proprietors' Association, and this document stated, in regard to the last election, "Vote Labor." Having read that, perhaps I can appreciate what is meant by the interjection.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: How much do you think they gave? Do you think they gave as much as the bookies?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not know.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I have not the confidence of the organisation to which the honourable member is referring.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Not as much as the oil companies put into the Liberal Party.

There are some other matters in Mr. Diver's speech to which I will refer; particularly his reference to a number of Press reports and to enquiries conducted in other countries. The extract of an article from *The Sydney Morning Herald* referred to by the honourable member quotes the Sydney retail margin for petrol at 6½d. This is incorrect, as the margin is 5½d. Therefore, instead of an 80 per cent. rise in margins having occurred in Sydney during the past four years, the margin has only increased 53 per cent. since 1945. During these 14 years, basic wage rates in New South Wales have doubled, and every item of direct cost has suffered from the depreciated value of the currency. Members will be interested to know that the retail selling price of standard petrol to consumers in Sydney—which includes this margin—is only 31 per cent. higher than in September, 1945.

Mr. Diver referred to legislation in New Zealand, and to his discussions with a previous Cabinet Minister of that country,

during which the latter suggested that the New Zealand licensing system should be adopted in Western Australia.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: Correct.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: During the Royal Commission in Western Australia, it was stated, on behalf of the Automobile Chamber of Commerce, that a system of licensing service stations, similar in scope and form to that in New Zealand, should be adopted in Western Australia.

When the Chamber's counsel submitted a draft of the suggested Bill to the Royal Commission, it did not involve a system of licensing, but was concerned primarily with the limitation of service station construction, indicating that the Automobile Chamber of Commerce realised that licensing was not desirable. Many of the reseller witnesses before the Royal Commission stated that they did not desire licensing. Many desired a restricted building programme, such as has been operating in Perth since 1957.

I had at that time, and still have a good deal of sympathy for the garage proprietor who is obliged to work long hours during the day. When, some years ago, I was in the seat now occupied by Mr. Lavery, I stood up and did the best I could to give assistance to the petrol resellers; and they were in the gallery and listened to the debate. I told them on that occasion that I would help them; and I tell them again that I will assist them as much as I can so long as they do not use this as a political instrument.

Prior to my trying to help them, they went out and worked politically against me to see me defeated, and at the last election they put out a pamphlet which said, "Vote Labour." I do not think the decent members of this association would have any part of that, but I am sorry to say that those who did, thought fit to subscribe to that sort of material.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: Some are prominent members of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is all right; but I still stick to the point of view that I do not want to see this question mixed with politics at all. If I can help these people, without the matter being mixed with politics, I shall be glad to do so.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Oil and water.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The honourable member mentioned the 1936 Royal Commission in British Columbia, which produced what is known as the MacDonald Report. This inquiry was held 23 years ago during a period when economic conditions were really depressed throughout the world.

A more recent Government investigation took place on the West Coast of America and was concluded only this year. The Federal judge assigned to the case concluded that competition under the present

system was intense and extensive; and, as a result, he held that he would not grant the divorcement of the companies from their retail marketing facilities. They therefore are to continue as before.

Mr. Diver quoted from the report of two oil companies, one in New South Wales and one in South Africa, which, upon endeavouring to break into a new market, found it more expensive than they reckoned. I imagine that anyone setting out to establish a chain of stores, or a shipping line, or a newspaper, or, in fact, any other large business in our competitive society, would also find it expensive. That could be the reason why the field in Western Australia is not more open than it is; because there are other companies in the Eastern States which are not in Western Australia.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It is a highly competitive business.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Many businesses are.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I know, but is this? That is the question.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would refer to what is known as T.B.A. trading—tyres, batteries, and accessories—and the arrangements recently made by two petrol companies to introduce this type of trading into Australia. The honourable member expressed considerable exception to this form of trading and suggested that the respective agreements were forced on the retailers by threats of tenancy termination. That is another point of view, I suppose, which is held by one and denied by the other. I am informed that it has been found that a very large number of service station operators who agreed to the proposition were either operating their own stations or were tenants of stations not owned by any oil company. In such cases, there could be no suggestion of threats of any kind. Bearing in mind that only 15 per cent. of the outlets are owned by the petrol companies, evidence is available to show that all retailer organisations in Australia are not opposed to this type of trading, and one in New South Wales supported such trading.

In concluding my remarks, I would repeat that the oil companies' plan for the rationalisation of service station building extends throughout the whole State; that the development of new retail outlets during the next three years, both in the city and in the country, will be exceptionally limited; that the experience derived from the local limitation of new outlets in Perth metropolitan area shows that the arrangement was completely observed by every oil company and that this new plan will be similarly implemented; and that the evidence before the 1956 commission was not in favour of licensing, but that the main concern expressed was to bring about a restriction in the building of service stations, which is now achieved through the rationisation scheme.

I well remember when I came back to this argument, at the time I was speaking of a few moments ago, that the particular thing the proprietors wanted in those days was a restriction on trading hours. That is what the question boiled down to. But during the course of the debate held here, and also as a result of much evidence given before the Royal Commission, I think that a satisfactory plan of control has been evolved; and as it is already being implemented, and has been carried on over the period of time that I have mentioned, I do not think the motion moved by Mr. Diver is really necessary.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

The Hon. R. THOMPSON: I was on my feet before Mr. MacKinnon.

The PRESIDENT: Will the honourable member resume his seat while I put the question? The question is, that the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 12th November, 1959

CONTENTS

	Page
ASSENT TO BILLS	3053
LEAVE OF ABSENCE	3059
RESOLUTION :	
State Forests, Council's message	3123
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :	
Point Samson Water Supply—	
Shortage	3053
Provision of a road train	3054
Inquiries re de-salting plant	3054
Emu-proof Fences—	
Length and Cost	3054
Use of ringlock wire	3054
Rents and tenancies Act, legislation for continuance	3054
Causeway, clover-leaf system of approaches	3055
Open-cut coal, supplies to Government and payments to companies	3055
Offer of reward to police, statutory provision for offence	3056
Bookmakers' turnover tax, Treasury Department advice	3056
Stock Stealing—	
Incidence	3056
Police action	3056
Water boring, action to control price increases by firms	3056

CONTENTS—continued

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—continued	
Maids Vale water supply, allocation from loan funds	3056
Country schools, installation of septic tanks	3057
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE :	
Water Boring—	
Action to control price increases by firms	3057
Restriction on inquiry by commissioner	3059
Workers' Compensation Act, amending legislation	3057
Point Samson water supply, provision of a road train	3057
Stock stealing, police action	3058
Monopolies and restrictive trade practices, duties of Director of Investigation	3058
BILLS :	
Marriage Act Amendment Bill, assent	3053
Main Roads Act Amendment Bill, assent	3053
Companies Act Amendment Bill, assent	3053
Katanning Electric Lighting and Power Repeal Bill, assent	3053
Supply Bill (No. 2), £19,000,000, assent....	3053
State Hotels (Disposal) Bill, assent	3053
Argentine Ant Bill, assent	3053
Oil Refinery Industry (Anglo-Iranian Oil Company Ltd.) Act Amendment Bill, assent	3053
State Housing Act Amendment Bill, assent	3053
Housing Loan Guarantee Act Amendment Bill, 1r.	3053
Entertainments Tax Act Amendment Bill—	
Notification of clerical error	3053
Com., report	3053
Hire-Purchase Bill, returned	3059
Betting Control Act Amendment Bill—	
Com.	3059
Report, 3r.	3064
Bookmakers Betting Tax Act Amendment Bill—	
2r.	3064
Com.	3070
Report	3072
3r.	3073
Betting Investment Tax Bill—	
2r.	3075
Com.	3087
Recom.	3116
Further report, 3r.	3123
Entertainments Tax Act Amendment Bill, Council's message	3123
Traffic Act Amendment Bill (No. 3), returned	3123
Road Districts Act Amendment Bill (No. 2), returned	3123
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment Bill (No. 2), returned	3123

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