COUNTRY AREAS WATER SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. WILD (Dale—Minister for Water Supplies) [5.44] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is designed to make certain areas outside country townsites come within the provisions of the Act. This is necessary because, in recent years, country towns have become larger and the areas taken over and included in the townsites have to be covered by the Act so that correct rateable values may be obtained. With this expansion of country towns, subdivisions of adjoining rural lands are from time to time approved and developed, but local authorities concerned sometimes omit to extend their municipal or townsite boundaries to include these new subdivisions.

Mr. Graham: You mean subdivisions for the purpose of building residences?

Mr. WILD: Yes. The member for East Perth probably knows that in many country towns in recent years, expansion has become so rapid that the townsite has extended into rural lands.

Mr. Graham: I merely wanted to differentiate between, say, a large farm and a smaller subdivision.

Mr. WILD: According to the provision contained in section 5 of the Country Areas Water Supply Act, the definition of "townsite" means a townsite as defined in the Road Districts Act and includes any land —including privately-owned subdivided land—which the Governor may declare, by proclamation, to be deemed to be included in a townsite for the purpose of this Act. Although the Governor may declare, by proclamation, any land to be included in the townsite, such proclamation would give no power to rate such land as townsite land in view of the rating provisions of section 65, subsection (2), unless the definition of "country land" is amended; as is proposed in the present Bill.

It is also intended to delete a paragraph in subsection (1) of section 65 of the Act and also to delete, in paragraph (b) of the same subsection, the words "whether the maximum rate exigible in respect thereof be 2s. or 3s. in the £ on that value," which appear in lines two, three, and four. Subsection (1) of section 65, would then read—

> In the case of rateable land within a municipal district or townsite, a water rate shall not in any one year exceed 3s. in the £1 on the annual rateable value of the land rated. Provided the amount of the water rate assessed at the rate fixed and computed on the basis of the annual rateable value of the holding would be less than £1, the Minister may fix the sum of £1 as the amount of the water rate to be charged against and be paid in respect of the holding.

It is felt that a continuance of the limitation of the maximum rate of 2s. in the £1 in townsites which were served by the Goldfields water supply system prior to the 1st January, 1949, is no longer justified, bearing in mind that all other towns now served from the Goldfields water supply system, as well as all but four of the separate country town water supply undertakings administered by the Public Works Department, are subject to a rate of 3s. in the £1. There is also strong justification for a more uniform basis of rating in all country towns. I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Tonkin, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 5.48 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 6th October, 1959

CONTENTS

CONTENTS—*continued*

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

MEMBERS' SPEECHES

Correction and Return

THE SPEAKER: Earlier this session I drew the attention of members to the need to correct the duplicates of their speeches and return them to the Chief Hansard Reporter as promptly as possible. Generally speaking, the response of members has been gratifying, although there have still been one or two occasions on which speeches were very slow in being returned with corrections thereon. Specifically a speech made last Thursday on the matter which comes up as order of the day No. 6 in today's notice paper has not yet been corrected and returned.

This delay has caused some inconvenience, not only to the Hansard staff—after all, it is expected to publish last week's copy of Hansard by tomorrow—but also to members. The delay prevents members from having access to copies of speeches and places them at a considerable disadvantage. I have told the Chief Hansard Reporter that if speeches are not corrected by midday following the day when they are made, or by 3 p.m. on the Monday following the Thursday when they are made, he is to make the uncorrected speeches available to members of Parliament, if they ask for them. It is only reasonable that members should not be placed at a disadvantage in obtaining copies of speeches.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

TRADE ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Regulations

1. Mr. NIMMO asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Why were regulations promulgated on the 15th September, governing trade advisory committees, when such committees have functioned satisfactorily for over 20 years, without such regulations?

(2) For what reason is a committee precluded from electing its own chairman?

(3) Why have the teaching staff of the technical division been deprived of the right to attend meetings—a custom for over 20 years?

(4) If the teaching staff of the Technical Education Division have not this customary right of representation on the committee, how does the department expect to obtain intimate knowledge of the problems connected with the teaching of technical subjects in the trades?

(5) Does the department envisage a permanent secretary and convenor on all advisory committees?

(6) Why has the customary right of an individual report by members of advisory committees to the Minister been removed?

Mr. WATTS replied:

(1) Promulgation of regulations with regard to trade advisory committees is part of a complete review of Education Department regulations currently being undertaken. It was decided to proceed immediately with the regulations relating to trade advisory committees rather than to await completion of the whole regulations, because the absence of such regulations has led to difficulties on various occasions.

(2) No trade advisory committee has ever elected its own chairman. These committees have met under the chairmanship of the Superintendent of Technical Education or his representative for over 30 years.

(3) The teaching staff of the technical division has never had the right to attend meetings but has been invited on occasion to do so. The regulations as promulgated still provide for them to be invited.

(4) The purpose of trade advisory committees is to provide the superintendent with the advice of persons actively engaged in the industry. The advice of teaching staff is constantly available to him through the normal administrative channels.

(5) No.

(6) There has never been any customary right of an individual report by members of advisory committees to the Minister. In fact, since there have been no regulations there have been no rights, which the regulations now seek to establish.

WEST MIDLAND STATION

Widening of Subway

2. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

Is it intended to widen and renew the subway steel work at West Midland station, before the new Welshpool line is constructed, to cope with increasing motor-vehicle traffic and possible through road to Hazelmere *via* the subway?

Mr. COURT replied:

The present proposal is for the subway to be reconstructed in conjunction with the construction of the new line.

PROSPECTORS

Qualifications for Assistance, and Ration Orders

3. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

(1) Is it still possible for an aged pensioner to qualify for prospector's assistance, in the form of ration orders, etc.?

(2) Is there any delay involved in payment to storekeepers for rations supplied to prospectors, once accounts for same have been rendered to the Mines Department? If so, what is the usual length of the delay and what is the reason for same?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) Prospecting sustenance is not available to aged pensioners.

(2) Provided the accounts are in order, payments are made by the State Treasury to storekeepers within approximately seven days of receipt of such accounts by the Mines Department, Perth.

1. *This question was postponed.*

GEORGE STREET

Resumptions for Widening

5. Mr. HEAL asked the Minister for Works:

(1) When is it anticipated that properties on the east side of George Street between Hay and Wellington Streets will be resumed for the purpose of widening the street?

(2) Have any properties been resumed? If so, which ones?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) It has not been possible at this stage for the department to prepare firm plans for the resumption of land on the east side of George Street between Hay and Wellington Streets; therefore the probable date of resumption cannot be given.

(2) Three properties have been acquired by the department under the terms of the interim development Act. They are numbers 30, 34, and 38 George Street.

STATE ENGINEERING WORKS

Dismissals, etc.

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

(1) How many employees have been dismissed from the State Engineering Works since the 3rd April, 1959?

(2) How many are at present under notice of dismissal?

(3) What is the number at present employed at the works?

(4) How many does he estimate will still be employed after the Christmas-New Year holidays?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) 108 from the 3rd April, 1959, to the 29th September, 1959.

(2) None.

(3) 382.

(4) If the volume of work is maintained at the present level it is anticipated that total requirements in January, 1960, will be 382.

SCHOOLCHILDREN

Travel Concessions

7. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Can he indicate what concessions are extended to schoolchildren in New South Wales with respect to travel by—

(a) train;

(b) bus;

(c) tram?

(2) Do such concessions cover school travel only or all travel undertaken by children still at school, *i.e.*, on excursions not directly connected with school as well as those with school attendance?

(3) Is it proposed to make any alterations in connection with travel concessions to schoolchildren in this State?

Mr. WATTS replied:

(1), (2), and (3) No; but steps will be taken to endeavour to obtain the information from New South Wales.

WATER RESTRICTIONS

Alteration of Hours

8. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

Has consideration been given to allowing water users to use water at earlier or later hours, in each day, in order to have a minimum of evaporation and a maximum of soakage, in order to bring about the greatest advantage from water available?

Mr. WILD replied:

This factor is always taken into consideration when fixing restriction hours.

TELEVISION

Pressure on Traders

9. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Premier:

(1) Is it the policy of the Government to refrain from taking any steps to debar a group of traders from applying pressure, in order to compel some traders to charge the public higher prices than would otherwise be the case, as for instance the action of R.E.T.R.A.?

(2) How does he reconcile the Government's lack of action with its declared policy of individual freedom, private enterprise, and business competition?

Mr. BRAND replied:

(1) and (2) It is not the policy of the Government to interfere with business more than is necessary, and my information is that there is keen competition in the television trade.

LAND RESUMPTIONS

Lot 486, Inglewood Ward

10. Mr. HEAL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

(1) Would he consider returning Lot 486, Inglewood ward, with a frontage of 98 ft. 11 in. to Adams Street, which was resumed in 1950, to its original owner, who purchased the said block of land for £90 in the year 1930, and was paid £40 by the then Government when resumed?

(2) If so, would it be returned to the owner for its resumption price (£40)?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) No. Lot 486 is required for commission needs and will lose its identity in the current replanning of the Nollamara area.

(2) Answered by No. (1) above.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

CRAYFISH INDUSTRY

Establishment on South Coast

1. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Fisheries:

(1) Is he aware of the article in *The West Australian* of Friday, the 2nd October, headed "Crayfish Survey Promising"?

(2) If he is aware of the article in *The West Australian* can he give this House an assurance that he has taken all the requisite measures to ensure that the industry will be established on the south coast of this State, if crayfish are in sufficient quantities to establish an industry?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

(1) I did notice the Press report.

(2) If further consideration of this survey shows that an industry is warranted, then every step will be taken, in conjunction with other Ministers, to ensure that the area is properly developed.

DIELDRIN

Availability of Spray and Equipment to Goldfields

2. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Agriculture:

I might explain, Mr. Speaker, that I have five questions to ask and they are a matter of urgency. I was unable to get these questions on the notice paper. The questions are—

(1) What is the retail price by the gallon to the ordinary purchaser of dieldrin?

(2) What is the price paid for this commodity by the Agriculture Protection Board?

(3) Does the Agriculture Protection Board supply to farmers—free or on a subsidised basis—dieldrin as a means of combating the little plague grasshopper?

(4) If so, would urgent consideration be given to similar provision being made to assist Goldfields residents and/or the appropriate local authority?

(5) As the grasshoppers that are at present menacing the Goldfields will soon be laying eggs in earnest, could assistance by way of loan of suitable spraying equipment, if requested by the Goldfields local authority, be made available?

Mr. NALDER replied:

(1) Average price is £4 6s. per gallon in 1-gallon tins of 15 per cent. concentration. This price reduces to £4 1s. per gallon in 45-gallon containers.

(2) The Agriculture Protection Board pays £2 18s. 6d. per gallon in 4-gallon containers and £2 17s. in 44-gallon containers.

(3) Yes—to farmers in outer wheatbelt areas only.

(4) Grasshoppers occur over most agricultural and pastoral areas, but assistance is restricted by the Agriculture Protection Board to the outer wheatbelt areas for the protection of crops.

(5) The Agriculture Protection Board has no grasshopper spraying equipment now available for loan.

BONNIE ROCK AND HYDEN RAILWAY LINES

Reopening

3. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) In connection with the decision of the Government to recommence railway services over the Bonnie Rock and Hyden railway lines, did he and the Government take into account the Interdepartmental Committee's reports, and also the report of the Royal Commissioner (Mr. A. G. Smith)?

(2) If the Government did in fact take into account those reports, what factors finally influenced the Government to override the recommendations previously referred to?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) As a result of a very close examination of both the Burakin-Bonnie Rock areas and the Lake Grace-Hyden areas by a Cabinet subcommittee, it was considered that a good case was made out to reopen these lines, as announced, on a trial basis; and during that period the Government proposes to bring the necessary roads up to a black-road standard, which it feels is a necessary prerequisite before taking away those two services. That consideration and several others were responsible for the decision made by the Government. If the honourable member desires a detailed reply and places his question on the notice paper, I will be only too pleased to give him a further answer.

Inquiry by Cabinet Sub-committee

4. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) I wonder whether the Minister can indicate to me approximately what time was devoted by the Cabinet sub-committee in its inquiries on the spot in connection with the two railway lines mentioned in my earlier question?

(2) Would I be right in assuming that political considerations were the deciding factor rather than the merits and circumstances of the two areas concerned?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) The actual on-the-spot examination by the Cabinet sub-committee as a sub-committee, quite apart from any individual examinations, took approximately 2½ days. In addition, a lot of time was spent by the three Ministers in discussion both as a sub-committee and with Cabinet.

(2) Political considerations did not dictate the opening of the lines. Practical aspects of consideration for the people of those areas were the predominant factors.

Subsidising of Cost by Treasury

5. Mr. HEAL asked the Minister for Railways:

In relation to the questions asked by the member for East Perth, does the Minister think it is good policy in regard to the opening of these lines for the Treasury to subsidise the Railway Department in the general overall cost?

Mr. COURT replied:

Undoubtedly it is a good policy.

Recoup of Losses by Treasury and Increased Fares

6. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Railways:

Does he consider it is fair that on the one hand the Treasury should be paying the losses on the two routes previously mentioned as against the decision made earlier to increase fares in the metropolitan area?

Mr. COURT replied:

I would say that the two factors have no relationship to one another whatsoever.

Mr. Graham: Why can't the Treasury carry both?

Mr. COURT: I would remind the honourable member that the Treasury is carrying something in the vicinity of £1,000,000 per annum in respect of suburban passengers as it is.

Mr. Graham: And about £4,000,000 in the country.

NARROWS BRIDGE

Parliamentary Inspection

7. Mr. WILD: The member for West Perth on two occasions has posed a question as to whether an inspection of the Narrows Bridge could be made by members of both Houses of this Parliament. I would advise him that arrangements are being made for this inspection to take place in about a fortnight's time, and necessary notice will appear on the board.

BILLS (4)—FIRST READING

1. Traffic Act Amendment (No. 3).
2. Road Districts Act Amendment (No. 2).
3. Municipal Corporations Act Amendment (No. 2).

   Introduced by Mr. Perkins (Minister for Transport).
4. Katanning Electric Lighting and Power Repeal.

   Introduced by Mr. Watts (Minister for Electricity).

KALGOORLIE-PARKESTON RAILWAY BILL

Message—Appropriation

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

Second Reading

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Railways) [4.53] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is a fairly simple one to rectify a state of affairs that has existed for many years, and that rectification has become more than ever necessary as the result of an agreement entered into with the Commonwealth in January of this year. The purpose of this Bill is to authorise the operation and maintenance of the section of 3 ft. 6 in. gauge railway which links the Western Australian Government railway at Kalgoorlie to the Commonwealth railway facilities at Parkeston.

Provision is also made in the Bill for validation of the past operation and maintenance of the line by the Western Australian Government Railways. This section of railway is 2 miles 75 chains 94 links long and is described in the Bill as the "line affected." It consists of two portions, one being—as described in the Bill—the "part line," and consisting of 2 miles 14 chains 17 links of the old Kalgoorlie-Kanowna railway; and the other portion, described in the Bill as the "spur line," being a connection 61 chains 77 links long from the old Kanowna railway to the Commonwealth yard at Parkeston.

During negotiations between the State and Commonwealth railway administrations on the matter of transhipping from one system to the other, doubt arose as to the lawful right of the Western Australian railways to run over the part line and the spur line. The history of the spur line is a little obscure, but records indicate that it was built in 1912 at Commonwealth expense.

The engineer in charge of construction of the transcontinental railway laid down sidings at Parkeston for the reception of construction material, and these sidings were linked with the Kalgoorlie-Kanowna railway by means of this spur line. The land on which the spur was laid was vacant Crown land, but outside the boundary of the Commonwealth railways land; and, although provision was made in a survey in 1912 for the land to be reserved for the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth advised later that it did not intend to acquire the land. The proposed reservation was therefore cancelled.

During the negotiations referred to earlier, the two railway administrations agreed that the Western Australian Government Railways should assume responsibility for the spur line and that the Commonwealth would not claim ownership. This agreement has been expressed in a deed executed by both administrations on the 8th January, 1959, as follows:—

> It is hereby agreed between the parties hereto that all the materials in that spur line have since its construction been and continue to be the property of the Commission.

No payment has been or will be made by the State to the Commonwealth for the material in the line, but lawful authority for the State to operate and maintain it is necessary.

A further complication arose, however, in that it was found that authority for the State Railway Department to operate and maintain the part line—that is, the portion of the old Kanowna railway—had ceased on the coming into operation of the Railway Discontinuance Act, 1928, which closed the Kanowna railway from Kalgoorlie onwards.

The Crown Law Department has pointed out the liability of the Railway Department in operating and maintaining both the part line and the spur line without lawful authority. This Bill is intended to cover that position by declaring that the commission is authorised, and shall be deemed always to have been authorised, to operate and maintain these lines, and that the provisions of the Government Railways Act shall be deemed as having always applied to them.

I might explain that if there is not statutory authority for the Western Australian Government Railways to operate the line, there are legal complications that could very easily arise. To the best of my knowledge and in answer to inquiries I have made in anticipation of introducing this Bill, there is no-one to be disadvantaged by the introduction of this legislation. For instance, there are no claims pending which this legislation would be responsible for defeating. I feel it necessary to convey that information to the House because this legislation is retrospective in its protection to the Western Australian Government Railways.

The land on which the spur line is laid will be gazetted by the Lands Department as reserved for railway purposes. The reservation of the land for the old Kanowna railway has not been cancelled. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Evans, debate adjourned.

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 1st October.

MR. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [5.0]: The Bill seeks to amend the Marriage Act of 1894, which was last amended in 1956. As the Minister explained, the first amendment proposes to allow a magistrate to issue an order permitting a girl of 16 years of age, or one who is younger, who has given birth to a child to marry the father of the child if she so desires. At present the magistrate has no power to issue an order to authorise the marriage. The Act states that if a magistrate, from inquiry on oath or affirmation, is satisfied that a girl under 16 years of age is pregnant, he can issue an order to allow her to marry the father. As the Act stands, it is causing hardship—or it could cause hardship—and in my opinion the amendment is a most humanitarian one and should commend it to all members in the Chamber.

The second provision relates to the registration of marriages. The Minister explained that the whole system of the registration of marriages in this State is based on the keeping of two registers—one in the districts in which the marriage takes place, and the other at headquarters, or at the office of the registrar-general.

In the case of marriages celebrated by a district registrar, section 11 makes provision for the registration of two of the three certificates issued; but when a marriage is celebrated by a minister of religion, the registration of only one copy of the certificates is provided for. The certificate is written out in triplicate, and one copy is given to the parties who have contracted the marriage, one is retained by the Minister for the records of the church, and the other is sent to the district registrar for registration. It would seem that no registration of a marriage contracted in a church, with a minister officiating, would be kept in the office of the registrar-general. This practice could cause a great deal of inconvenience. The amendment provides that a copy of the certificate of marriage will be registered with the registrar-general to overcome any possible inconvenience.

I remember an incident that occurred many years ago when I was trying to find a birth certificate. Naturally I applied at the office of the Registrar-General, but no record of the birth could be found there. I knew the town in which the birth had occurred, and I inquired in which district it came—the birth had occurred many years previously—and when I made inquiries at the district office, I was told that the town was no longer included in that district but, for some reason or other, had been put into another district. The amendment in the Bill will overcome any such inconvenience in the future.

The third provision in the Bill concerns marriage by special license. Section 12 of the Act relates to the celebration of marriages by a minister of religion, and provision is made for the issuing of special licenses; and when such a license has been issued, the minister can go ahead and celebrate the marriage. But section 13, which relates to the celebration of a marriage by a district registrar, contains no mention of special licenses. This amendment proposes to eliminate the construction that could be put on the Act, that a marriage cannot be celebrated by a district registrar under the provision of a special license. The words "special license" are to be added to section 13.

Under section 16 of the principal Act, the district registrar on receiving notification of a contemplated marriage is required, first of all, to post the notice in some conspicuous place, and then to enter notice of the marriage in the marriage notice book. For doing this, the section provides that he shall charge a fee of 1s. The purpose of the amendment in this connection is to fall back on the schedule in the Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act which states that the fee shall be the prescribed one

for this duty; and at the present time the fee is 2s. Therefore, by this amendment the words "fee of one shilling" in the Marriage Act will disappear and the words "prescribed fee" will take their place.

I wholeheartedly agree with these amendments, but I am not completely happy about the 100 per cent. increase; and I cannot tolerate, to any extent, government by regulation.

The amendment to section 17 of the Act relates to a certain period having elapsed after notice of marriage has been given—a period of seven days. After the lapse of that time the district registrar can issue a certificate for marriage, and for doing so a fee of 1s., in accordance with the Act, is charged. Again the words "fee of one shilling" are to disappear, and the words "prescribed fee"—at present it is 2s.—are to take their place.

Because I believe the amendments are long overdue, are humanitarian in nature, and are such that they should commend themselves to members, I do not propose to raise any opposition to the Bill. I commend the measure to the Chamber and support the second reading.

MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe—Chief Secretary—in reply) [5.7]: I thank the member for Kalgoorlie for his support of the measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2—Section 8A amended:

Mr. EVANS: If, when the magistrate is satisfying himself that the intended husband is the father of the child, the intended husband admits that he is the father, is the intended husband laying himself open to an action as one who has had some knowledge of a girl under 16 years of age? I hope that, by doing the right thing by the girl in the circumstances, he will not lay himself open to having any action taken against him in that regard.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Obviously if he made that admission, then he is open to the charges being made. I do not think we can get over that problem. By his admission, he admits he has done something illegal.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 6 and Title put and passed.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

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

MAIN ROADS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 1st October.

MR. TONKIN (Melville) [5.10]: The purpose of this amending Bill is to give legislative authority for the expenditure of Main Roads Department funds for the provision of lighting on the main arterial metropolitan roads. The Minister, when introducing his measure, could have given some credit to the previous Government for the successful conclusion of negotiations in connection with this matter; because all he has been obliged to do with reference to it is to bring the necessary amending Bill here, everything else having been completed before the present Government took office. No mention whatever was made of that fact in the Minister's speech, and no reference whatever to the circumstances which led up to the preparation of this Bill; so I think I might be pardoned if I recount, for the record, just what did transpire.

For a considerable time local authorities were concerned about the inadequacy of the lighting in the metropolitan area, and some private members made representations on behalf of organisations, asking that steps be taken to effect improvement. After quite a lot of consideration, a deputation from local authorities waited upon me and submitted a straightout request that Government action be taken to effect this improvement in the lighting; and the agreement reached between us was that the Government would go into the matter and see whether it was possible to draw up a plan for improved lighting. This plan would subsequently be submitted to the local authorities, who would then be given opportunity to make a further approach to me in order that matters might be discussed.

So well did the State Electricity Commission and Main Roads Department officers do their work that, when a plan was drawn up and submitted by me to the local authorities, they had no desire to see me again in connection with the matter, but accepted the scheme without reservation. It then remained only to work out a basis, which would be acceptable to all parties, in connection with meeting the cost of the scheme, because hitherto the total cost of lighting roads was borne by the local authorities through whose districts the roads passed; but here was a new scheme of improved lighting which would impose upon the local authorities a burden which they should not be expected wholly to bear, and it was reasonable that the Main Roads Department or some other Government department should assist in meeting the cost.

The local authorities were very pleased with the proposed plan of lighting—that of colour corrected mercury vapour lamps

—and an experimental strip lighted with these lamps was prepared in Shepperton Road, Victoria Park; and people who were interested were invited to observe it. The result was that the plan which was submitted was completely acceptable. Having agreed upon the method of lighting, and having subsequently agreed upon the basis of finance, only one thing remained, and that was the preparation of an amending Bill which would give the Main Roads Department the authority necessary to expend its funds in this way; because, as the Act stands at present, no matter how desirous the department might be of expending the money in this direction, it is not able legally to do so.

All that this Government is actually doing in connection with the matter, therefore, is introducing to Parliament the necessary Bill to create the machinery by means of which the scheme can operate. I do not think the present Government would have lost anything by stating that this was not its scheme, and that it had nothing whatever to do with the matter. After all, the Government will have its opportunities and will no doubt take credit for what it does, being entitled to do that; but I do not think it gains anything by attempting to cover up what was previously done.

It is as well to know—as I know you do, Mr. Deputy Speaker—that everything in connection with this question was completed under the administration of the Hawke Government; and it was to the entire satisfaction of the local authorities, who themselves would be quite ready to admit that the negotiations were to their complete satisfaction. The Bill is necessary, because without it the scheme cannot be implemented, as the Main Roads Department at present cannot expend its funds in this direction. If the power is given for the expenditure of Main Roads Department funds in this way, we shall see the scheme being progressively put into action, and under it there will be a considerable improvement in the system of lighting on the main arterial roads in the metropolitan area. On behalf of the Opposition I indicate support for the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

[*The Speaker resumed the Chair.*]

BUILDERS' REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 1st October.

MR. TONKIN (Melville) [5.21]: This is a Bill in connection with which I do not want to claim any credit whatever.

Mr. Wild: That's a wonder!

Mr. Bovell: It must be a good one.

Mr. TONKIN: I regret to say that my attitude towards it must be very different from what it was in connection with the Main Roads Act Amendment Bill. The Minister, knowingly or unknowingly, started off with a misleading statement when he introduced the Bill. He had this to say—

> This Bill, to amend the Builders' Registration Act, emanates from recommendations by the Builders' Registration Board, and submissions made by the Builders' Guild and the Master Builders' Association. I can assure the House that while none of the amendments contained in the measure is very sweeping, they do contain one or two changes from what we have known over recent years. The Bill has the approbation of all the bodies I have mentioned.

In the post today I received—as I understand a number of other members did also—a letter from one of these bodies which was supposed to have given approbation to this Bill. The letter, which is from the Western Australian Builders' Guild, reads as follows:—

> Members of this Guild, which embraces approximately 200 practising builders, are concerned at certain provisions of the Bill for an Act to amend the Builders' Registration Act at present before you and on their behalf I respectfully submit their views for your consideration.
>
> The proposed amendment to section 10A of the principal Act by increasing from £5,000 to £10,000 the value of contracts which may be entered into by a "B" class builder is strongly opposed. It is submitted that the instruction classes conducted by the technical school are well organised, are readily available to any person desirous of improving his knowledge of essential aspects of the building industry and are extremely beneficial. The examinations are very reasonable and not restrictive as evidenced by the number of persons passing each year. In view of this, and in fairness to those who have already completed the examinations, it is felt that there is every opportunity for a "B" class builder to improve his status to "A" class and then engage in any type of contract.
>
> Furthermore, as the Act was originally designed to protect the public it is contended that by permitting "B" class builders, most of whom were recently admitted without examination, to engage in work up to £10,000, the protection to the public will be removed to a large extent. Any "B" class builder, at present permitted to engage in contracts up to £5,000, who is not

prepared to improve his knowledge and so qualify as an "A" class builder is obviously not the type to be permitted to carry out work on contracts of £10,000, many of which could involve technical difficulties.

The second point to which objection is taken concerns the proposed increase in the registration fee from £3 3s. to £5 5s. It is considered that in view of the large number of builders registered the total income on the basis of a registration fee of £3 3s should be sufficient to enable normal administration and inspections. In view of this, it is respectfully suggested that during the debate members give close attention to the financial structure of the board prior to agreeing to any proposed increase in the fees.

Other than the above two matters the Guild considers the Bill most desirable.

As in those two matters we have the most important matter, it cannot be said that the Bill has the approbation of this organisation. All this organisation does is to say that except where it has indicated its opposition it considers the proposed amendments desirable. I will agree that there are some desirable amendments in the Bill; but the measure, in its entirety, does not find favour with the Opposition.

I think the Minister might have taken the House into his confidence on the financial aspect of this matter. It would have helped us considerably if some balance sheet or statement of accounts had been presented so that we could see by how much the sum being provided fell short of the requirements; because, after all, this board should not have a great deal of expense in its administration. It is true that there is a registrar; but the chairman is a Government officer, and the members of the board receive three guineas a sitting with a maximum of £36 or £37 a year. That would not take a great deal of money; and there are some few hundreds of builders contributing three guineas each. So I think it would have helped us to give proper consideration to this proposal if some balance sheet had been presented to us.

I am not opposed to providing the requisite amount of funds for the proper functioning of the board; it is most desirable. If we want the board to function, we have to pay for it. The Builders' Guild believes—and its members ought to be in a position to know—that ample money is already available. If the Minister thinks that there is not, it would be a simple matter to say, "there are so many builders contributing so much each; therefore the income is such-and-such a figure, and the approximate annual disbursements amount to so-and-so." Then we would be able to judge whether it is a reasonable proposal to increase the fees from three guineas to five guineas, as the Minister proposes to do, but which is opposed by the Builders' Guild.

The Guild claims that it has 200 builders in its organisation, so it must represent a fairly large proportion of the total building force. Some information on that question should be vouchsafed to the House in order that we can better give our attention to the proposal.

Another provision in the Bill is for the registration of architects and engineers who are now specifically exempted by the Act, and who are permitted to engage in building without being registered. The Minister gives as his reason for this the difficulty of control and the desirability of being able to effect closer control over architects and engineers. I have no great objection to altering the position so that engineers and architects shall be obliged to be registered, if that will result in better work being performed by these men. I would like to emphasise that this is not a proposal to confer upon engineers and architects a power which they did not previously possess. They can build now, without this amendment, but without the control of the board.

The amendment will prevent them from building as architects and engineers unless they first become registered by the board; and registration is made possible without examination and upon payment of the necessary fee. This will mean additional income to the board, and so is a matter to be taken into consideration when deciding whether an increased fee is desirable.

There is also a proposal in the Bill to change the chairman of the board, the present chairman being the Principal Architect. So at present a Government officer is in control of the board; and, in my view, this is an excellent arrangement because it permits the Minister for Works to have close association with the Builders' Registration Board, and when complaints are received he can readily have the matters attended to. If a change is made so that an outside architect is appointed as chairman of the board, the same liaison cannot possibly exist, and I fear that the efficiency which has been attained will be difficult to maintain. Therefore, I would not favour a change unless it can be shown that the work is so onerous, or is expected to get so onerous, as to make the Principal Architect overburdened with these duties.

As the total number of registered builders is less now—at one stage there were 1,600 conditional builders registered, but that number has now fallen to about 400—there are fewer builders to come under the control of the board, and the work should not present as great an obstacle at present as it did previously; and, as the Principal Architect appears to be able to carry out the duties of chairman without any difficulty, I can see no reason why he cannot continue in that position. The Minister did not offer any reason why there should be a change; he simply explained what the Bill proposed to

do. I would, therefore, like to hear some argument in support of the change because I cannot see any good that will result from it, and it could cause a good deal of harm.

I do not intend to oppose the increase in the fee to be paid to a board member. That fee is to be increased from £3 3s. to £4 4s. for each sitting, with a maximum of £50 in any one year. That is a little enough sum to pay anybody for the time he spends sitting on a board. The amount of £50 a year is not a handsome figure for giving up one's time for this work; and I think, therefore, that that proposal in the Bill is quite reasonable.

With regard to the amendment to prevent dummying, I think there is a good deal of merit in it but I can foresee some disadvantages. I freely admit that at present there are people who do not know much about building—some are foreigners who have not been long in this country—and who use the name of a registered builder by entering into a partnership with him to carry out certain work. The registered builder, in many instances, does not know and does not care what is going on. In some cases he is paid a nominal fee for the use of his name, and the persons who are using his name but who are not expert builders proceed to erect houses for unfortunate people; and they are the ones who suffer.

I understand the object of this amendment is to give the board more control over this practice so as to ensure that when a registered builder's name is used, that builder shall undertake the management of the job and accept the responsibility for it. I am not quite clear on how that provision is going to be policed. It will present a major problem to the board. Nevertheless, it is a step in the right direction.

What I am concerned about is that there are a few men who, over the years, have proved themselves to be first-class practical builders. There is one man called Costello who has been able to undertake buildings of considerable magnitude running into tens of thousands of pounds. He is able to perform such contracts under the Act by using the provision which enables him to enter into a partnership with a registered builder. As I have said previously, the registered builder gives his name to the partnership and Costello is able to do the work. If this amendment is put through, so far as I can see, Costello will have to curtail his building activities considerably because his building work will be limited to jobs costing £5,000 or £10,000, perhaps, whereas he has already successfully constructed buildings costing £70,000 or £100,000.

He has built extensively to meet the requirements of the Roman Catholic Archbishop; he performs, very successfully, a considerable amount of church work. I would like to find some way by which men like Costello, who have proved their ability as practical builders, can continue with their building activities, because it will not be to the detriment of anybody that such men should be allowed to do so; but it will be to the detriment of many if their building activities are curtailed. Whilst I agree that it is most desirable to protect people from inexperienced builders, nevertheless, in so doing we should not restrict the operations of men who are thoroughly competent, although not theoretically qualified.

During my lifetime I have met many men in different walks of life who were first-class practical tradesmen, but who, because of their age, found it almost impossible to face up to the theoretical requirements of certain examinations. As it is the practical result we want, I think exceptions should be made in those cases where practical skill is evident.

Mr. Wild: Would the member for Melville say that the man Costello, to whom he refers, is so old he cannot take this examination?

Mr. TONKIN: I would not say that definitely; but what occurred leads me to believe that is so; because I cannot imagine that a man like Costello—who, until he saw this loophole in the Act and took advantage of it, was considerably disadvantaged—would not have qualified and settled down if he could have taken the examination.

Mr. Wild: I knew him for a number of years, particularly when I was Minister for Housing; and I would say he is not a day over 45 now.

Mr. TONKIN: What I cannot understand is why a man with his practical ability would not have followed that preferable course if he felt he could achieve it. I know what I would have done in his position. If I knew I could have passed the examination I would not have hesitated. But he knows his own capabilities. He would not, however, have gone on in this insecure position if he had felt he could qualify in the ordinary way. I do not know what the reason was, but it was extremely difficult for builders to become registered as A-class builders; they all seemed to fail that examination one after the other.

Mr. Wild: It still is very difficult.

Mr. TONKIN: That may be the answer. If it is extremely difficult to pass the examination, whatever the reason, one can understand why people are disinclined to keep on trying to pass it. However, I mention the case of Costello because I personally inspected his work in a number of places, when, as Minister, I was very concerned about the situation; because I felt it was unfair that a man with his proven practical ability should have difficulty in carrying out this work. I made it

my business to inspect the various jobs he had done, and to discuss with various people what they thought of his work. They all tended in the one direction in their opinion; namely, that his work was very satisfactory.

Yet this man has to depend on this provision in the Act to enable him to undertake large jobs; because he is obviously a man who is not content with small cottage work. I would be concerned if he were put out of business as a result of this amendment; yet I would readily agree that some safeguard is desirable to prevent people—and I know of one instance that was brought to my notice in the last few days—from undertaking work for which they are not qualified, or which they are not capable of doing, simply under the cloak of a registered builder who, apart from the fact that he received some recompense for the use of his name, has no idea how the work is being done or what is being done; and, what is more, does not care.

I agree it is no longer reasonable to have the stipulation that unless a B-class builder carries out a certain amount of work in a year, he shall no longer claim the right to registration. That amendment was introduced for a special purpose, which was to cull from the ranks of B-class builders a number of people who should not have been in the list at all, but who were encouraged to come in simply because of the great dearth of builders and the pressing need for speeding up our building capacity. Some of them had no knowledge whatever of building and desired to become B-class builders simply to get the advantage of discounts which could be obtained in the trade, and to erect buildings for themselves.

Having done so, they do not serve any great purpose in continuing to be registered; and it would not be to the advantage of anybody to employ them. Hundreds of them have dropped out, so that it could be taken that those who remain in the list of B-class builders are now, in the main, people who know how to build. So I agree that the restriction of their registration which previously existed should no longer apply.

Now we come to the more contentious provision as to whether a B-class builder should be permitted to contract for a building in excess of the value of £5,000 up to £10,000. This figure has been altered from time to time. If my memory serves me correctly, the figure originally put in the legislation was about £400.

Mr. Graham: It was £800.

Mr. TONKIN: The member for East Perth informs me that the figure was £800; but even that figure was low compared with what it is today. The idea was that these B-class builders should be allowed to come in and undertake the smallish jobs and so make their contribution to the improvement necessary in our building capacity at a time when large numbers of buildings were required. Circumstances changed over the years, and the amendment was liberalised until it got as high as £5,000, which now applies. This £5,000 covers the cost of the majority of dwellings.

Most people—practically all working people—build houses which cost somewhat less than £5,000. Those who go over that figure would by no means be the majority. If the B-class builder is permitted to contract for the erection of a house up to £5,000, then he has a pretty wide field in which to compete.

Mr. Graham: I want to apologise; the original figure was £400.

Mr. TONKIN: I was right.

Mr. Graham: Yes.

Mr. TONKIN: I accept the apology of the member for East Perth. It would appear my memory did serve me aright; the original figure was £400; and I thank the member for East Perth for emphasising the point. However, in the final analysis it does not mean anything except that the figure has been progressively improved from £400 up to £5,000. Now it is proposed to extend it to £10,000. Rather than tinker with the position in this way, I would prefer to see some competent authority—the registration board with somebody added to it; or the board as it stands—get down to a consideration of the practical qualifications of all people who are at present registered. They have not got to take them on trust; they have been in the industry for some years and there would be round about, within easy access, a number of examples of the capacity of these builders. The board ought to be able to say whether they can build or not.

If the standard of workmanship has been such as to indicate that they are competent builders, then, without wasting any time about it, we should register them as competent builders—the lot of them. Do not let us put any stipulation in about £5,000, or £10,000, or anything else. Those who are not competent should not be allowed to undertake this building up to the amount of £10,000.

An attempt should be made to get them to adopt some other calling so that the people who employ them will not be penalised. Let us examine the work which these builders have done; and if it is satisfactory, register them all on one basis. Then for the future, let them go through their training and take their examinations and qualify in the proper way. In that way we can recruit additions to the building force and ensure that only fully qualified people will be admitted to the calling. Should we for any reason whatever face a situation such as we faced before, and which necessitated inviting extra people

in, then consideration can be given and the necessary steps taken at the appropriate time to deal with it. At this moment we are not in difficulty, because we cannot find enough of the master builders to undertake contracts; although, as I said on a former occasion, in future years we may find ourselves short of building tradesmen, because we are not training enough apprentices. But that is a different matter and has no connection with the question under consideration at the present moment.

Instead of increasing the maximum value of work which a B-class builder is permitted to undertake, we should get to grips with this question straightway and find out whether each of these persons registered at present is capable of taking any job which may become available. Those who are not capable should be prevented from undertaking higher-quality constructions.

It is a fact that today some people are suffering because incompetent builders are using the Act and the names of registered builders to enable them to carry out building construction which they are not capable of undertaking. I had occassion a few days ago to forward to the Builders' Registration Board, a case in which the unfortunate owner had to list two or three dozen items which were unsatisfactory in the house built for him, and for which he had to pay a high sum. Up to date he has not had much success in having any remedy applied.

The weakness of the Act which the Minister proposes to tighten up may bring about some control in that direction, but that may not be enough. If a complete overhaul of the situation is made, and only thoroughly competent tradesmen are registered, then much tighter control can be exercised, because the board can always hold over the registered builders the threat of deregistration if they do not perform completely competent work, and the board can compel them to remedy any deficiency. That would be a preferable method of dealing with the present situation.

It can be gathered from what I have said, that I regard the Bill somewhat as the curate's egg—more of it is bad than is good. I propose to oppose the Bill, and that is the attitude of the Opposition generally.

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth) [5.55]: There are several aspects of this Bill that do not meet with my approval. I cannot understand the attitude of the Government in seeking to displace the Principal Architect as one of the members of the Builders' Registration Board. This board comprises five persons, and now it is proposed that it be composed of persons, none of whom is to be responsible to the Government. Surely if we, as a Government or as a Parliament, set up an authority, in order to protect the public; in order to ensure a high standard of workmanship; and in order to ensure the standard of qualifications, the Government is entitled to representation.

It is exceedingly bad that a body with the power and authority which this board possesses should be denied even one representative of the Government. Who are the other representatives? One is to represent the Master Builders' Association, another to represent the Builders' Guild, another to represent the Institute of Architects, and another to represent the building trades' workers. Each one of these has some vested interest.

Surely the public, which is at the receiving end—the people for whom the houses are to be built, and who will suffer if there is any poor workmanship or shoddy work performed—are entitled to some form of representation! I can think of nobody better suited to represent the consumer—the person for whom a home or some other structure is to be built—if he is not to have direct representation, than a public servant. The Principal Architect is mentioned in the legislation. If that officer is too busily engaged upon his normal functions, then it should be possible to nominate some other governmental officer, who has the necessary qualifications and the time, to sit as a member of the board.

Surely this is a case of handing over the set-up—lock, stock and barrel—to private enterprise and interested parties! It is admitted that if the Principal Architect—who under the Act is the chairman —is to remain on the board, he will have only one voice out of five; but at least the Government of the day will have one voice. There will be somebody on the board who will be able to make reports to the Minister.

The Builders' Registration Board is not set up to benefit vested interests; it is organised to protect the public for whom buildings are to be erected. Accordingly, I ask the Minister and the Government to have a second look at the state of affairs contemplated in the Bill. I can think of only one other illustration where it is proposed that a governmental function should be handed over entirely to an outside body—I do not intend to debate that matter because I cannot—and that is the industrial promotion council which is embodied in a Bill before Parliament at the present time. The Government has an interest and has a responsibility in connection with this matter.

I seriously and earnestly call upon the Government to give further consideration before using its brutal majority to remove the governmental representation entirely from a sphere of influence in which it holds a very definite responsibility.

Like the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I wonder whether an increase in fees is actually warranted. As he has

pointed out, to date there is no evidence which has been placed before us to indicate that an increase is necessary. When the legislation was passed in 1939, the registration fee was one guinea per annum. In 1953, which is not very long ago, it was increased to three guineas. That, of course was necessary because of the increase in costs and the loss of the value of the pound. Now, it is proposed to increase the amount to five guineas per year. It may be warranted, but I think there should be some reason given for practically doubling the amount within this short period of time. I repeat, the fee was reviewed as late as 1953.

It is proposed in the measure that a member or partner in a firm shall be responsible for the supervision of work carried out by that firm where some of the principals do not hold a certificate of registration. I wonder how practical that is? What is the position at the present moment with most builders? I am thinking of the bigger building firms like A. T. Brine & Sons, H. A. Doust, Sloan Construction Company, and the rest of them. I do not know how many qualified A-class registered builders these firms have, but I could imagine considerable difficulty in supervising some hundreds of thousands of pounds' worth of building activity at Talgarno; perhaps a several-storeyed banking building at Albany; or a new town hall at Bunbury, to say nothing of some enterprise of considerable size in the metropolitan area—all these works going on simultaneously—if we depart from the master builders who, after all, are the A1 of the building trade.

Mr. Brand: Does this apply in the country?

Mr. GRAHAM: No, it does not; but if, on account of the importance of the work or the magnitude of the project, the qualified man happens to be in the country, then a breach is being committed, because it is not possible for him to be present in the metropolitan area to supervise some important works that are in progress. I have used the case of these larger builders as it would apply to them; but perhaps they have sufficient of these registered builders—A or B class—in order to meet the requirements of a job costing more or less than £5,000.

I am wondering how a small, or smallish, builder, who engages his work force upon average-sized undertakings would be placed. He simply could not afford to have three, or four, or half a dozen or more persons on his staff who had the qualification required under the legislation with the restrictions that are proposed in this Bill. I do not know that the present system, all in all, has not worked reasonably satisfactorily.

I am aware that there are cases of where persons who have virtually no building qualifications, but perhaps the ability to organise and to supervise in a general way; and who in previous life and experience have been associated with building undertakings, have managed for some years, to organise their work and proceed from job to job with apparent satisfaction to themselves and to their clients. They are still in business.

Whilst it is true that in some instances they resort to the subterfuge of giving a share to or making a partner of a person who has no interest and plays no part whatsoever in the building activities of the firm, might we not be performing a greater injustice by seeking to close the door entirely? Because I put it to the Minister and to the Government that great damage has been done in the case of these builders who offer for a sum, or without payment for ability, the name and the registration number of a person who happens to be in possession of one.

The proposal is to increase the permissible extent of activity from a maximum of £5,000 for a particular job—and this includes everything: materials, wages and so on—to £10,000. I wonder whether, by setting a financial limitation, that meets the position. I am not criticising the Government when I say this, because I am aware that, from 1939 to the present day, the restriction has been stated in terms of pounds, shillings, and pence.

As I see the position, the primary objective is to ensure that where there are large buildings with some complications—perhaps an engineering knowledge or something approaching it is necessary to deal with them—a prospective client should have an assurance that the person undertaking the work has the necessary qualifications. In other words, where it is a matter of building large churches and cathedrals, multi-storeyed buildings, departmental stores, factories and similar buildings, then surely it is necessary that those who engage in such building should be well qualified.

However, where it is a matter of building humble cottages, simple dwellings, sheds, garages, making additions and extensions to existing structures, erecting small lock-up shops, etc., the same degree of training, knowledge, and specialised skill is not required in order to undertake the work and supervise the tradesmen engaged upon the project.

My feeling is that if we adhere to the financial limitation of £5,000, by and large it will be ample. That covers the cost of a more than humble home, but one of reasonable proportions. Surely all the reasonable requirements—the cottage, the average dwelling, the shed, and the garage, as mentioned earlier—are easily encompassed within that figure. The simple shop—indeed two or three of them adjoining—could be covered by the sum of £5,000; and normal extensions and additions to

homes and other simple structures would surely not exceed or even approach that sum. Therefore the existing limitations, in my view, cover the situation reasonably well.

However, if we make the sum £10,000, it will be possible to erect two-storeyed flats. I think that the construction of a two-storeyed flat is totally different from the simple constructions I mentioned earlier. Therefore, a greater knowledge is required, because all sorts of factors and materials have to be considered in the construction of a building that is of more than one floor. As I am reminded by one of my colleagues, the more complicated the building becomes, the greater the necessity for the building contractor to have a knowledge not only of building practices but also of organisation of his work force and the supply of materials, together with some knowledge of accounting and business processes.

We have read in the Press from time to time where building contractors have folded up and become bankrupt, and they have admitted quite freely that it was not until they had got into the depths completely that they fully realised that their account did not square, and that they were on the wrong side of the ledger.

Therefore, in order to protect the client—and, indeed, to protect many of these building contractors from themselves—we would be well advised to keep the limit to what it is at present and not seek to extend it further—certainly not at this stage, anyway. I am aware that, as was hinted by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, certain relaxations were made by the late Labor Government with, I think, the indulgence of members generally in both Houses, and of all Parties.

Some six years ago when, with regard to housing particularly, we were in most desperate straits—a time when the building contractors simply could not handle all the work that was offering and when anyone, practically, who could render a useful service in connection with building construction was given a job—relaxation was necessary in order that we could, without any hindrance whatsoever, get on with the job of providing homes for our needy people. However, the problem of today is not the problem that existed then; and this is the time to get back to what I might call a pre-war concept, where we can be more selective and choosey, and where we can give protection not only to the workers who might be left unpaid, or to the business firms which might be left lamenting on account of the credit they have given to persons who have more ambition than business knowledge, but also—and perhaps most important of all—to those people who are seeking to have some building work undertaken, and who have the utmost confidence in the tenderer or the person who has submitted a price.

It is only when the work has proceeded to a certain stage and the contractor has got into serious difficulties that the persons for whom the buildings were being erected realise that a mistake has been made; or it may be that after the construction has been completed—perhaps a year or two later—it is found that there is some basic weakness; and then it is too late. The bird has flown; the building contractor, more or less a fly-by-night, has gone out of business; and accordingly there is no redress whatsoever.

Finally—speaking of homes—most people build a home for themselves once in a lifetime; and if they are faced with some of the tragedies I have outlined, they are probably ruined forever as far as achieving their life ambitions is concerned. I am, therefore, going to vote against the second reading.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

MR. OLDFIELD (Mt. Lawley) [7.30]: At the outset, I support the measure, for the simple reason that it seeks to give some relief to those persons who are registered as B-class builders under the Act as it stands at present. The position has been outlined sufficiently to indicate that some years ago the maximum value of the work which B-class builders could undertake was increased from £4,000 to £5,000; and the proposal now before us is to increase that maximum to £10,000. I do not think that provision goes far enough; because when we examine the principal Act, it becomes apparent that it is probably the greatest piece of humbug that has ever been foisted on any section of the community—and there I refer to the builders themselves.

We know that, when the Act came into force, all those actively engaged in the building industry automatically received A-class registration, without having to give proof of any qualifications at all. Since then, any person before being registered as an A-class builder has had to pass certain examinations. Whether he had any practical experience or not did not enter into the matter—it was simply a theoretical test; and the result is that there are many anomalies today, inasmuch as many firms which have been engaged in building for years have found it necessary to employ some person with an A-class builder's certificate in order to comply with the Act. This often means that a firm employs some young person, who has just completed his studies and has passed his examination, but who has had no practical experience at all. Just because he has passed the examination, his name and registered number can be placed on a sign at the site of the building, and then the firm in question can undertake any work it desires.

I repeat that the principal Act is simply humbug, because it applies only to the metropolitan area, and there is no restriction on any builder outside the metropolitan area doing any class of building work to any value whatsoever. People in Bunbury or Albany who wish to have any building—perhaps a hotel—to the value of £100,000 or more built, can give the contract to anyone—even an unregistered builder—and he can do the work. However, when we come to the metropolitan area we find, for some reason or other, that a builder must be registered as an A-class builder if he is to take on work over a certain value, while the B-class builder is able to take on normal cottage-type work to a restricted value of £5,000 maximum, which the Bill before us proposes to increase to £10,000.

I feel that if country people are sufficiently safeguarded at the present time, there is no reason why there should be restrictions on building in the metropolitan area. It has been suggested in this House on many occasions that the restrictions are there to protect the public, but I do not think that is the reason for them at all. I believe that the Act had its genesis at the behest of the big contractors, and it is there simply to protect them from competition. Once again we see certain people enjoying the effects of legislation which is there under the guise of protecting the public; when, in fact, all it does is to protect those persons and not the public generally.

Mr. Graham: As a matter of historical fact, it was introduced at the behest of the building trades unions.

Mr. OLDFIELD: That may have been so; but it would have the condonation of the big building contractors, although there is ample protection for the public without this legislation. The local authorities have their own building surveyors and building inspectors, together with by-laws governing the construction of buildings, and specifications with which all structures must comply. Those officers of the local authorities inspect buildings within their areas. If it is a public building that is being erected, the Public Works Department and the Health Department are interested, and they lay down specifications that must be complied with. Those departments also have their inspectors to see that such buildings comply with the specifications.

If buildings are being constructed for the State Housing Commission or the War Service Homes Department, those instrumentalities have their own architectural staff and building surveyors and inspectors who inspect the work, in addition to the officers of the local authority concerned. I repeat that there is ample protection for the public. If we really want to do something to help the B-class builders and remove the pinpricking restrictions which serve only to irritate people, the best thing we can do is to repeal the principal Act and be done with all these shenanigans.

I wish to state emphatically, in supporting the proposed increase of the maximum for B-class builders to £10,000, that I am disappointed that the figure fixed is not £20,000 or £25,000, or that the whole Act is not to be repealed. If the legislation is to remain, I feel that the distinctions of the A-class and B-class registrations should be removed, and any registered builder allowed to undertake the erection of any kind of building, of whatever value. I repeat that any builder is under strict supervision from the various local authorities and others that I have mentioned; and, if the person letting the contract had any doubt at all as to the ability of the contractor, he would not be given the job in the first instance. I support the second reading.

MR. NULSEN (Eyre) [7.40]: To a great extent I agree with the member for Mt. Lawley. I oppose the Bill because I think the increase from £5,000 to £10,000 is unnecessary. This legislation will give greater protection to the master builders and will eventually cut out the B-class builders altogether. We must realise that the B-class builders are the practical builders, but this Bill will mean a virtual monopoly and a closer confine as far as the master builders are concerned. I do not like the Bill; nor do I like the principal Act. No other State in Australia—and indeed no other country in the world—has a Builders' Registration Act; and if I had my way, or I were a dictator, I would abolish the Act.

Mr. Evans: You do not have to be a dictator to do that.

Mr. NULSEN: The public has plenty of protection through the local governing inspectors, surveyors, health officers, and—as the member for Mt. Lawley mentioned—the architects. Architects are skilled in designing buildings, and the fact that people can engage architects should give them sufficient protection.

In my opinion the buildings of today are not nearly as good as the buildings which were built 30 or 40 years ago. There was no Builders' Registration Act in those days, and therefore I feel that the Act should be abolished. Nobody can tell me that because we have this Act the buildings in Western Australia are better than those built in the Eastern States or other parts of the world. Anyone who has been to Coolgardie, Kalgoorlie, Cue, or Meekatharra, and has seen the hotels or public buildings built in the early days, will realise that the buildings of today cannot compare with the buildings of years ago. The same applies to the fettlers' quarters which were built near the railway lines in the early days.

To my way of thinking there is too much theory about present-day building, and too many restrictions. If we want to protect the employees, why not get the builder to enter into a bond for £2,000, £3,000, or £4,000, according to the cost of the building he is erecting? This bond could be on a graduated scale, and that would give sufficient protection to the industry and the public. Although I realise that, in the first instance, the principal Act was passed to give protection to employees engaged in the building trade, I do not think there is any need for the Act now. We have had sufficient experience, and the employees have other means of getting protection. My greatest objection to the Act is that it creates a monopoly, and this Bill merely makes the position worse. Because of it the cost of buildings must rise in the future. By making it a close confine, there will be no opposition to the master builders.

Whatever we want to do—whether it is to play cricket, or do anything else—we have to practise; and without the practical knowledge, we will not get very far. Theory is not sufficient. As I have said, I oppose this legislation because it creates a monopoly; and, like most members of this House, I am opposed to monopolies. If we had a precedent in some other part of the world there might be some reason for it; but this is the only place where there is a Builders' Registration Act. Although some of my colleagues may not agree with me, I have argued along these lines for many years, and I shall vote against the second reading.

As I have already stated, there is nothing constructive either about this Bill or about the principal Act; and as it will afford protection only to the master builders; and as the public is well protected through the local authorities, the Health Department, and the architects, I oppose the Bill. All it will do is to grant a monopoly to those who, like a lot of others, wish to make money more quickly.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [7.47]: At the outset, I wish to indicate that I am opposed to this Bill, but I would like to give a few ideas I have about the Act and the amendments that this Bill proposes should be made to it. In the first place, I understand that the principal Act was passed for the purpose of protecting the public against unscrupulous builders. Since then, of course, the Act has been amended on several occasions, and various Governments have used it to gain some protection for those who support their particular point of view. No doubt the Master Builders' Association and the Builders' Guild have exerted their influence on Governments of the same political colour as members opposite, and no doubt the trade union movement has done the same thing on Governments composed of members from this side of the House.

Like the member for Eyre, I am inclined to the view that this amending Bill is in line with that thought; and the Builders' Guild, or, more particularly, the Master Builders' Association—because the Builders' Guild has clearly indicated that it is not in favour of several aspects of the Bill—has made some move to have these amendments introduced. In the absence of any information from the Master Builders' Association, one can only come to the conclusion that it is that organisation which has been behind the move. Of course, every section of the public is entitled to its point of view on such things as protective Acts and protecting different trades and callings.

However, I think it would probably be better if we abolished B-class builders altogether and only required builders to enter into a bond in regard to their finances, because I think that is the main problem associated with B-class builders. In view of the fact that a number of them have gone broke in recent years, it would appear that while they may be perfectly capable from the building point of view, their financial standing and their ability to be able to assess the financial aspect is very limited.

It causes much confusion among architects when they find that a man who has been a B-class registered builder suddenly runs short of finance and leaves the building half completed, and his workmen unpaid. The provision to enable a B-class builder to erect a building to the value of a maximum of £10,000 would, I suggest, only increase the number of builders who become financially embarrassed. I do not think it is wise that other members of the community should be involved with several people who become bankrupt because they do not fully understand the ramifications of the calling they have entered. Strangely enough, this calling is an easy one to enter; because if a man can erect a cottage or any other small structure he might gain the name of being a builder within the limits of such structures, and if he branches out or expands —which is a simple thing to do—he might find himself in considerable trouble.

So far as an A-class builder is concerned, I differ, to some extent, from other speakers. In this day of academic qualifications I consider there is a place for academic qualifications in the proficiency of a builder in the same way as such qualifications are held by other members of the community who practise as medical practitioners, accountants, and so on. Once such people have successfully passed the necessary examinations, that should be a fair indication to the public that they are fully qualified in their own particular field. It should also be borne in mind that one of the qualifications of an A-class registered builder is an advanced knowledge of accountancy. Therefore, I consider that the public is protected to a great degree by an Act such as this.

It would appear to me that a B-class builder who becomes somewhat successful would surely be able to make himself readily available as some sort of partner with, say, a reputable building firm so that he may engage himself on any advanced building work without being responsible for the actual work performed. That would not pose such a difficult problem; because, as in law, or accountancy, or similar professions, large firms take on to their staff people who have already qualified in the profession and who have letters after their name; and, at a later stage, if they so desire, they can branch out as lawyers or accountants in their own right.

However, while such people are working for a qualified accountant or a qualified firm of accountants, they know what is required of them and they carry out the necessary duties, which involves a knowledge of taxation and other laws, under the supervision of a fully registered person. A similar practice could be followed with young, or more recently qualified builders who have passed their examinations, have been registered, and who hold an A-class certificate. I feel that such an academic qualification is quite justified.

There are some features of this proposed amendment which will make it mandatory for people who hold certain qualifications to become registered builders on making application; and this provision names a person who is a member of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. I do not object to that person being registered. It also mentions a person who is registered under the Architects Act, 1921. No real argument could be advanced against that provision, either, because men who have been registered under that Act would probably be few and far between; and, in any event, they should have a wide knowledge of architecture.

Another person mentioned is a member of the Institution of Engineers, Australia (Perth Division). Why a person in that category has been mentioned I do not know; and, to my mind, it needs a little clarification, because some would be members of the Civil Engineering Institute and Constructional Engineering Institute and would be quite entitled to be registered upon applying to become A-class builders because they would be competent supervisors of any building on which they would be in charge. Another person, who is to be given registration on application, is a member of the Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy.

I see very little reason why a member of that institute should be registered as a builder, unless the Minister has some specific knowledge to justify such a person being registered as a master builder. However, I do not know that a member of that institute would have any particular knowledge of building—particularly A-class building—because, after all is said and done, building today, with modern techniques, is rather a complex business; it is equally as complex as any other trade or similar profession in the community.

So I suggest that those points need clarification; but the proposal to enlarge the field of the B-class builder is somewhat distressing to me. I consider that a better result could be obtained by insisting that such a person, when registered, should put up a bond to ensure that his finances are sound, and so protect those persons for whom he will build.

That is all I have to add to this debate, except to say that the provision which proposes to remove the Principal Architect from the position of chairman of the board, and the granting of the right to the Governor to appoint an architect to be the chairman of the Builders' Registration Board, is not in the interests of the State. I believe that a Government officer should be guaranteed that position; and if it is required that an architect shall be appointed by the Governor, he can be any one of the persons nominated by the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. At this juncture I indicate my opposition to any amendment to the Builders' Registration Act, as envisaged by this Bill.

MR. O'NEIL (Canning) [7.57]: Briefly, I wish to give my support to this measure. I was rather amazed at the turn of the debate in some respects. Unfortunately, I was absent from the Chamber when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition began to speak; but when I resumed my seat I sat back and found myself nodding in agreement with much of what he then said. To me, his remarks indicated that apart from a few minor aspects, he supported the measure. Imagine my amazement when he indicated, just prior to resuming his seat, that he was going to oppose it.

The second rather amazing occurrence was that the member for Eyre indicated his agreement with the remarks made by the member for Mt. Lawley and his support of the measure; but, later in his speech, said that the Builders' Registration Act should be repealed, and then went on to say that he would not support the measure.

I consider that the increasing of the value of a building to be constructed by a B-class builder from £5,000 to £10,000 will widen the field of competitive tendering. I feel, too, that due to the passage of time, the builder who would be inclined to go broke through inefficiency has, in fact, already done so.

Therefore, those who are still in the field have proved, over a period of time, that they can construct buildings up to £10,000 in value; and I would go so far as to say they could construct them up to an even greater value. Further, this amendment restricts this increased value of buildings to the metropolitan area; and that, in itself, is a good reason why some

further consideration should be given to extending the field of operations of the so-called B-class builder.

A small amendment which I would like to see incorporated in this measure is one that would differentiate between the academically-qualified builder and the builder who is qualified by virtue of his practical experience. I refer to the designations A-class and B-class builders. To me, the term B-class means inferior. I cannot agree that the quality of the work constructed by men, many of whom are registered as B-class builders, is inferior. They are B-class builders by virtue of the fact that they have not any academic qualifications. As indicated by the member for Mt. Lawley, a young lad who has completed his articles and passed the necessary academic examinations can become a registered A-class builder without having any practical experience of major building construction. At this stage I indicate my support of the measure before the House.

MR. BRADY (Guildford-Midland) [8.1]: I regret I must oppose the measure, because I feel it will not help the position that has arisen since the parent Act came into operation. I believe the parent Act was intended in the first place to stop people doing what was known at the time as jerry-building—work not measuring up to the required standard. As the years have gone on the Act has failed to do just that. I understand that we are the only State in the Commonwealth and probably in the world—we might be unique in this respect—which has a board superimposed on the local governing bodies and the functions those bodies are supposed to carry out.

Members know that most local governing bodies today have building inspectors. What is their job, if it is not to check to see that jerry-building is not carried out in the metropolitan area? We are not getting the protection that we should from the parent Act, and to that extent I feel that both the Act and the Bill now before us are superfluous; they only add irritations to an already difficult situation. I have heard of men who have constructed buildings to the value of hundreds of thousands of pounds in Western Australia, even though they are not A or B-class builders; but they have worked for somebody who is an A or B-class builder, who has allowed his name to be associated with the buildings I have in mind. These works have been passed and have been equal to anything that has been put up by A or B-class builders.

I understand that certain people, without sitting for examinations at all, are permitted to register under the Act. This makes the whole thing farcical; and it is not helping the building industry. I feel we should encourage and help young tradesmen, whether they be carpenters, plasterers, cement workers, or bricklayers, to get out and start on their own in the building industry; and to learn by practical experience to do a job for the community.

If this legislation is to remain, the Government should give consideration to incorporating it in the new local government legislation, which I understand is to be introduced. These provisions could be supplementary to the powers which the local governing bodies already possess in relation to the inspection of buildings. I had some little experience a few years ago as chairman of a local government committee and the building body, and I was amazed at the amount of jerry-building that was going on. If it had not been for a very keen inspector there would have been many more jerry-built houses. I am not sure that a great number of them are not being built today, despite the fact that we have State Housing Commission inspectors, architects, and the Builders' Registration Board to look after the people's interests.

Accordingly I cannot see how the parent Act, or the Bill, will improve the position I have already set out. In view of the fact that the Bill may pass the second reading stage, I want to say that, like the member for Canning, I feel we should have only one class of builder. It is quite wrong for two classes to be designated as A and B, because the B-class designation conveys the impression that men in that particular class are inferior builders when actually the man registered as a B-class builder may know more about buildings than an A-class builder, by virtue of the fact that the former is a practical tradesman, whereas the A-class builder may be an architect who has never used the tools of trade.

So I hope some effort will be made during the Committee stage to have but one class. I have made an inquiry about the balance sheet and financial statement which is supposed to be supplied to the Minister in charge of the Builders' Registration Board, and I understand that no balance sheet has been tabled for some years. There should be some provision in the Act stating that the board's financial returns shall be tabled in the House so that we can see the activities of the board and also decide whether, at the present time, the proposal to increase the fees is justified.

Personally I think the continual increasing of fees and setting up of boards is not helping the building industry; it is only placing restrictions in cases which should be encouraged; and I refer to young tradesmen who should be assisted and encouraged to get out and do a job for the community. I have heard some criticism of the board as at present constituted, because those who are proposing to take examinations are not able to get a look at the type of questions they are expected to answer; as a result they are not able to study them. If the board wants to encourage people to

qualify as master builders, whether A-class or B-class, the people desirous of sitting for the examination should have an opportunity of seeing the type of examination questions they are likely to be asked, in order to help them become conversant with the requirements in that respect. The Minister should try to encourage the board to set out questions and answers of a type that are likely to be required, in order to help potential examinees. That is the only other comment I would like to make about the board, and I regret I must oppose the Bill.

MR. WILD (Dale—Minister for Works—in reply) [8.8]: The comments from members on the opposite side of the House have been remarkable, because practically every speaker to the debate has had 2s. each way, and has finally said he opposed the Bill and then sat down. I suppose members opposite have opposed the Bill on principle, because they constitute the Opposition.

It is rather interesting to note that legislation dealing with the registration of builders was introduced by a Labor member (the late Mr. Needham) in 1939. Looking back at the division lists, I notice the measure was supported by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Eyre, both of whom are at present in their seats.

Mr. Nulsen: That is before we had experience of seeing how it worked.

Mr. WILD: The member for Eyre said he was opposed to this measure because it was monopolistic, and so on. Let us look further on in the passage of time. We find that in 1953 the Deputy Leader of the Opposition introduced the first major amendment to this legislation when we had conditionally-registered builders. Again it received the approbation of all members on the opposite side of the House, who at that time occupied the Treasury bench. Then in 1956 the Government, in which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was Minister for Works, introduced a further amendment to the Act when the A-class and B-class builders were separated. The conditional registered builders disappeared and the B-class builders took their place.

During this debate, members opposite have stated that they do not like the B-class builders, and they would prefer all builders to be in one class. It appears that they tackled the bone from every possible side. It is difficult to pick out a peg on which to hand one's hat, or to know where they stand on this matter.

Mr. Toms: Did you support the two previous amendments to the Act?

Mr. WILD: I did when I was in the Opposition, because I thought it was an excellent idea in 1953 to assist the man who was prepared to help himself. The housing industry was then in a most deplorable state, and there was a big lag. As the honourable member well knows—because apparently he was a member of the Bayswater Road Board—a large number of houses were built, and he supplied the building materials. The Party now in opposition was instrumental in putting this legislation on the statute book. The only amendments to the Act were made by members opposite.

I want to refer to a few points raised in this debate. The ones mentioned by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition require some comment. The first concerns the letter received from the Builders' Guild. It appears that all members received a copy. I regret that I have not the requisite file before me, because it is kept in my office. I do not understand the filing system and cannot get the file at this stage. I want to stress the point I made when I introduced the Bill that I did not sponsor it. The matter was raised in a letter from the Builders' Registration Board which requested me, as Minister for Works, to introduce the amendments now contained in the Bill.

The Builders' Registration Board has set out the amendments, and it gave the reasons. I want to point out that a representative of the Builders' Guild sits on the Builders' Registration Board. In addition to receiving that letter, I also received letters from the Master Builders' Association and the Builders' Guild, and both organisations supported the move of the Builders' Registration Board.

I suppose that as Minister for Works I was entitled to assume that the Bill, having been sponsored by the Builders' Registration Board, which includes a representative of the Builders' Guild, was requested by all the members on the Builders' Registration Board.

I may point out here that the secretary of the Builders' Guild is a member of Parliament in another place. As with all Bills before they are presented to Parliament by all Parties, this Bill received his approbation at the time. Today, out of the blue, came this circular letter in which the Builders' Guild considers that the maximum value in the case of a B-class builder should not exceed £7,000 on any job. I notice the letter is signed by the President, so it appears there is a division among the ranks of their members.

Another point raised was the amount of registration fees. The Principal Architect pointed out that at present registered members pay £3 3s. per year. There were 1,600 B-class builders registered, but now the number has dropped to 430. Consequently there is a large decline in the revenue of the board. It employs two inspectors to police the work performed by its members. If the proposed increase in fees is not approved, one inspector will have to be put off. That is the matter in a nutshell.

The member for Guildford-Midland raised the point that no financial statement has been presented by the board for some years. I was not aware of that, but apparently they were not presented to my predecessor either. I have only the word of the Builders' Registration Board that it was necessary to raise the registration fees in order that the two persons now engaged in inspectorial work may be retained in their employment.

A further point to which I refer is the proposal to alter one of the provisions to include "an architect appointed by the Governor." There is a good reason for that amendment. I repeat that this amendment came about by way of the correspondence from the Builders' Registration Board. The Principal Architect (Mr. Clare) is due to retire next year. It was the wish of the Builders' Registration Board, the Builders' Guild and the Master Builders' Association that the move to allow Mr. Clare to continue as a member should be made.

In 1939 the late Mr. Millington referred to Mr. Clare as the Principal Architect, so the latter must have been in the department for a long period. It was the wish of every member of the board, as indicated by the letter signed by every member excepting the chairman, that the Act be amended to enable Mr. Clare to carry on as chairman of the Builders' Registration Board after he retires.

The final point I wish to make relates to B-class builders. Under the Act A-class builders have to pass an examination of a certain standard. They have to possess qualifications other than those required of a building tradesman. If they are all to be allowed to become A-class builders, and if they are to be permitted to tender for projects like the new R. & I. Bank building, they should be able to work out quantities and should possess engineering knowledge. They have to be men above the average. For that reason it is necessary to have two grades of builders.

In the country there is no distinction between A and B-class builders, and any person can tender for building work in the country.

Mr. Nulsen: Generally speaking, their work is good.

Mr. WILD: I agree. I happen to know of one case. Recently some tenders came before my notice in regard to a large project in the country the cost of which was some £350,000. The lowest tender came from a B-class builder and he was quite entitled to submit a tender. If that tender had been recommended by the Principal Architect, the builder would have won the contract although he was a B-class builder. There is a different field for each of the two types of builders; one need only possess the ability to build structures of the smaller type, and that is the reason for the limitation, and the other requires higher qualifications to enable him to undertake the large building construction in the city.

In 1956 the Minister for Works increased the maximum value in the case of the B-class builder from £4,000 to £5,000. In reading his speech I find he said it was necessary to increase the amount, because of the depreciation in the value of money, and it was necessary to open the field. I feel in this respect one should take a reasonable step forward; and, instead of the maximum amount being increased to £7,000, as proposed by members opposite, I think it should be increased to £10,000, which is a fair figure.

If one gets away from house-building, one cannot erect very much in the way of a small factory or additions to a factory for £7,000, £8,000, or £9,000; and we would be giving that fellow an opportunity to tender. As the member for Canning said, that person will help in the competition which, without doubt, does exist today in the building industry. I feel there is a strong justification for this Bill; and I can only say finally that its provisions were submitted to me by the Builders' Registration Board—it was not sponsored in any way by the Government or myself. The Builders' Registration Board wrote and requested all of these amendments. Therefore, I feel that Parliament is justified in passing the measure.

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

Ayes—24.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Mann
Mr. Brand	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Burt	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Court	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Grayden	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Owen
Dr. Henn	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Roberts
	(Teller.)

Noes—21.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Norton
Mr. Jamieson	*(Teller.)*

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. I. W. Manning	Mr. May
Mr. Watts	Mr. Graham

Majority for—3.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Roberts) in the Chair; Mr. Wild (Minister for Works) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 5 put and passed.

Clause 6—Section 9A added:

Mr. JAMIESON: I wonder whether the Minister could clearly elaborate on the various categories of persons who will get automatic registration upon application. I understand from the Minister's reply to the second reading that the Builders' Registration Board did make these recommendations. While I see merit in some of the categories, I feel it is doubtful that all of them have merit. It is also doubtful whether some of them have any knowledge of actual building procedure.

Mr. WILD: In looking through the parent Act I find that the "member of The Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy" was inserted in that Act in 1939. Like the honourable member, I cannot line it up with a member of the Institution of Engineers, Australia (Perth Division). I read the speech of the late Mr. Needham when the provision was inserted in the parent Act, in order to see the reason why; but he did not give any. Therefore, I am afraid I cannot answer the honourable member. However, I will have the matter investigated.

Mr. J. Hegney: Did the Master Builders' Association advise you that there was any such person practising at a builder?

Mr. WILD: In the country there is no necessity for this registration—there never has been. It may be that the degrees and qualifications of both categories are the same. If there is any reason why it should be removed from the Bill, I will have it amended in another place.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 7—Section 10A amended:

Mr. OLDFIELD: I move an amendment—

> Page 3, line 10—Delete the word "ten" with a view to substituting the word "twenty."

I am moving this amendment for the reasons I outlined during my speech on the second reading. I do not believe that £10,000 is enough. The cost of modern buildings involves much more in some areas, particularly when it comes to blocks of flats and two-storeyed buildings. Also is this so in regard to the conversion of old homes into flats and office suites. Although I know the B-class builders are not such by virtue of qualification, I feel they should be given an equal opportunity to tender for work which the bigger firms are able to do.

Mr. WILD: I am afraid I cannot agree to this amendment. We have to put a limit somewhere. The Builders' Registration Board in its wisdom is altering the amount from £5,000 to £10,000. Quite frankly, I think it has been generous. I am in complete agreement with giving the small fellow the opportunity to make good and the opportunity to tackle the bigger buildings, but there must be a limit somewhere.

Mr. TONKIN: In August, I asked the Minister for Works what was causing the delay in the acceptance of tenders for the Narrogin Hospital. The Minister said that it was due to adjustment of a number of variations—a very illuminating answer. I understand that it was over some trouble with a B-class builder, who had, I believe, submitted the lowest tender. If that is so, and the Minister has such concern for increasing the amount for which these builders ought to be permitted to tender, it would help us very considerably if the Minister would say what happened with regard to those tenders, and why there was a delay of a number of weeks on a job considered urgent. If it was because of some doubt about the capacity of this builder to undertake the work, it weakens the Minister's case for increasing the figure; and I think we should know, because it would have a very distinct bearing in regard to this amendment. I do not know whether the member for the district knows the circumstances; but if so, it should influence his vote in this connection.

Mr. WILD: As a matter of fact, the delay in that particular job was exactly as I stated. Before tenders were considered, there was a readjustment of the type of building that was to be erected. This was necessary because of advice from the Health Department. So there had to be an adjustment in the tenders submitted for the original building. In regard to the B-class builder to whom the honourable member referred, it was not a question of his being a B-class builder, but that he was in the hands of his creditors and therefore unable to obtain the necessary credit for the supply of the building material necessary for the job.

Mr. JAMIESON: I feel that the last remarks of the Minister must be clearly borne in mind when voting on this amendment, because it is the very point I have been hammering. These people might be competent in their own way to build; but very often, through their over-enthusiasm, they get themselves into difficulties, and then all parties become involved in trying to sort out the mess. In this case referred to by the Minister, the builder was in the hands of his creditor; but had he, through an inability to assess costs, tendered a very low figure and then commenced the building, he would have found himself in difficulties at a later stage. The member for the district would then have been upset because the building would not have been proceeding at the pace it should have been; the Minister would be upset because he would have had to call tenders again for the completion of the building; and, in fact, the whole box and dice of the contract would have been most unsatisfactory. Therefore, I feel the Committee

should reject any move at this stage to enlarge the scope of the B-class builders.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 8 and 9, and Title put and passed.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

MR. WATTS (Stirling — Attorney-General) [8.44] in moving the second reading said: Section 99 of the Companies Act provides that every company shall, as from the day on which it begins to carry on business, or as from the 14th day after it is incorporated, whichever is the earlier, have a registered office in the State, to be approved of by the registrar. Section 103 of the Companies Act provides—

> Every company shall keep at its registered office in one or more books a register of its members, and enter therein the following particulars:—
>
> (a) The names and addresses and the occupations (if any) of the members of the company, and, in the case of a company having a share capital, a statement—
>
> (i) of the shares held by each member (with distinguishing numbers); and
>
> (ii) where the share capital comprises shares of different classes or kinds or having special rights or subject to special restrictions or disabilities of the classes or kinds of shares and the respective number thereof held by each member; and
>
> (iii) of the amount paid or agreed to be considered as paid on the shares of each member.

Section 105 of the Act provides—

> The register of members commencing from the date of the registration of the company, and the index of the names of the members shall be kept at the registered office of the company, and, except when closed under the provisions of this Act, shall (subject to such reasonable restrictions as the company in general meeting may impose, so that not less than four hours in each day be allowed for inspection) be open at least four hours, between the hours of eight o'clock in the morning and ten o'clock in the evening, each day for at least two days each week, to the inspection of any member gratis, and to the inspection of any other person on payment of one shilling or such less sum as the directors may fix for each inspection.

From that it is clear that, as the law stands at present, it is the obligation of every company to maintain a register and index of its shareholders at the registered office of the company, which registered office must be approved by the registrar.

In more recent times, companies have been formed with the express object of keeping a share register and index of other companies. In the Eastern States of Australia, companies of that nature are carrying on business at the present time; and that system has been found to be very convenient and, in many cases, less expensive than the business of maintaining a separate share register and index of each company at its own registered office.

In consequence, representations have been made that provision should be made for the registration of such a company in Western Australia; but, as will readily be perceived from the sections of the Companies Act which I have read out, under the existing law in Western Australia it is impracticable or unlawful for any company, formed for the purpose of keeping a share register of other companies, to operate in this State; because the Act clearly lays it down that each company must keep its own share register and index, at its own registered office.

The purpose of the Bill is to make it lawful for such a company as I have suggested to be registered in this State, and to keep the share registers and index of shareholders of other companies at its office; and that when that register and index are kept in those circumstances, and the registrar duly notified, the law will be deemed to be complied with. The Bill provides that—

> Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (1) of sections one hundred and three and one hundred and five of this Act—
>
> (a) where the work of making up the register of members and index, if any, is done at another office of the company, it may be kept at that other office; or
>
> (b) where the company arranges with some other person to make up the register on its behalf it may be kept at the office of that other person at which the work is done
>
> but the register of members and index, if any, shall not be kept at a place outside the State, and shall be open

to inspection at that office as provided in section one hundred and five of this Act.

The reference to the register and index being kept by some other person is there because, under the Interpretation Act, the word "person" includes corporations; and therefore the reference is more to a corporation keeping the share register and index, if any, than to any individual person. I mention that because of the use of that particular word.

It is then provided that every company shall forthwith send notice to the registrar of any place other than the registered office where the register and index, if any, are kept, and of the days and hours during which it is accessible to the public, and of every change therein. If that is not done a fine, as well as a daily penalty, is provided.

That is the purpose of the Bill—to make it possible for a company to be registered in Western Australia and to keep the share register of other companies, which, in the present state of the Companies, Act, is not allowed. I think that experience elsewhere has shown that such a provision is desirable. This matter has been carefully considered by the Deputy Registrar of Companies in this State, and there is no doubt in his mind that the proposal is a desirable one; and one, as a matter of fact, that was accepted in principle by the conference on uniform company law which was held a short time ago on the other side of Australia. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Nulsen, debate adjourned.

COUNTRY AREAS WATER SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 1st October.

MR. TONKIN (Melville) [8.52]: There are two proposals in this Bill, and the first is to make provision for bringing within the townsite definition certain areas which are now outside it. It is true that provision exists in the parent Act for the issuing of a proclamation which can decide that certain lands can be brought within a townsite, but that does not give any power to rate. So, although such lands may be brought within the definition of townsite lands, they would still not be ratable. The Government desires that power should be placed in the Country Areas Water Supply Act to permit of the inclusion of certain rural lands as townsite lands, and rated accordingly.

That is proposal No. 1; and, in view of the development which has taken place in country towns, and because what was previously rural land has progressed, has been subdivided, and has residences upon it, I see no objection to that being done. I think it is a reasonable proposition, and I consider that the land should be rated accordingly.

With the other proposal I am not in agreement, because I see a difference. The only purpose of this amendment is to bring to the Treasury more money; and by the attitude of this Government the Treasurer is not very much concerned about the revenue side. He has already indicated that he proposes to give money back with regard to probate duties; he proposes to reduce the land tax; and, more recently, we have had a decision to reopen railway lines which will mean the loss of a lot of money; and the Treasury will have to find, from its funds, the money to pay for that loss. In those circumstances I do not think the Treasurer is justified in looking to certain people in the country, for whom, in 1949 a maximum rate of 2s. was specially provided, to pay an increased rate of another shilling—up to 50 per cent—for the sole purpose of giving the Treasurer more money; and this amendment will not do anything else.

It is acknowledged that country water supplies yearly lose a substantial sum, and that they have been heavily subsidised by the Treasury. That is considered desirable and necessary, and no attempt has been made to alter the position. The Country Areas Water Supply Act was altered in 1949 to provide that only those towns which were served from the Goldfields water supply subsequent to 1949 should have a maximum rate of 3s., but those that were being served up to that time could have a maximum rate of 2s. Now, by this amendment, the Government proposes to take away that maximum rate of 2s. which has applied, and to put all these towns on a maximum rate of 3s., which will mean an immediate increase in rates of 50 per cent; because, make no error about it, if the department has a maximum rate—and I speak from experience—that is the rate which is almost always levied.

The intention of this amendment is to permit the Government to increase the maximum rating to 3s. in country towns which are now on a maximum of 2s. If it were intended that that money should be used to give an improved service to the people who pay for it, it would be a different matter; but it must be borne in mind that these people have already been subjected to a substantial increase in rates because of a revaluation of their properties. In that respect they are no different from other ratepayers, because the same revaluations have taken place in districts on a maximum rate of 3s., and also in the metropolitan area. As these revaluations periodically take place, they inevitably mean an increase in the amount of money paid for water rates. But by altering the

maximum rate in the pound on the annual value, the Government will impose, on a certain section of the community, increases which will have the effect of giving them a double increase.

So we could have a situation where, in some country towns, because of development in those towns, there would be an increase in the valuations. As the ratepayers are already paying an increased amount for the water they receive, and on top of that they are to have an increased rating from 2s. to 3s., a number of them will be subjected to a 50 per cent. increase on a rate which is already considerably high; and in order to do one thing only—give more money to the Treasurer, who is already giving it away as fast as he can.

I am not prepared to assist him to get more money in this way, so that he can give it away in such a manner. If he could indicate to Parliament that he was short of funds, and was having difficulty in financing his requirements, one would be disposed to take a more serious look at this request. But I repeat: The Treasurer has already announced that he proposes to give a reduction in probate duty which will deprive him of substantial funds; he has already announced that he will be granting a reduction in land tax which will deprive him of substantial funds; and his Party was responsible for depriving the previous Government of substantial revenue from land tax.

The Treasurer's most recent act has been deliberately to accept an obligation running into some tens of thousands of pounds for making good losses on railway lines which we know will continue to lose large sums of money, and which inquiries have shown must be losing propositions, apart altogether from the absolute necessity to spend large sums of loan money for rehabilitation, and the servicing of the loans from the Treasury.

When the Treasurer has so much money that he can throw it about, I do not think we should assist him to get some more in this way from country water supply users. I would want a strong argument advanced —and none has been advanced in support of this—to justify the action which the Government proposes to take. One can only assume that the reason is to bring more money into the Treasury; and it is not proposed to do anything specific with it. The Government will put more money into the Treasury by taking it out of the pockets of the country water supply users.

That is what this proposal means, and nothing else. The Government proposes to say to those people in the country districts already subject to an increase in water rates because of increased valuations: "You will pay more for the water you have been receiving. We are going to increase your maximum rate from 2s. to 3s. in the £, and when we get the money we will proceed to give a rebate or a reduction in tax to many other people. For example, we will reduce the land tax to be paid on the large buildings and on the big estates in the city; and you, the users of water in the country, will pay for it."

Mr. Brand: You forgot to mention that we are going to reduce entertainment tax.

Mr. TONKIN: The Treasurer saved me the trouble and only emphasised my argument. If he has so much money at his disposal that he can, with equanimity, contemplate the distribution of largesse in this way to the detriment of users of water in the country—

Mr. Brand: I merely mentioned entertainment tax because you promised to reduce that.

Mr. Hawke: We did not promise to increase the water rates.

Mr. TONKIN: So the responsibility is on the Government, because this proposal is a money proposal only. It is not a proposal to undertake certain specific work. It is a straightout proposal to increase the water rates on a section of the community in order that the Treasurer shall benefit. At the same time the Treasurer is contemplating a distribution of money in a number of directions, and the people from whom this money will be obtained will, in very few cases, be the recipients of any of this benefit. Therefore it is not an equitable proposition, and there is no justification for it. Until the Government shows a greater realisation of its responsibility all round, I am not prepared to grant it this method of obtaining additional finance; and, on behalf of the Opposition, I oppose the Bill.

MR. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [9.3]: I oppose the Bill. I cannot consume myself with a flame of rage about the first provision, but at the same time I cannot speak for it with much enthusiasm. It proposes to amend section 5 of the principal Act and to delete the reference to the Road Districts Act, which sets out the definition of country land. In the principal Act country land is defined as—

> Any holdings within the boundaries of a country water area, but not within the boundaries of any municipal district constituted under the Municipal Corporations Act or townsite as defined in the Road Districts Act.

The first amendment of this Bill proposes to delete the words "Road Districts Act" and substitute the words "this section."

The aim of this amendment is to enable certain lands outside the townsite boundaries, as defined by the Road Districts Act, to be brought within the boundaries of the townsite and to be rated accordingly to enable the Treasurer, not to gain extra money, but to save on the subsidy that is being paid. I am one of the first to realise that, and to acknowledge that a certain

subsidy is paid to the country water consumer; and, in my opinion, that is justified.

I am strongly opposed to the second amendment; and I will be greatly surprised if some of the Country Party members remain silent and allow a measure such as this to pass through this House. It means that certain towns in the wheatbelt and on the Goldfields will have their rating values increased. As mentioned by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, when the Country Areas Water Supply Act was amended in 1950 provision was made that towns that had drawn a supply of water from the Goldfields water supply line prior to 1949 would be safeguarded to the extent that the maximum water rate for those towns would be 2s. in the £ on the annual ratable value. I realise now that other towns are rated at the maximum rate of 3s. in the £.

If the Government were aiming at uniformity, I would be the first one to support it if its move were to reduce the maximum rate paid by other towns to make the uniform rate 2s. in the £ on the annual ratable value of the land. However, I will not support the Government in a move to increase the maximum rate for the towns that have enjoyed—and rightly so—a maximum rate of 2s. in the £ on the annual rateable value.

Section 65 of the principal Act reads as follows:—

> (1) In the case of ratable land within a municipal district or townsite, a water rate shall not in any one year exceed three shillings in the pound on the annual ratable value of the land rated:
> Provided—

Here is the proviso that is under fire in this Bill—

> (a) where the maximum rate exigible in the case of the land immediately prior to the coming into operation of this Act was two shillings in the pound on that value, a water rate under this section shall not exceed that maximum . . . .

The Bill proposes completely to delete that provision; and, if the amendment is agreed to, with the deletion of the section, people living in the country areas and in the wheatbelt—many of which are represented by Country Party members—will be deprived of the privilege—a rightful one—of paying a maximum rate of only 2s. in the £ instead of 3s. in the £. In other words, if the Bill is agreed to it will mean that those people will pay extra water rates.

As members know, during the hot summer months in the wheatbelt areas and on the Goldfields, the consumption of water is tremendous; and I would hate to visualise the water bills of the people living in those parts if their water rates were to be increased by this measure.

A further deletion is proposed by the Bill. Paragraph (b) of subsection (1) of section 65 of the principal Act reads as follows:—

> (b) where in respect of any holding of the land, whether the maximum rate exigible in respect thereof be two shillings or three shillings in the pound on that value, the amount of the water rate assessed at the rate fixed and computed on the basis of the annual ratable value of the holding would be less than one pound, the Minister may fix the sum of one pound as the amount of the water rate to be charged against and be paid in respect of the holding.

The Bill proposes to delete from the Act all mention of those words stating that the maximum rate shall be 2s. or 3s. in the £. As mentioned by my Deputy Leader, the passing of this measure will not result in the Treasury coffers being filled with extra money, but the Treasurer will be safeguarded from emptying so much of the Treasury wealth into the country areas water supply scheme. If the Government were sincere and said, "We are short of money and we are making every endeavour in the country to supply water, but we need extra money to achieve this," the Opposition would endeavour to assist. But we realise that the Government is not sincere in its attitude; if it were it would be making every effort to economise in all other directions.

As mentioned by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the Government has shown a desire to provide relief in relation to probate duty. The Premier, as Leader of the Liberal Party, also mentioned in his policy speech that it was the desire of the Government to give some relief along the lines of the entertainment tax. We find that the Government has opened up a railway line and has admitted that, if this line is found to be unpayable, it will be subsidised from the State Treasury. When taking those factors into consideration, is the Government sincere when it says we must save money on country water schemes? If it were, it would endeavour to save money in other directions also.

A few years ago—and I will endeavour not to be parochial—one of the local authorities on the Goldfields—if not the other two—increased its annual ratable value. What was the first thing that happened? The Water Supply Department did the same. If we are going to allow the Water Supply Department to increase the maximum ratable value from 2s. in the £ to 3s. in the £, we will find that water rates will again skyrocket; and I will not be a party to that. My voice will be heard loud and clear in opposition to this Bill. Once again I invite Country Party members to have a look at the measure to see the full purport of its provisions. If they do, then, like the members from the Goldfields, they will be hard to convince that the Bill is either necessary or justified.

MR. MOIR (Boulder) [9.13]: For the reasons already outlined I, too, must add my voice in opposition to this measure. I wonder how irresponsible this Government will eventually become. In one swoop it seeks to add a tax burden of 50 per cent. on certain of the people of the State, when, as has already been pointed out, the Government is lavish in the hand-outs it is giving to certain other sections of the community. I am well aware that the country areas water supply and the Goldfields water supply lose substantial sums of money; but, like others, I have always considered that to be in the nature of a subsidy paid by the State to people who live in the outback areas under difficult climatic conditions, in order to help produce the wealth of the State.

Only a few years ago our water rates were considerably increased by virtue of the fact that the Water Supply Department instituted a revaluation. I know that at Kalgoorlie and Boulder the rates went up by almost 100 per cent. Other people were fortunate, however, inasmuch as their rates went up only 50 per cent. If we consider the vastly different method of operation so far as water supplies are concerned in the country areas as compared with what exists in the metropolitan area, we find that the average householder in Kalgoorlie and Boulder would have 10,000 or 12,000 gallons of water allowed in his ratable value, after which he would have to pay for any excess water which might be used.

I understand that in the metropolitan area the average amount allowed the householder is in the vicinity of 60,000 gallons. It is only after that amount has been consumed that people are asked to pay for any excess water that is used. As I have said, the people in the country areas start paying for excess water after 10,000 or 12,000 gallons have been used. In my case I pay excess water after 16,000 gallons are consumed. I can assure the House that anybody who desires to have a little comfort around the home by way of gardens and lawns, and similar amenities—which I consider are essential for people living in the dry areas of the State—will have a water bill of at least £20 a year to pay; in some cases it would be even higher.

So I think it is very serious when the Government, quite light-heartedly, decides it is going to increase the rating by 50 per cent., particularly after the increase that was imposed only a few short years ago as a result of a revaluation. It is possible that this revaluation by the Water Supply Department and the local authorities was carried out with a view to bringing valuations more into line with present-day conditions. When, however, this is followed by an imposition such as that proposed in the Bill, it makes one want to take a second look.

There is no suggestion that the general rates are to be raised; that the rates on water used by the farmer are to be increased. It is only to apply to people who live in the towns; it has no application to the general farming community which uses such large quantities of water. It will apply to farming towns such as Merredin, Kellerberrin, Southern Cross, and also to the Goldfields. These towns have drawn water from the Goldfields water supply since its inception, and over the years they have paid vast sums of money into the State revenue.

I consider that this Government, by its attitude, is legislating for only one section of the people; because we see that on the one hand it proposes to give all sorts of concessions to certain people who are not altogether in need of them; and yet on the other hand it is prepared to place these impositions on others who, over the years, have found it very difficult to make a living in arid climates where water is so much of a boon to them; and water enables them to enjoy a little more gracious living than would otherwise be possible. I strongly oppose the imposition the Government is seeking to make by this Bill, and I oppose the second reading of the measure.

MR. WILD (Dale—Minister for Works—in reply) [9.20]: It is rather strange that this Bill should be opposed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, seeing that it is one which he left behind on the plate for me to handle. It was not placed into the "Too Hard" basket, like some of the others. All the action in relation to the measure was initiated by the Minister; all I am doing is to implement what he would have done, had he been sitting on this side of the House during this session of Parliament.

Looking through the different ratings for water, I find from the list that, in repect of the areas served by the comprehensive scheme and the Goldfields water scheme, the rates ranged from 2s. to 4s. If ever there was a time when the varying rates should be brought into line, it is now. I was looking through the list only this morning when I received a deputation introduced by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn. Even though in 1949 an indication was given that those consumers originally served by the scheme would pay a 2s. rate, the new consumers had to pay 3s. They all used the same water, and it all came from the same line.

Now, under the comprehensive scheme, centres like Cunderdin are served. The rating there is 2s., yet the same water taken a little further down the line is charged at the rate of 3s. That does not add up. The Treasurer had nothing to do with this measure. It was brought down by the department, and I take full responsibility for its introduction. We all recognise that in these days the State has to bear increased costs. If we want to give a service to the State, which this measure proposes to do, then we are entitled to make the

scheme a payable one. We cannot be paying in all the time; we have to balance the Budget some time.

Mr. Moir: Why don't you do so in other directions?

Mr. WILD: So we may, when time permits.

Mr. Hawke: Is this a Government Bill?

Mr. WILD: Of course it is a Government Bill, but it is sponsored by me as Minister for Works. I take full responsibility for it, because it is a measure intended to bring all water rates into line. The Leader of the Opposition, as well as the Deputy Leader, knows that the rates vary from 2s. to 4s. Some are 2s 6d., some 3s., some 3s. 6d., and others 4s. The same applies to excess water rates. The measure seeks to bring the rates into line. I commend the Bill to the House.

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

Ayes—24.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Roberts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Lewis	Mr. I. W. Manning
	(Teller.)

Noes—21.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Moir
Mr. Brady	Mr. Norton
Mr. Evans	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. W. Hegney
Mr. Kelly	*(Teller.)*

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. May
Mr. Mann	Mr. Graham

Majority for—3.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Roberts) in the Chair; Mr. Wild (Minister for Works) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3—Section 65 amended:

Mr. EVANS: I take this opportunity of expressing my opposition to the aim of the Bill, with particular emphasis on the consequences of clause 3, if it is included in the Act. The acceptance of this amendment will mean that the maximum water rating will be increased in some towns from 2s. to 3s. in the pound on the annual ratable value. It will mean the Treasurer receiving a certain amount of money; but it will not mean that he will receive any more money. The Treasurer will receive money with one hand, and will give it out in other quarters with the other hand, in accordance with the views expressed by him when he was the Leader of the Opposition, and during the election campaign as Leader of the Liberal Party. To be brief, he mentioned that the Entertainments Tax Act would be amended, and certain relief would be given therein; and probate duties and land taxes are to be reduced. It is hard to reconcile the generous attitude of the Government now with its attitude in 1956 when it was in Opposition and when it maliciously opposed and defeated the Bill of the then Government to—I claim necessarily—increase land tax.

The CHAIRMAN: That has nothing to do with this clause.

Mr. EVANS: There was no concern then about safeguarding the Treasury's funds. Now we find that the Government is making steep inroads into the resources of the Treasury by offering relief in certain directions. In the past, country people have been receiving a subsidy, but now they are going to hand part of it back to the Treasurer to be used in other ways. I cannot agree to the measure; and I am surprised to see at least one member of the Country Party support the Bill, because I believe certain towns in his electorate are now paying the maximum of 2s., while others are paying 3s. If I supported the measure I would find it extremely difficult in Kalgoorlie to reconcile my attitude as a representative in this House of the people in that electorate. I hope a certain member of the Country Party can wriggle out of that one.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: In his reply to the second reading the Minister gave no information as to the number of water consumers who would be affected by this amending Bill; nor did he state the amount of revenue the department expects to receive because of the amendment. But I think that is relevant information. The Minister said that the Government had to try to meet the situation so far as the finances of the State are concerned; yet it is releasing revenue in many respects. Under this amendment it is proposed to include more consumers and make them pay increased rates.

Mr. Norton: They are not farmers!

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I remember when I was sitting in a detached position a year or two ago that the Minister for Railways complained bitterly when valuations were increased in the Nedlands electorate. It has been pointed out by country members that in the Goldfields and other country towns, because of increased valuations the revenue contributed to the Water Supply Department has increased by 50 per cent. in many cases. Under this Bill, the revenue will be increased another 50 per cent. That is a fairly substantial increase

on consumers of water, particularly as water is a vital necessity to those in the outback of this State, who have many other charges to meet.

Under this Bill a greater number of people will be included for the purpose of contributing revenue in connection with the consumption of water; yet, on the other hand, it is proposed to release revenue to certain sections of the taxpayers in this State. I cannot understand the attitude of the Government; it is most inconsistent. I hope the Minister will be able, during the Committee stage, to provide the statistics which I referred to earlier.

Mr. TONKIN: When the Minister informed the Committee that I initiated this move, he stated something that was not true, and which he knew was untrue. As a matter of fact, never at any stage did I submit this proposal or approve of it; and the Minister knows that. Had I initiated this proposal, I would have requested the officers to investigate the desirability of it, and subsequently would have made a recommendation to Cabinet. I did neither.

This proposal obviously is a recommendation of departmental officers which the Government has accepted, and for which the Government must take full responsibility. Governments do not always accept the recommendations of departmental officers. A lot are not accepted. I cannot understand the Minister standing in his place and informing the Committee that I initiated this proposal when I did nothing of the sort; and, I reiterate, he knew I did nothing of the sort. This proposal is that of the Government; and it is one to take from country towns additional revenue at a time when the Treasurer is distributing revenue in various ways, by means of rebates of taxation.

It is very hard to justify increasing charges on some sections of the community while the Government is reducing charges on other sections. That is the weakness of this proposal. If the Government were endeavouring to get increased revenue by increasing taxes and charges in different ways, then one would be disposed to take a different attitude in regard to this matter. The Government is not doing that. The Treasurer has already accepted a very large responsibility for the losses which will be incurred in regard to the opening of new railway lines. The Government is fully cognisant of what is involved in that, but it is prepared to meet those losses and costs by direct payment from the Treasury.

On top of that, there is the proposal to reduce land tax; and I reiterate that that proposal will undoubtedly benefit the large landholders, who will not be paying this increased tax. It is unfair and unreasonable to say to the people who have been on the maximum rate of 2s. that they shall now pay a 50 per cent. increase in the £ on their water rate in order that the Treasurer may distribute this money.

There is a very good reason why this differentiation in regard to water rating has existed. It was considered that those people who were fortunate enough to have the water supply provided for them when costs were very much lower than they are now should benefit from that cheaper cost of installation, just the same as a person who built a house 20 years ago should have the advantage of that lower cost compared with the present-day prices.

There is nothing unfair in allowing the people a proportionate charge, having regard to the reduced initial cost in some districts as compared with the higher costs in other districts which necessitated higher charges.

Mr. Perkins: That argument would be all right only that most of them happen to have been renewed.

Mr. TONKIN: They have? That is news to me.

Mr. Perkins: Perhaps it is.

Mr. TONKIN: And I am sure this Government has not been in office long enough to have renewed them. They were not renewed by me. The Minister for Transport had better think about that one a second time. That is not the answer.

Mr. Perkins: You will find you are out of date on it, too.

Mr. TONKIN: Oh no I will not! It is true there has been duplication of the main and renewal of the main from Mundaring to the Goldfields in order to cope with the greater demand upon the water supply owing to extra reticulation; but that is in the interests of the new districts which have been served, not the old ones. It would not be necessary to duplicate the main to service the old districts; although, of course, I will admit that so far as the section of the main which was built with wooden stays was concerned, the renewal of that is legitimately a cost against those being supplied from the original.

Mr. Perkins: The old one would not last forever you know. It was put there in 1900.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister who is interjecting would be hard put to justify increasing by 50 per cent. the rate in the £, having regard to the fact that valuations have substantially increased in the interim, while at the same time supporting the proposal of his own Government for the handing of large sums of money from the Treasury back to the taxpayers. This action is being taken at the expense of one section of the community in order to benefit other sections. Accordingly, I am very strongly opposed to this clause.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I think the Committee is entitled to some information on the questions I raised. Surely the Minister must have had a submission made to him by his departmental officers when this amendment was proposed; and surely it was indicated what revenue would be derived by increasing the rate, and the number of prospective consumers! The Committee should be entitled also to know the amount of revenue the Country Water Supply Department will receive from the imposition of this tax.

Mr. EVANS: I make a final appeal to the Minister to give earnest consideration to this clause. The ultimate outcome of it will be, once again, that people living in the Goldfields and in certain wheatbelt towns whose water supplies are drawn from the Goldfields line will find that their rate will be increased by 50 per cent. The section which is going to be affected by this Bill is the section that can least afford to be affected.

On the Goldfields it has been a sore point for a long time that the basic wage is less than that prevailing in the metropolitan area, and even in the South-West Land Division. However, I can name half a dozen basic commodities which are consumed practically every day by people in that area, and the prices of which are well above those prevailing everywhere else. One particular commodity is petrol which is 1s. 0½d. dearer in the Goldfields than in the metropolitan area. Despite these facts, the basic wage is less; and a further inroad into the living standards of the people in the Goldfields and the wheatbelt towns is to be made by this particular measure.

Mr. WILD: In answer to the member for Middle Swan, who asked whether I knew how much would be derived from this extra rate, I cannot tell him because, I repeat, this measure was on my desk when I took over—irrespective of what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said. It was submitted on a basis of making these rates more uniform; and when this particular measure was contemplated, it was desired to get the rates from the land that was being changed over from rural to townsite. Therefore it was included to bring them all into line. There was no question raised at all as to the number of people affected, or the amount that would be raised.

Mr. TONKIN: I regret that I have to rise to correct again the statement made by the Minister for Works, who will persist in misleading the Committee. I must inform the Minister that when I left the office there was not a single file on the table.

Mr. Wild: We will agree to differ on this then.

Mr. TONKIN: No we will not. I repeat—and if necessary I will take steps to prove it—that there was not a single file left on my table when I vacated office. Now, what invariably happens is that a new Minister does not expect to sit there with nothing to do; files will come forward, as they do in some offices, every three or four minutes of the day. I have no doubt that, in the period after I left office, the departmental officers considered that there were certain files which should come forward to the Minister—and no doubt they did come forward. I repeat—I will leave the responsibility on the Minister to prove it, and he has easy access to the files—that there was not a single file left on my table which had received consideration from me and which was left uncompleted; not one. But there were some matters, of course, on which it would have been improper for me to make a decision in connection with which the incoming Government would have been critical.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will relate this to the clause.

Mr. TONKIN: You have permitted the Minister to make the statement he made, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: I think I have been pretty lenient with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in this regard.

Mr. TONKIN: With all respect, Mr. Chairman, I think you have only given me my rights. If you permitted the Minister to make a charge against me, you should now permit me to answer it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is not doing justice to himself, to his Party, or to this Parliament by carrying on like that. I think he has received from me the same leniency as I extended to the Minister; and I would like him now to keep to the clause.

Mr. TONKIN: And I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to call on the Minister to withdraw the untrue statement which he made.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether or not it is untrue.

Mr. Hawke: It is objected to because it is regarded as objectionable.

Mr. TONKIN: I object to the Minister's statement as being untrue.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is objectionable.

Mr. TONKIN: If you do not think it is objectionable and do not ask for a withdrawal of the statement and permit it to remain, I suggest you should permit me to answer it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am afraid I have given the Deputy Leader of the Opposition an opportunity to reply to the

comment made by the Minister for Works; and there the matter must remain at this stage. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition decides to disagree with my ruling now, he can do so.

Mr. TONKIN: I do not want to disagree with your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but I want to say that what the Minister said was untrue.

Mr. HAWKE: In view of the fact that the Minister is not in possession of vital information in regard to this clause I move—

That progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.

I do this so that the Minister may have an opportunity of obtaining the information.

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

Ayes—21.	
Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Norton
Mr. Jamieson	*(Teller.)*
Noes—23.	
Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Naider
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Watts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Lewis	*(Teller.)*

Pairs.	
Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Graham	Mr. Mann
Mr. May	Mr. O'Connor

Majority against—2.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. HAWKE: I think the Minister has treated the Committee quite shabbily in connection with this clause. After all, any Bill brought to Parliament for the purpose of increasing taxation upon any section of the people should be supported by a case, and by detailed information as to how the tax will apply; the number of people to whom it will apply; and the additional revenue which it is anticipated they will contribute to the Treasury. I remember how some members of the present Government and some of its supporters performed in this regard when we, as a Government, introduced a measure to increase the taxation on the people. The member for Murray used to become quite excited and hostile towards our legislation; and used to stand up in his place and demand all kinds of information—the greatest possible amount of detailed information imaginable—from the Minister concerned, in explanation and in justification of the proposal. In such circumstances our Ministers used to make that information available quite readily.

But even then the member for Murray did not support our proposals; yet tonight the member for Murray and other supporters of the Government are swallowing, without any question, this proposal for increased taxation. They are supporting the Minister in his action in refusing to make information available to the Committee. And what excuse does the Minister give? He simply tells the Committee that he has not the information in his possession. Surely that is a shabby way for the Minister and the Government to treat members of the Committee! It is a shabby way to treat Government members, as well as those on the Opposition side of the Chamber.

I think you would agree, Mr. Chairman —I am sure you would if you were in Opposition; and in fact I can almost hear you agreeing—that any taxation proposal brought forward by a Government should be documented with considerable information and a great deal of detail; not only as to the percentage increase in the rate of tax, but also in regard to the number of people to be called upon to pay the increased tax, and the amount of increased tax or rate which it is anticipated they will pay to the Treasury.

Surely members on the Government side, whose people are concerned in this increased tax proposal, would want some information from the Minister to justify the proposal; or is it that they have been supplied with considerable detailed information at secret Party meetings? If they have not been so supplied with the relevant information, it is a great surprise to me that they swallow an increased tax of this kind without inquiry or comment. I am certainly not prepared to vote for a clause which provides for an increase in the rate without having considerably more information made available to us. If members are prepared to swallow this sort of thing without the relevant information, it is a pretty poor lookout for the taxpayers of this State.

Mr. MOIR: It was surprising to hear the Minister's reply to the request of the member for Middle Swan for more detailed information. Those who have had Cabinet experience know perfectly well that a Minister does not decide to do something and then merely bring the matter to Parliament; he has to place it before Cabinet. Does not this Government do that? Does the Minister simply have a conference with one or two members of Cabinet and decide what shall be done? It looks as though this Cabinet is run on football meeting lines. This legislation will increase the taxation by no less than 50 per cent. on many people in this State, and

evidently that has been accepted quite lightly by members on the Government side.

Mr. Brand: You speak as one who is not convinced that he is speaking facts. You do not even believe what you are saying.

Mr. MOIR: I ask the Premier to withdraw those remarks; I object to them.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think the remarks are objectionable; the honourable member may proceed.

Point of Order

Mr. BRADY: On a point of Order, Mr. Chairman, Standing Order No. 149 states—

> When any member objects to words used in debate by another member, the Speaker, or Chairman of Committees, shall, if either considers the words to be objectionable, or unparliamentary, order them to be withdrawn; and, if necessary, an apology made.

The member for Boulder says that the words used by the Premier are objectionable, and I think he has a right to ask for the words to be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: It is my decision—

Mr. BRAND: All right, Mr. Chairman; I will withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: The Premier has withdrawn; the honourable member may proceed.

Committee Resumed

Mr. MOIR: I am not used to having my sincerity questioned in this Chamber. I represent people to whom this matter is very important; but apparently those on the other side, who also represent people to whom the matter is important, are not concerned with it and are prepared to swallow this increased taxation without question. On the Minister's own admission he has not shown his fellow-members of Cabinet to what extent people will be affected, or the overall sum of money that will be involved. It appears that the Government has been lightly handing out sums of money and promising remissions in taxation, and it now feels that the people in the areas concerned by this legislation are fair game.

If the Minister thinks that those people will swallow that sort of thing, he is making a big mistake. The people concerned will be most indignant at this imposition, and the manner in which the Government is bringing it about. I believe the people on the far end of the pipeline are in a bad enough position for water at the moment without having this extra burden.

Mr. Brand: Will they be affected by this?

Mr. MOIR: I oppose it strongly.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I listened to the Minister's reply a few moments ago in respect of my inquiry for information. According to his statement, no information was supplied to him; and he said that this Bill came forward in the ordinary departmental way, and the departmental officers had put it up on the ground that uniform provisions should apply. Surely departmental officers must have some information as to the extra amount of revenue that would be derived from the imposition of this tax! That is relevant information which should be supplied to the Minister so that he can justify the introduction of the Bill in Parliament.

What would be the Minister's attitude if departmental officers suggested that uniform rates should apply as between metropolitan and country areas? He would not want to come here empty-handed, and with no information as to the extra revenue that would be derived from such an imposition. I am surprised at the lack of attendance of Country Party representatives. It shows that they have little interest in this additional tax. The Premier can laugh, because he hopes to get some extra revenue.

Mr. Brand: I am laughing at you.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: Possibly only one member opposite is involved; all the rest are outside the Chamber. They are not concerned about this. They are supporting the Government willy-nilly. They, on that side of the Chamber, are, apparently, unable to express an opinion. That cannot be said of the members on this side of the Chamber. They always had their say when they were on the cross-benches, even when their Party was in office.

Mr. Brand: There are a few in tonight.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I can assure the Premier that the members on this side of the Chamber are not like dumb, driven cattle; and they had their say when they were on the opposite side of the Chamber. The Committee is entitled to full information about this measure. The Premier has indicated that he proposes to make moneys available to the people; and yet, rather than continue the subsidy that is already being paid, he proposes to impose an increase in water rates on the most important commodity of all affecting the people in the country.

This is an important question to those people, and it should be an important question to the Country Party representatives. But what do we find? We find that they are outside the Chamber and apparently are not interested in this matter. Even when they are in their seats they sit dumb. I am amazed at what the Minister will bring to this Chamber in the form of legislation when he introduces a proposition like this. I oppose the clause.

Mr. EVANS: At this stage two significant features of the clause suggest themselves to me. Firstly, the Minister has said that he has no relevant information

on the number of persons likely to be affected or concerned by this amendment; and, secondly, there is the amount of revenue that is likely to be saved by the Treasury. In other words, the Minister has said that he does not know; and, from his attitude and that of his colleagues, it is quite obvious that he does not care.

I agree with the member for Middle Swan when he says that opposition to this measure by Country Party members is non-existent. Apparently it is the towns-people—and, in particular the workers in the towns—who will be most concerned. There is one member on the back benches of the Government side of the Chamber, namely, the member for Murchison—

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that the honourable member keep to the Bill.

Mr. EVANS: I am keeping to the Bill, Mr. Chairman. I am referring to the people in Kalgoorlie, and especially those in Lamington Heights who, in the heat of the summer months, are forced to use extra water to maintain their gardens. They will find that they will be burdened with an increase in their water rates.

The CHAIRMAN: This Bill relates to the country areas water supply scheme and not to the Goldfields water supply scheme, and therefore I would ask the honourable member to keep to the Bill.

Mr. EVANS: Kalgoorlie is one of the towns concerned.

Mr. Perkins: No it's not! That is where you are wrong!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. EVANS: I am keeping to the Bill, Mr. Chairman. This amendment will mean that people in country towns will have their water rates increased, and I am speaking for the people in the Goldfields towns. I am surprised that the members on the back benches on the Government side of the Chamber have not expressed their views. I have appealed to the Minister, but to no avail; and so I now appeal to the member for Murchison, because perhaps he will support us in opposing this amendment.

Mr. TONKIN: I move—

That progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.

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

Ayes—21.

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Heal	Mr. Sewell
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Andrew
Mr. Kelly	*(Teller.)*

Noes—23.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Watts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Lewis	*(Teller.)*

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. May	Mr. Mann
Mr. Graham	Mr. O'Connor

Majority against—2.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. KELLY: I am rather amazed at what I think is the irresponsible attitude adopted by the Minister and the Premier to this Bill, because the deletion that it is proposed to make from the Act will affect many people, particularly those on the main Goldfields water supply line.

The Premier asked whether the member for Kalgoorlie knew what the country areas covered. By his interjection the Premier showed he does not know the full coverage of the country areas water supply as defined in the Act, which says that it means any part of the State other than the metropolitan area for which part a scheme or reticulated supply of water is prepared and which is declared by proclamation to be a country water area for the purposes of the Act. So the area is defined clearly in the Act, and it is ridiculous for the Premier to say that the areas to which we refer are not affected. Of course this includes Kalgoorlie.

Mr. Perkins: It does not. Kalgoorlie is on the maximum rating.

Mr. KELLY: The Minister has stuck his neck out, because Kondinin, in his electorate, is also affected by this legislation.

Mr. Perkins: They are on the maximum rating and cannot be raised any higher.

Mr. KELLY: The Minister is talking out of the back of his neck. He is as bad as the Minister for Works, who referred to my having introduced a deputation today. The deputation I introduced had nothing to do with this subject; it dealt with water rates per 1,000 gallons. We have the member for Mt. Marshall not knowing whether Kellerberrin is to be affected.

Mr. Perkins: I can assure you he does know, because it has been discussed with him.

Mr. Hawke: When?

Mr. Perkins: In the last month.

Mr. KELLY: We have not been given sufficient information, and there have been conflicting views as to the areas to be affected by this legislation. The Premier

should be reasonable and postpone further discussion to enable us to secure the information we want.

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

Ayes—23.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Watts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Lewis	*(Teller.)*

Noes—21.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Norton
Mr. Jamieson	*(Teller.)*

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Mann	Mr. May
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. Graham

Majority for—2.

Clause thus passed.

Title put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is—

That the Chairman do now report to the House.

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

Ayes—23.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Watts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Lewis	*(Teller.)*

Noes—21.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Norton
Mr. Jamieson	*(Teller.)*

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Mann	Mr. May
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. Graham

Majority for—2.

Question thus passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Report

MR. WILD (Dale—Minister for Works) [10.33]: I move—

That the report be adopted.

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

Ayes—22.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Craig	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Roberts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Lewis	Mr. I. W. Manning
	(Teller.)

Noes—21.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Norton
Mr. Jamieson	*(Teller.)*

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Mann	Mr. May
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. Graham

Majority for—1.

Question thus passed.

Report adopted.

WESTERN AUSTRALIAN INDUSTRIES AUTHORITY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from the 1st October.

MR. HALL (Albany) [10.37]: I know that the Minister for Industrial Development and I will get on much better than we did during the debate on the measure just discussed. In speaking to the Bill before us, I turn to the portion which states as follows:—

> "Department" means any department under the administration of a Minister of the Crown in the Government of the State, and includes any State Trading Concern, the Rural and Industries Bank of Western Australia, the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners, and any Crown instrumentality which controls or carries on an industry;

That one portion gives a very wide and sweeping power to the proposed authority. The first of the departments referred to in that definition includes any State trading concern. If the people of the State only knew of the contents of that definition and of the sweeping powers that the proposed authority will be invested with, they would be worried.

I do not think it is the prerogative of any Government to interfere with State trading concerns. Some of them have proved quite profitable, but in respect of others we have some doubts. In the consideration of the sale of the State hotels,

a breathing space has been given to consider any proposition to allow them to pass into the local communities, so that those communities may reap the benefit.

In an article in *The West Australian* of the 1st October, 1959, the following is stated:—

> The State works help firms, says Tonkin.

No member in this House can dispute that on many occasions our State trading concerns have assisted private enterprise in more ways than one. The article goes on to say—

> Many private engineering firms had been forced to hand over jobs to the State Engineering Works because of their lack of equipment, Deputy Opposition Leader Tonkin told the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Bovell: What has that got to do with this Bill?

Mr. HALL: I consider it has everything to do with the Bill.

Mr. Bovell: This Bill has nothing to do with State trading concerns.

Mr. HALL: It is necessary for the people of Western Australia to know what action is contemplated by this Government. The Government is setting up an authority to deal with the State trading concerns without informing the public.

Mr. Court: That is not in this Bill.

Mr. HALL: Yes it is.

Mr. Court: Had you read it you would not say the things you are saying.

Mr. HALL: What I am saying appears in the Bill; and it deals with State trading concerns.

Mr. Court: Nothing of the sort!

Mr. HALL: As I proceed with my speech I will show the effect that the State trading concerns have had on the economy of the State. This Bill will control—

Mr. Court: They will not be controlled under this Bill.

Mr. HALL: Will the authority interfere with industrial conditions in the State trading concerns?

Mr. Court: Of course not! You read the Bill.

Mr. HALL: The authority has sweeping powers to control industry.

Mr. Hawke: What about page 6, paragraph (f)?

Mr. HALL: I am getting assistance by interjection. The next is the Rural and Industries Bank.

Mr. Bovell: What has this Bill to do with the Rural and Industries Bank?

Mr. HALL: It is covered in the first page of the Bill.

Mr. Court: That is only a definition.

Mr. HALL: The authority will have control over money belonging to the people of Western Australia. As much as the Government tries to hoodwink the House, the authority which it is endeavouring to establish will interfere with industry. The Government says it is not in the Bill, but it is there all right.

Mr. Norton: On page 6.

Mr. HALL: It is quite obvious that the State trading concerns and the Rural and Industries Bank will come under the administration of the Minister. We cannot dodge that; it is there in black and white.

Mr. Court. It is only a definition.

Mr. HALL: It is the interpretation that is important.

Mr. Bovell: What powers are to be given to it?

Mr. Hawke: Obviously the Minister for Lands has not read page 6 of the Bill.

Mr. HALL: Probably he has not.

Mr. Bovell: It has nothing to do with what the member for Albany is talking about.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: The definition of "industry" is as follows:—

> "Industry" includes any trade and any business, and any activity or undertaking which has association with commerce or industrial activity whether carried on by a department or otherwise;

I suppose the Minister for Lands will say that is not in the Bill.

Mr. Hawke: He will.

Mr. Court: It is still only a definition which you have to read into the Bill.

Mr. HALL: I am sure resentment will be shown against the Government by industry and commerce when they really know what the definition of "industry" means. My experience is that private enterprise resents interference and will not lightly accept it by this Government or any other Government. They will not take kindly to this authority having power to enter factories and to dictate policy on decentralisation if it is not their wish to be decentralised. This authority is going to run into a lot of trouble.

Mr. Court: I do not know where you find that in the Bill.

Mr. HALL: I intend to read an article from the *Albany Advertiser* dated the 10th April, 1959.

Mr. Norton: A first-class paper.

Mr. HALL: The article is headed, "Concentrated Effort Needed to Decentralise Industry says Russell Dumas." I am predicting that Sir Russell Dumas will be a representative on this authority.

Mr. Bovell: He has contributed a lot to Albany.

Mr. HALL: The article states—

> Western Australia had slipped behind other States in industrial development and had "virtually stood still," Sir Russell Dumas said on Saturday.

He went on to say—

> This authority will have wide powers and executive control to expand the industrial side of W.A's. economy.

Does not that link up with banking and industry? He was talking about this mighty power on the 10th April, 1959, at the regional conference held in Tambellup. I now intend to read from another article headed, "Minister Says Can't Direct Industry. Country Towns Must Fend for Themselves."

Mr. J. Hegney: Which Minister?

Mr. HALL: I will come to that. The article states—

> Country towns will have to fend for themselves in attracting new industries to their areas, the Minister for Local Government, Mr. L. A. Logan, said in Albany this week.
>
> Mr. Logan said that the Government would "do all in its power" to assist in the development of new industries.
>
> He said that Western Australia was in urgent need of large heavy industries as a nucleus for industrial expansion.

We are coming back to the position where Country Party members do not know what the Liberal Party is doing. That is true to form. I now come to a further article which, in my opinion, contradicts Sir Russell Dumas. This article appeared in the *Albany Advertiser* on the 20th March, 1959, and is headed, "W.A. Needs Larger Population Says Bank Chief. Local Development Handicapped." I have to be careful because this article mentions a David Brand, and I do not want to give the Premier credit for this. The article reads—

> Western Australia would show no great industrial development until the population increased, the Chairman of Directors of the E.S. & A. Bank said this week. The establishment and success of industry depended on a large home market.
>
> The Chairman, the Hon. David Brand, said that at the moment W.A's population was too small for the expansion of major industrial projects.

No-one would dispute that; it is sound commonsense. How are we going to increase our population if we cannot provide stability of employment? The Government is talking about closing down State trading concerns and doing less by way of public works; and I defy any Government to carry out such a programme and at the same time bring in migrants.

The proposed authority will endeavour to sell the State trading concerns, and thus destroy an avenue of employment that has been open to migrants. The Premier says that the unemployment position has improved. However, an article which was published in *The West Australian* of the 14th July, 1959, is headed, W.A. Still Has the Most out of Work." The figure is not very much different today.

In regard to the Bill, I was interested to hear the member for East Perth ask a question today pertaining to the monopoly control by R.E.T.R.A. over the sale of television sets. In this connection I have an article which was published in *The West Australian* of the 18th September, 1959, headed, "A Trial of Strength for R.E.T.R.A." The article states—

> The Radio, Electrical and Television Retailers Association is making an attempt to control television set trading here which may make it or break it. . . . .
>
> Next week it will face appeals by two or three dealers disciplined by a trade panel this week for alleged advertising breaches. Both sides will be represented by legal counsel.

I raise that point to illustrate that it is obvious that free enterprise is all right sometimes; but no action is taken when the worker is going to receive the benefit.

I do not know the verbiage of the reply given by the Government to a question asked on this subject today, but it was to the effect that there was already enough competition in the field. However, that does not alter the fact that these discounts could be offered to the worker; and, I think, quickly accepted too. If the Government desires to get rid of the State trading concerns and put private enterprise on its feet, it should attack this subject immediately.

Touching on the other matter to which I wish to refer, the *Official Year Book of Western Australia* for 1957, under the heading "Industry of the Population," has this to say at page 297—

> For Census purposes, industry may be defined as any single branch of productive activity, trade or service. It is concerned with the activities of persons, firms or businesses, considered as a group producing the same commodity, performing the same process or providing the same service. All persons engaged in any such branch of economic activity are classified industrially as belonging to that particular branch irrespective of their personal occupation within the industry. Examples are:—Mining, which includes, in addition to miners and prospectors, such persons as laboratory technicians, transport workers and office staff employed by mining companies; Shipping, which covers staff members of shipping companies and agencies, as well as ships' crews; professional activities such as Medicine, Law and Architecture which include not only qualified practitioners but also

persons employed by them as, for example, receptionists, law clerks and draftsmen.

In the following table, the population is classified according to the main industrial groups such as Primary Production, Mining and Quarrying, Manufacturing and so on, and some component sub-groups such as Fishing, Hunting and Trapping, Agriculture and Mixed Farming.

We cannot dodge the far-reaching effect this authority will have on practically the whole economy, as much as the Government tried to mislead us by its statement today.

Another point I wish to make is that this measure will undoubtedly obliterate the Department of Industrial Development. Pages 227 and 228 of the *Official Year Book* for 1957 include the following:—

> With the aim of fostering secondary industry, the State Government established at the end of the first World War a Council of Industrial Development, which now functions as the Department of Industrial Development. At its inception the objects of the organisation were to advise the Government on the best means of encouraging new industries, whether primary or secondary, and of assisting existing ones. It was also to advise private industry on such matters as the best methods of production and marketing. In due course the further function of recommending financial assistance to industries was added and the Department now has an extensive field of activity.
>
> Since its formation assistance has been given to a wide variety of industries and the establishment of several large-scale industries encouraged. A notable example was the erection of a wood-treatment plant and blast furnace at Wundowie, situated 41 miles from Perth in the Darling Range.

That extract gives an indication of the formation of the Department of Industrial Development. We are now considering the formation of this authority; and in this connection I would like to quote from a leading article in *The West Australian* of the 5th October as follows:—

> Government Prepares Its Industrial Drive
>
> Under the Industries Authority Bill, the Government proposes to set up a three-man authority to supersede the Department of Industrial Development. It will have wider scope than the department to work towards expanding industry.

The two men referred to in the article are Mr. H. L. Brisbane and Sir Russell Dumas. I do not doubt that ability. They are probably very capable men and have proved themselves; but when we start to handle industrial development and the troubles associated with industry and automation, we will have to have someone with a very good industrial background to guide these knowledgeable men.

Apart from that aspect, we have to discover whether they are knowledgable and whether they are going to be sincere in their efforts to work for the State, or whether they are going to lean towards a tendency to dictate a policy for their own extension.

In the Press recently there was an article headed, "Hawke Calls Industry Plan Bureaucratic." Mr. K. F. Walker in his book entitled "Automation," has a section on human problems, and on page 30 is to be found the following:—

> However, automation should rapidly make the bureaucrat extinct, meaning by bureaucrat the man who simply applies rules and regulations in a routine manner. As I have often thought in dealing with such people, both in governments and in private business—for they exist in both—to apply rules in a rigid, inflexible fashion requires practically no brain at all and is exactly the kind of decision that a so-called giant brain could make.

Where we are to get the brains necessary to stimulate the idea of the Government to set up this authority, I do not know. I know from an industrial experience of some 30 years in the textile trade, that co-operation between the workers and the management is ever so essential to achieve the necessary result to make business a success. When the management has conferred with the workers and the workers, on the other hand, have conferred with the management, there has been success. The next article to which I wish to refer is in regard to a warning on automation. It is as follows:—

> The trade union movement knew that it could not push the tide back by opposing automation and a higher degree of mechanisation, A.C.T.U. President A. E. Monk said today.
>
> It did insist, however, upon proper planning between Governments, employers and unions, to meet new developments and new methods of production.
>
> Mr. Monk agreed with the professor of psychology at the University of Queensland, Professor D. W. McElwain, that not enough consideration was given to the human elements in industry.

In referring to human elements, I wish to mention an article in *The West Australian* which was headed "Industrial Hazards to Health." Today by negotiations with the management, better protection is being afforded.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must relate his speech more closely to the Bill.

Mr. HALL: I believe it is related to the Bill.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must relate it more directly to the Bill.

Mr. HALL: I think the people selected will need to have industrial backgrounds; otherwise this authority will not work successfully. That is the point I have tried to make clear. With an industrial man on that authority, we will perhaps find we have a mechanical giant brain, to which I have referred, representing private enterprise, and without considering the sentiments of the workers. I think it is essential, if we are to achieve something, to have a man who has knowledge at his disposal, and who knows the background of industry.

There are too many pitfalls in this new phase; and the proposed authority will run into many of them, including the trend towards automation and a reduction in working hours. To set up an industrial authority without any knowledge of such problems will increase its difficulties. Under this measure the authority is to be given power to enter upon any land, street or place, and survey and take levels thereof and take, fell, remove, and carry away from the land any earth, stone, gravel, sand, or other soil or timber or trees required to be used in any industry the subject of any actual or proposed contract as mentioned in the Act. There could be no more sweeping power than that. The authority, admittedly, can be sued for compensation; but I do not think any ordinary worker could raise the finance to sue the Government.

There might be some merit in the proposed authority if it was to work in conjunction with the Department of Industry which, since its inception, has gained a lot of experience; but to do away with all that experience and set up an authority without that guidance in the field is very dangerous. On those grounds I oppose the measure; because I believe the Department of Industry could be stimulated by the Government and used to the maximum advantage, in conjunction with the proposed new authority, to further the industrial development of this State.

MR. CRAIG (Toodyay) [11.2]: I will be brief in my remarks in support of the measure. I feel it is necessary that we should have some statutory authority by means of which to develop the industries which we are all anxious to see developed in this State; and I am surprised at the opposition to the Bill. I would like to believe that members opposite think, as I do, that we should give whatever encouragement we can to the development of industry in Western Australia.

I wish now to voice objection to one portion of the Bill, along much the same lines as the objection raised by the member for Albany. Here I refer to the fact that the proposed authority is to be given power to remove certain things from anybody's land; and I have in mind clay deposits, about which I feel very keenly, because control over them is vested in local governing authorities. For that reason I intend, when the Bill is in Committee, to move for the deletion of that clause. In the meantime, I heartily endorse the principle behind the Bill. I believe that encouragement should be given, firstly, to locally established concerns; secondly, to the expansion of those concerns; and, thirdly, and most important, to the investment of overseas capital in this State. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

MR. OLDFIELD (Mt. Lawley) [11.5]: Although I intend to support the Bill, I feel I must voice criticism of some of its provisions. I fail to see why so much power and finance should be made available to the authority proposed to be set up, seeing how little power and finance were made available to the existing department. If that department has failed in its duty of endeavouring to attract industries to this State, or finding markets for existing industries, it is only because it has not had sufficient funds or power. All it has been able to do is to investigate and recommend to the Minister who, in turn, would take the recommendation to Cabinet; and it would depend then on a Cabinet decision, or Treasury approval, whether anything was done or not.

What is now proposed is a complete somersault, with an entirely new authority to be set up with almost unlimited powers under which it could go ahead with possibly unlimited funds at its disposal. One wonders why it is necessary to create a new department with so much power, when we know that the existing department has been handicapped in the past by lack of finance and of power. The Department of Industrial Development embarked on its "Buy W.A. Made Goods" campaign; but, unfortunately, in this modern age of high-pressure advertising on a national basis, per medium of the radio stations and newspapers, all the business has gone to the great national companies; and local firms have been unable to compete on that basis of advertising, and have, therefore, not enjoyed the same consumer demand.

I feel that the "Buy W.A. Made Goods" campaign failed, because we did not select individual items to be pushed; and I also think we should have hammered not only the home market but also Eastern States markets. A lot of industries manufacturing consumer goods here—such as shirts, clothing generally, and kitchenware—have enjoyed some success in marketing in the Eastern States; and all that prevents them from expanding greatly is lack of capital with which to undertake large-scale advertising such as is indulged in by their more wealthy Eastern States competitors.

I believe that any authority proposed to be set up for this purpose should be charged with the responsibility of promoting the sale of Western Australian goods not only in Western Australia, but also in the Eastern States. It should select concerns that it considers worthy, and provide the finance for them to undertake large-scale advertising so as to create a demand for the products; and emphasis should be placed on advertising on a national basis in order to catch some of the Eastern States market as well as the home market.

One of the mistakes of the past has been in trying to entice new industries to come here, when there was insufficient local market to absorb a great part of their output. Industrialists and manufacturers generally look to see what the local market is, before setting up a factory anywhere. They can always get rid of a certain amount of their production in other places; but never as profitably as on the home market. From time to time we see large national companies using Western Australia as a dumping ground for their surplus output.

That is why from time to time our local manufacturers suffer dearly and pay heavily—because Eastern State's firms which may have a 5 per cent. surplus in output place their goods on the Western Australian market at a price at which the local manufacturers cannot compete. On many occasions goods manufactured in the Eastern States have been sold on the local market at 75 per cent. of the price paid by Eastern States people for the same article. Whilst dumping is permitted, our local manufacturers will always suffer; and it is a difficult problem to overcome.

Mr. Roberts: Have you any evidence of that 75 per cent. reduction in price?

Mr. OLDFIELD: What 75 per cent.?

Mr. Roberts: You mentioned a difference of 75 per cent. in price.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I can show the honourable member instances of where Western Australian people have had to pay only 75 per cent. of the Eastern States price on goods manufactured in the Eastern States.

Mr. Roberts: Have you any evidence of that?

Mr. OLDFIELD: Yes. Our existing factories should be encouraged to develop to full capacity, and a market should be made available for them so that it can absorb that increased output. It is of no use for us in this State to ask our factories to produce double their present output if there is no market for the goods. That leads to only one thing. If a factory doubles its output, and there is no market to absorb that output, at the end of three months the factory is closed down until the stocks are sold.

I know that in many instances local firms can increase their output to meet any extra sales resulting from a large-scale advertising campaign. In some cases it may require working a double shift; but that in itself is not harmful. It is quite good for industry. In many parts of the world, production costs are considerably reduced through the working of double shifts. The same capital outlay used in producing, for instance, 50,000 articles, can be used in producing 100,000 articles; and that, in itself, means a reduced price to the consumer.

Most local firms have been struggling because of a lack of the necessary finance to place themselves on a stable footing, and to meet the charges and repayments on money borrowed from Eastern States' banks; consequently, they have not sufficient money to seek Eastern States markets. They cannot afford to advertise nationally, and they cannot afford to pay for Eastern States representatives. The quality of the Nevada shirt, the Goodura shirt, or any other locally-made shirt, is equal to any of the nationally-advertised lines. Some of the shirts that are on the market carry at least a 5s. loading per shirt to pay for the advertising. It is a well-known fact in the jewellery trade that on a certain well-known brand of wristlet watch £5 5s. on the cost of each watch is to pay for advertising.

I should also like to refer to the aluminium ware produced by Jason Industries Ltd. at Welshpool. That firm makes kitchenware which is equal to any spun in Australia, and I understand that it enjoys a certain proportion of the Eastern States markets. The Eastern States have 10 times the population of this State, and a firm does not need to have much of that market to have a good business. If the two lines I have mentioned—and there are many others—could be investigated by this committee or authority, or even the present department, and an agreement reached with the principals of the companies concerned, they could be advanced money for advertising on a large scale.

That money could be repaid over a period at, say, 3d. or 6d. an article, according to a formula that could be worked out on a royalty basis. When the money had been repaid, it could be placed in a pool which could be used to assist other industries to advertise on a national basis.

I understand that it costs somewhere in the vicinity of £1,000 a page to advertise in the *Australian Women's Weekly*—that is on a three-colour basis. Some 800,000 copies of that magazine are sold weekly, but I suppose that in 50 per cent. of the homes to which the magazine is delivered the menfolk glance through it, thus making 1,200,000 readers weekly. But it does not stop there. The magazine is reread many times; because, unlike the daily paper, it does not finish in the bathheater the day

after it is read. These magazines finish up in doctors' and dentists' surgeries, and hairdressers' salons; and they are read when they are weeks old—at least they are at the hairdressers' where I get my hair cut.

When one works it out, I suppose the *Australian Women's Weekly* would have a potential of somewhere in the vicinity of 1,500,000 readers per week. We must also bear in mind that half of the shirts sold in Australia would be bought by the womenfolk, who buy them for father's day presents, Christmas presents, and so on; and many women buy all their husbands' clothes. As regards aluminium ware for the kitchen, the women would buy all of it.

Mr. Lawrence: What about the single men?

Mr. OLDFIELD: Those firms could always advertise in the *Football Budget* to cater for the member for South Fremantle. If an advertising campaign such as I have outlined were undertaken, I feel sure we could promote the sales of some of our local industries. I have named only two that come readily to mind, but there are plenty more. We have many local industries which make goods worthy of advertising on a national scale because they are capable of capturing the Eastern States' markets.

As I said, I would make money available to these companies to be spent on advertising to promote the sale of their goods rather than try to get new industries to come to this State. If we can double the output of one factory here, and then follow that up by doubling the output of another, and so on, we will increase the amount of labour required and make more jobs available, which is the important thing. If we can capture the Eastern States' markets we will reduce our adverse trade balance.

The money used for this large-scale advertising campaign could be strictly supervised to see that it was not squandered, and it should be repaid at so much per article, on a royalty basis. That money, in turn, could be re-circulated through other industries which required assistance. I support the Bill.

MR. NORTON (Gascoyne) [11.18]: I oppose the Bill. When one first looks at it, it appears to be quite innocent; but the more one reads it, the more complicated it becomes and the greater the implications one sees in it. It appears to me to be one of the cloaks which the Government has brought forward to cover up the disposal of State enterprises. It was claimed earlier in the debate this evening that State enterprises were not mentioned in the Bill. But they are clearly mentioned; and, what is more, there is some mention of local governing authorities.

When one looks through the definitions set out in the Bill, one wonders what is to come next. The definition of "public authority" means that it will include any local government authority such as a road board or municipal council, because they carry out or administer the essential services that are referred to in this definition, such as the supply of electricity, water, sewerage, and so on. Those are services for which charges are made. Therefore, under that definition this authority of three men could make recommendations to the Minister to have those authorities taken over. Reference in regard to this is made in the Bill at the bottom of page 10.

A "public authority" is defined in the Bill as follows:—

> "Public authority" means any authority managing or controlling service to the public such as roads, bridges, water supply, sewerage or drainage, or any public utility.

What else could that have reference to apart from a road board or municipality? Therefore, if one follows that definition through to the paragraph set out at the bottom of page 10, it will be seen that this proposed authority, with the approval of the Minister for the time being administering any department, or public service in the State, or public authority, can make recommendations upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed. It is clear, therefore, that local authorities can be affected. As one goes through the Bill it is found—

Mr. Court: What does it matter if they can be affected? If you read the whole paragraph that you started to quote, you will realise that there is nothing objectionable in it.

Mr. NORTON: Can the Minister give any reason whatsoever as to why a local government authority should be included in a Bill such as this?

Mr. Court: They might have a good reason why they want to be in this scheme.

Mr. NORTON: It is evident that the Minister has not gone through the Bill, despite the fact that he was responsible for introducing it. He does not realise its implications.

Mr. Court: I can almost recite it to you.

Point of Order

Mr. LAWRENCE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that due to the laughter and the conversation that is going on between the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Lands, it is very hard to hear what the honourable member is saying.

The SPEAKER: I can hear the honourable member quite well, but I hope the noise will cease. The member for Gascoyne will continue.

Debate Resumed

Mr. NORTON: On page 6 there is a rather astounding clause. It sets out what the proposed functions of the authority shall be, subject to the Minister. Lately we have heard quite a number of comments—and we also heard them in the previous session—by the Minister for the North-West in regard to any authority coming under the jurisdiction of a Minister. When debating the Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust Act Amendment Bill last session, the Minister was most adamant that that authority should not come under the jurisdiction of any Minister, but should be free to carry out its own administration without any interference.

Further, when the new Commissioner of Railways was appointed, the Minister for Railways was very keen that he should be left to administer his department without any interference from the Minister. Again, this session, we heard the Minister express himself in respect of a certain airline that applied for a license to operate a service in the North-West. The Minister should set a good example and not interfere with the Transport Board. He should permit that board to make its own decisions. Yet we find that this Bill proposes to make it mandatory that the authority shall give effect to the Minister's directions.

Another clause in the Bill provides that the authority shall be granted power to make recommendations or form the policy for the Minister. I wonder why the Minister should want this proposed authority to form a policy for him. If I were a Minister I would not desire any authority to frame any policy for me.

As one proceeds to study each clause of the Bill it is found that the powers proposed to be vested in this authority are tremendous. In fact, one finds difficulty in estimating the extent of these powers. The Bill proposes to give this authority power to make inquiries and investigations with respect to the industrial development of the State. It will also be empowered to assemble statistics and general information concerning existing and possible or desirable industries established or to be established within the State. It will have power to seek out and negotiate with persons who are likely to establish or extend an industry in the State.

The Bill even proposes to grant this proposed authority power to advise the Minister on the policy which should be adopted in regard to the best methods of undertaking the transfer of State trading concerns and other State enterprises to the field of private enterprise, and to assist in any such transfer. In the leading article of Monday's issue of *The West Australian* it is reported that the Minister has already appointed two directors to this authority—before the Bill has even passed both Houses of Parliament.

Mr. Court: You can't appoint anybody before the Bill is made law.

Mr. NORTON: How does the Minister appoint them, then?

Mr. Court: No-one has been appointed. They cannot be appointed before the Bill is passed.

Mr. NORTON: Apparently *The West Australian* report has no substance. There is no doubt that in Monday's issue of that newspaper, the leading article contains the following:—

> One member has still to be appointed but the authority will start well with the services of Mr. H. L. Brisbane, with his practical business experience, and of Sir Russell Dumas, who has an impressive record in State development.

If that does not mean that these men have been appointed to this authority, I do not know what does. That report states that one more member is still to be appointed.

Mr. Court: You do not believe everything that is printed in *The West Australian*, do you?

Mr. NORTON: No doubt the Minister will take the matter up with *The West Australian* to ensure that a correction of that statement is made.

Mr. Watts: Do you always believe what you read in black and white in *The West Australian?*

Mr. NORTON: One has to believe some of the reports that are printed in it.

Mr. Watts: I am afraid that will not wash.

Mr. NORTON: That was printed in the issue of *The West Australian* of Monday, the 5th October, 1959, and I have not heard of any contradiction up to date. It will be interesting to see whether any contradiction is made by the Minister. A further provision in the Bill proposes to grant power to this authority to enter upon, survey, and take any land required under the powers contained in and in accordance with the procedure described by the Public Works Act, 1902. It will also be given power to enter upon any land, street or place and survey and take levels thereof and take, fell, remove and carry away from the land any earth, stone, gravel, sand or other soil or timber or trees required, etc.

In other words, it appears that the authority is to be given the right to enter upon any land and to do what it thinks fit. However, there is no mention of any compensation to be paid to any owner in that

part of the Bill. Should the Bill pass through the second reading stage, it is my intention to add a proviso to those two clauses. This will provide—

The SPEAKER: The Bill is not yet in the Committee stage. The honourable member can make a general reference to what he proposes to do during Committee, but he cannot make too much detailed reference to it.

Mr. NORTON: I intend to add a proviso to certain clauses in the Bill to make it mandatory that the authority shall pay adequate compensation if it takes such action as is proposed in the Bill.

Finally, in one of the latter clauses of this measure it is noted that the authority will not be liable to pay any rates, taxes, or assessment. Yet it is proposed that this body can be a money-making or commercial authority. It will not pay any levies for works or undertakings on any land. Why should not this authority—which, as I read the Bill, is to be a commercial authority—pay rates and taxes? Why should it be exempt? If this Bill is to become law, there are many features in it which should be modified to make it workable. Power should not be given to three men, who will probably be directors of other companies, to make recommendations that certain industries and certain developments should take place; because, human nature being what it is, they will more than likely recommend the companies they represent to the exclusion of other interests. I oppose the Bill.

MR. EVANS: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and a division taken with following result:—

Ayes—21.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. Heal	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Norton
Mr. Jamieson	*(Teller.)*

Noes—24.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Court	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Roberts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Lewis	Mr. I. W. Manning
	(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Mann	Mr. May
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. W. Hegney

Majority against—3.

Motion thus negatived.

MR. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [11.35]: My opposition to this Bill will be brief; but I will endeavour to make it as pointed as possible, because I believe the measure is not in the best interests of the community at large. As I see it, the ultimate aim of the statutory body of only three persons that is to be set up will achieve little more—if anything more—than the present Department of Industrial Development, which is to fall by the wayside with the passing of this measure.

The member for Mt. Lawley voiced certain criticism which is only too well justified, inasmuch as the department which has been handling this titanic task of encouraging industry to the State has been impoverished in the past through lack of finance, lack of support, and lack of powers that are being given to this three-man body.

When the present Minister for Industrial Development was in opposition, he was very vehement in his criticism of the previous Government; and his criticism was mainly confined to the fact that under the regime of that Government industry had not been encouraged to come to the State. He presumed to give us the reason for that, which was that the Government, in its attitude, particularly in the field of the unfair trading legislation—as it was then called—was frustrating the drive for industry and keeping people away. There has now been, in the mind, and also in the attitude of the present Minister, what he would call a clean sweep. The previous Government has passed to the Opposition benches and a new Government has arrived; yet no new industry has come to the State in accordance with the prophecy made by the present Minister for Industrial Development.

Accordingly, I see this Bill as an endeavour by the Minister to cover the remarks he made previously. I cannot see the measure achieving any more purpose than that which has been achieved by the Department of Industrial Development in the past; and which, if the department were clothed with extra finance and with extra powers, it could achieve in the future. There is a well-known maxim which says that too much wine in the head of one man is like too much power in the hands of another. Therefore I see this statutory body of only three persons as a very dangerous move.

Mr. Craig: You have been drinking too much plonk!

Mr. EVANS: I have not been drinking at all, and I ask for a withdrawal of that remark.

The SPEAKER: The member for Toodyay must withdraw his remark.

Mr. Craig: I would not like to insult our local wine, so I withdraw my remark.

Mr. EVANS: Without casting any reflection on the local wines, the member for Toodyay would be a good judge as to their quality. Too much power in the hands of three men would be a dangerous move indeed, and for that reason I cannot support the Bill. The most pernicious aspect of the measure is the shady and perhaps shoddy methods of subterfuge used to do away with State trading concerns.

I see the proposed authority being set up as a scapegoat. We know it is the clear and defined attitude of the Government to dispose of State trading concerns, and this authority is to be set up with one aim. It will be there to make a certain recommendation. In the words of the Minister, its members will be experts. He will say, "Here is an expert committee which has brought forward a recommendation." The Government will be only too willing to grasp that recommendation and act accordingly. The authority will be made the scapegoat for any public wrath that may be whipped up in connection with any incident. I would like to know whether any other committee has been set up for a purpose such as that.

I reiterate briefly my opposition to this Bill under the following three points:—

(1) I cannot see the authority achieving any more than the present Department of Industrial Development has the potential to achieve.

(2) I see a very dangerous move in the existence of an authority of three members who perhaps lack the various attributes required to handle such a large undertaking.

(3) As I see it, the aim behind the setting up of the authority is to make it a scapegoat against the wrath of the public resulting from the sale by the Government of some State trading concern.

With those words I give notice of my opposition to this Bill.

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth) [11.42]: Prior to the advent of this Government to the Treasury bench I would not have thought it possible for any democratically-elected Government of Western Australia to attempt some of the blatant moves which have been made by this present Ministry to hand over the State of Western Australia—lock, stock, and barrel—to its political supporters.

It is no use for the Minister for Industrial Development, the Treasurer, or anybody else to deny that assertion. That can be proved and substantiated by very many points. There is very little, in the way of major legislation or major decisions made by this Government, which has not been in the form of direct hand-outs to its political supporters, or which has not presented golden opportunities for those political supporters to exploit the State and the people of Western Australia. It appears to me, so far as the Liberals in particular are concerned, that Western Australia, its resources, its departments, and its assets exist for no other reason than to be exploited for profit by certain people and by certain interests.

Mr. Court: Such as what?

Mr. GRAHAM: It appears they must be handed over to those interests which must be given the opportunity to enjoy the State's assets. The rights of the people count for nothing!

Mr. Roberts: Give us an instance.

Mr. GRAHAM: I could spend an hour of my time in giving instances along those lines. What is the position regarding this Bill? I put it to all members in this House that since the accession of this Government, which I believe to be absolutely power-crazed and power-mad, it has been aided, abetted, and goaded by an irresponsible and completely monopolistic Press.

I could say a few words about the activities of this Government in connection with that matter quoting none less—if you, Mr. Speaker, permitted me to expound this, which I shall not attempt to do—than a highly-placed Commonwealth member of the Liberal Party who was in Western Australia within the last fortnight, and what he thought of the local Press; the way it suppresses, distorts, and generally presents anything but news, whether it be local, Australian, or overseas news. He stated that we were completely in the dark because of our lack of access to what is going on.

I venture to suggest that it would be impossible for the Liberal and Country Party supporters—in them I include many of those who are in the Ministry at the moment—to assert that this sort of thing has occurred to them before; that a Government department be handed over to three persons who are not public servants, or servants of the Crown; and that the promotion of industrial development through a Governmental agency be handed to private persons outside, who owe no allegiance to the Crown.

Mr. Court: That is subject to the Minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am talking about the people who are to be appointed to the authority. There is already an appointee in Mr. Lance Brisbane, one of the captains of industry and private enterprise. That is the direction in which his interests lie; they do not lie in the direction of the assets, belongings, and possessions of Western Australia.

Mr. Court: Do you think we want no-hopers on the authority? We want the best we can get.

Mr. GRAHAM: What I do not want is a complete sell-out of the assets of the State to private enterprise and private industry.

Mr. Court: They are to be people who know how to go about this matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: Apparently the Minister for Railways cannot see any virtue in anybody or anything, unless some of his political allies are able to get their corner from any project or any scheme put forward by the Government, or unless things are done in accordance with what suits the industrialists and private business.

We find a provision in the Bill that, with the approval of the Minister, persons over the age of 65 may be appointed as members of the authority. Sir Russell Dumas is in his 73rd year. No words from the Minister will convince me that that provision has been inserted in the Bill for any other purpose. That is a provision created specially to accommodate Sir Russell Dumas.

Mr. Court: Are you aware that that provision is in the State Electricity Commission Act, and has been for years?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not care whether it has. I am stating that it was inserted to accommodate that gentleman.

Mr. Court: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is the person who involved the State in hundreds of thousands of pounds, because he felt he knew more about all the gamut of Government departments than did the responsible officers themselves. I have already given, chapter and verse, the circumstances leading to a couple of agreements entered into by the Liberal-Country Party Government some half dozen or so years ago when action which committed the State to several million pounds was taken by Sir Russell Dumas, without conferring with the departments concerned.

Mr. Court: Which agreement are you referring to?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am concerned, because no public servant or private person should be given the power and authority as set out in the Bill, and apparently the confidence of the present Government—though not worthy of that title. No Government should repose such powers in the hands of an individual. The Government had such blind faith in him that he was able to write any conditions into a document. The agreement was swallowed hook, line and sinker by the McLarty-Watts Government.

Mr. Court: Would you like to reverse those contracts?

Mr. GRAHAM: There could have been a much more businesslike approach. I have stated previously that what was written into the Kwinana Oil Refinery agreement was also written into the Broken Hill agreement and the Cockburn Cement Company agreement with respect to the erection of houses for the employees; and that those conditions were included in the agreements without the knowledge or consent of the responsible departmental officers in the State Government. Indeed, in certain cases it was more than 12 months after the passage of the legislation, as a tyro Minister, and because of my recollection of debates that took place in this Chamber, I informed the State Housing Commission; and that was its first knowledge of any obligation on the part of that important Government department so far as certain of these things were concerned.

Mr. Court: You got the industries.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is a proper way of going about it.

Mr. Court: Would you rather we did not get them?

Mr. GRAHAM: Nobody has suggested anything of the sort. What I am indicating was the irresponsible attitude of the Government. Now we find that two persons have already been identified. Goodness knows who the third person will be! I venture to suggest it will be another captain of industry or a leading light from St. George's Terrace. If I might hazard a guess, it could be "Sir" Oscar Negus who has done his job conscientiously and well for the Liberal Party and those interests associated with it. I put this question to you, Mr. Speaker: Have you ever heard of a proposition before under which a Government department is to be taken away from Crown control—forgetting the "subject to the Minister" part—and handed over to three individuals who are in no way whatsoever related to the activities of the State? The whole thing is preposterous and absurd to the nth degree.

Nobody but the principal architect of it, the Minister for Railways, would envisage such a thing. Of all the members I have known during the time I have had the honour of being a member of Parliament, none would have the effrontery to suggest such a proposition. I am astounded and bitterly disappointed that the ministerial colleagues of the Minister for Railways whether Liberal Party or Country Party, are not doing something to apply some sort of rein or check upon this person—a member of the Ministry who regards the State of Western Australia as being easy prey for certain interests. So long as that can be done, then he feels his job is well done. I wonder what has happened to the terms of the oath of office that were sworn to by those who, a few moths ago, became Ministers of the State.

By way of interjection, the Minister for Railways has sought, to a degree, to belittle some of the powers and the scope and extent of this legislation. He might get away with that sort of thing before a Liberal Party kindergarten, but he cannot do so before a deliberative Chamber such as this, where some members, believe it or not, have had more parliamentary experience than has he.

The Bill, on page 6, says, among other things that the functions of the authority are—

> To advise the Minister on the policy which should be adopted in regard to, and the best methods of undertaking, the transfer of State trading concerns and other industry controlled or carried on by or on behalf of the State or a department to the field of private enterprise, and assisting in any such transfer.

The member for Albany mentioned the Rural and Industries Bank. There were cries of derision from the other side of the House. What does the Bill say? It says this—

> "Department" means any department under the administration of a Minister of the Crown in the Government of the State, and includes any State Trading Concern, The Rural and Industries Bank of Western Australia, the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners, and any Crown instrumentality which controls or carries on an industry.

There were cries from the other side of the House when it was suggested that the Rural and Industries Bank came within the ambit of this authority. As I read the Bill, it provides for the authority to advise the Minister on the policy which should be adopted in regard to, and the best methods of undertaking, the transfer of State trading concerns and other industry controlled by the State. What is meant by industry? It means this—

> "Industry" includes any trade and any business, and any activity or undertaking which has association with commerce or industrial activity whether carried on by the department or otherwise.

Does not that include the State Government Insurance Office? What does it not include? It probably also includes Government House, and the Parliament of Western Australia. I believe, in the interests of this extraordinary efficiency, the Minister for Railways would be happy and content if he hand-picked some of his St. George's Terrace colleagues—after consultation of course with the sausage king of Western Australia—and planted them here. Then we would have private enterprise at its best. We would not have ordinary representatives of the people; we would have the captains of industry; we would have the cream of the community; we would have those with initiative!

Mr. Brand: Hallelujah!

Mr. GRAHAM: We would have those with experience in industry and the conduct of affairs. Those are the sorts of terms that have been employed, particularly by the Minister for Railways, in respect of anything and everything. His gods are Mammon and those people who play a large part in amassing sums of money, irrespective of what is done to the State of Western Australia and its interests, or to the interests and welfare of the ordinary people of this community. They count for nothing. I have said things akin to this on a number of occasions, but I never thought it would be my misfortune to have to speak along these lines in the Parliament of Western Australia; just as I never thought I would live to see the day when a Government would unashamedly and deliberately hand over the assets of the State in very many different degrees. Now it intends to hand over the authority which is vested in Government departments and Government instrumentalities.

These are the people who will negotiate for the disposal of the assets of the State of Western Australia. It will not matter whether the Bank of New South Wales comes along with 2s. or half a dollar or something of that nature to buy the Rural and Industries Bank, the type of people on this authority, because of their fetish for private enterprise, will recommend to the Minister for Railways that it be disposed of under those terms and conditions. Because of the Minister's apparent influence and authority in Cabinet, it would become an accomplished fact; and Parliament would have no opportunity whatever of saying "Yes" or "No" to the proposition.

All we would know about it would be this: A certain group of individuals engaged in private enterprise would be happy and content because they would have received a tremendous bargain. Those who sit on the other side of the House would be similarly happy and content because, irrespective of the loss that would be made, certain of their friends would be happy. That seems to be the prime purpose and objective of this Government.

The Bill, on page 9, goes on to say that the authority should not make any contract except in writing drawn up or approved by its solicitors. Here in a few innocent words this authority is being told —as though it needed any telling—"There is no occasion for you to use the Crown Law Department. You wander up and down St. George's Terrace until you find a person who will soon be Sir Oscar Negus, and you can do your business with him."

Mr. Court: You don't seem to like Mr. Negus.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not like any person under the circumstances under which I formed an opinion of that man; and how he has let himself, without any justification, under privilege granted by this so-called Government, assist in the blackening of names of otherwise respectable people.

The SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM: No; but it has something to do with solicitors; and the Bill is an open invitation for this authority to sidestep the Crown Law Department and go to more of the political friends of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Roberts: You have no political friends; we have the lot.

Mr. Court: Except the S.P. fellows!

Mr. GRAHAM: As long as the Minister for Railways gets a pat on the back by St. George's Terrace and the daily Press, he feels that the job is being done, irrespective of the sacrifice of Western Australia in the process.

Mr. Court: They have not been patting me on the back lately!

Mr. GRAHAM: In a period of six months or so there have been two leading articles that have not been on the side of the Government; and judging by the drawn and haggard faces, that is a tragedy. What about us; and myself, particularly? For a period of six years—

The SPEAKER: The member for East Perth had better get on to the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM: If I may complete my sentence, for six years it was a matter of concern if I found them on my side in respect of even the most trivial matter. I now refer to page 11 of the Bill. This is the Government that talks about lots of things. It talks about, as I mentioned earlier in a question today, the matter of free competition and free enterprise; and it has a group of people trying to squeeze a group of traders so that they will charge more for their goods.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Is this in the Bill?

Mr. GRAHAM: It might not be in the Bill but—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: If it is not in the Bill, you should not be referring to it.

Mr. GRAHAM: As if the Chief Secretary knows what is in the Bill! He does not even know what is in the Bills he presents to the House. I doubt whether he even knows the title of this Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GRAHAM: This Government speaks of the sanctity of private property.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Get off the soap box!

Mr. GRAHAM: If there were not a lady taking notes, I would tell the Chief Secretary where he could go.

Mr. Brand: He would not take your advice.

Mr. GRAHAM: I repeat that the Government talks of the sanctity of private property, and yet on page 11 this authority, for the purposes of exercising and discharging its functions, is given the right to enter upon any land—and I emphasise the word "any"—and take, fell, remove and carry away from the land any earth, stone, gravel, sand, or other soil, or timber or trees.

Mr. J. Hegney: Or mushrooms.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is unbelievable!

Mr. J. Hegney: It is all-embracing.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is fantastic; and it is ridiculous. To enter upon any land! It surely includes parks and reserves, rural land, land upon which factories and business undertakings are erected, and land upon which there are private homes. There is no limitation whatsoever; and these people can remove all of the soil and vegetation. And this, I repeat, is something submitted by a Government that believes in the sanctity of private property.

Just harking back to the newspapers, I know full well what my friends of *The West Australian* would have to say if I introduced a Bill including a clause along those lines. There would be leading articles, letters to the editor, comments by this interest, and that person, and someone else; and there would be a stream of criticsm. All the comments would be from one side only so long as it was an issue before this Parliament; and no doubt there would be echoes long after it had ceased to be an issue.

But there is not a word, of course, of any kind about the evil contents of this Bill, because possibly it was hatched in Newspaper House; and I wonder whether some day there is to be a sense of responsibility? It is all right for the Premier and some of his back-benchers to cackle in respect of this matter!

Mr. Brand: I could not help it!

Mr. GRAHAM: I wonder how, if he wears the mantle of the Premier of this State, he allows a subclause such as the one I just quoted in clause 21 to be included in a Bill introduced to this Parliament. I venture to suggest that there will be some of his back-benchers who will want to ask a question or two in the Party room in connection with it; and the tyro, the member for Toodyay—and I use that term with the greatest of respect to him—in his innocence let the cat out of the bag this evening.

Mr. Moir: Do not be too hard on him!

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not being too hard. I have every respect for him. He intended to say that when the Committee stage was reached he was going to move for the deletion of that particular subclause, but he was not very careful in the selection of his words. He commenced to tell us that the Country Party would take action and then corrected himself and said that he would. It becomes obvious that this Bill ran the gauntlet of Cabinet without being properly studied.

Mr. Craig: No. You are wrong. I was referring to—

Mr. GRAHAM: The member for Toodyay, no doubt vigilant in his youth and enterprise, alighted upon this and made some sort of song and dance in connection with it; and now more eyes have been opened, and he comes to appreciate that this not only violates all the tenets of the Liberal and Country Parties, but also it affronts, I should say, the concepts of decency and the democratic rights of any person who calls himself a democrat.

Mr. Court: Have you only just found that offensive clause in legislation? Did you not find it in any legislation your Government had?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. Court: You didn't?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. Court: It was all right when you had it.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the Minister would be pleased to tell me when I had it I would investigate the matter.

Mr. Court: It was in the State Electricity Commission Act, at least, during the whole of the term of your office.

Mr. GRAHAM: Was it?

Mr. Court: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: I only wish, you, Mr. Speaker, would allow me to speak about the State Electricity Commission Act, but I know, by the way you are shaking your head at the present moment, that you would not.

Mr. Court: They are the exact words.

Mr. GRAHAM: As I think the debate has shown, the more one cares to analyse this Bill the more generally distasteful and unnecessary does it become; and whatever else the Minister might say—and I do not think that my hearing was astray at the time, and I would like him to correct me now, if I did not hear him correctly—I want him to tell the House something about it in his reply. He, together with some of his colleagues, heaped scorn on the head of the member for Albany when he suggested that this measure had tremendous scope and breadth and could, among other things, enable this authority to prepare plans and make a submission to the Government for the disposal of—among other things—the Rural and Industries Bank.

Mr. Bovell: That is rubbish!

Mr. Court: If you read the relevant clause, you will see that you are misinterpreting the power of the authority.

Mr. GRAHAM: Apparently I must go over it again; and so I will try once more. If I try a third time, that will come under the heading of tedious repetition. The functions of the authority are to advise the Minister on the policy which should be adopted in regard to and the best methods of undertaking the transfer of State trading concerns, and other industry controlled or carried on by or on behalf of the State or a department, to the field of private enterprise.

Mr. Court: If you want to carry that definition to its logical conclusion, it is an industry carried on by the R. & I. Bank; and there are many cases where it wants the authority to take over the responsibility of looking after a particular industry. It is as simple as that.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister cannot get away with it by that explanation.

Mr. Court: You asked me to tell you, and I am telling you.

Mr. GRAHAM: I wanted to check whether my memory of the interjection made earlier was a reasonably true representation of what took place; and the Minister assured me that that was so. I therefore emphasise that the authority is to advise the Minister on the policy which should be adopted in regard to the best methods of undertaking the transfer of State trading concerns and other industry controlled or carried on by the State to private enterprise. If it means anything, it includes the Rural and Industries Bank, which is specifically mentioned.

Mr. Court: It is industry carried on by a department, which includes the R. & I. Bank. I think the honourable member is misreading the significance of that clause.

Mr. Bovell: Nobody knows it better than the member for East Perth does.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is apparently impossible for the Minister for Railways and the Minister for Lands to understand the verbiage of their own Bill. This measure is as wide open as it is possible for it to be. I do not think there is anything that belongs to Western Australia as a State, which could not be disposed of under the terms of this measure. The authority is empowered to make recommendations to the Government, and to suggest ways and means by which the Government can achieve the passing of all the things which are Western Australia over to private enterprise.

Mr. Court: It can make a recommendation, but that is not the executive action of disposal.

Mr. GRAHAM: Of course not! But all the present Minister wants is a hint or suggestion; and then he proceeds on his path of disposing of the State of Western Australia. These are the experts that he will pick to show how it is to be done. I repeat that, as the Bill is drawn, there is no limit whatever on what can be disposed of by the State; and these are the people to show the Minister and the Government how to do it. As the Minister obviously has such tremendous authority

over members of Cabinet—at least in the majority—what he desires will come into being; and so we have this Government choosing three persons representative of private industry—the Minister will not attempt to deny that—to sell the State of Western Australia to private enterprise, subject only to the Minister's consent; or, in one or two places, subject to his being able to cast a spell over four or five of his colleagues, so that the Governor in Executive Council will have a recommendation in a certain direction.

Having encompassed the Bill, or some of its points, we return to where we commenced: that here is this fantastic conception of taking a Government instrumentality away from the Crown and handing it over to a committee of three persons of private enterprise; and here is a Minister who shows, as he has shown, a far greater concern for private enterprise than he has shown for the State of Western Australia and those things which belong to it. I only wish that he who has a meat business in Beaufort Street in my electorate did not wield such an influence over private members of the Liberal Party; because I am as certain as I am that I stand here that, much as they and their Party are dictated to by private enterprise, there must be some limits and some rhyme or reason.

After all, I suppose the most rabid socialist-cum-communist or co-operationist, or whatever we like to call it, would draw the line at sharing his tooth-brush with all his neighbours; and, conversely, surely all but the really fanatical private enterprise supporters—in the political sense—have some restrictions or limitations somewhere! Surely they do not believe that, irrespective of what damage is done in the process or what indignity their own State suffers, as long as something is being handed out to private enterprise a good job is really being done!

I refuse to believe that some of the younger members on the Government side of the House really and implicitly believe in such a line. I am afraid that the discipline that is enforced upon them is enforced to a greater degree than I have seen, when previously there have been Liberal and Country Party Governments in this State, with the result that they are in fear and trembling; and, however dastardly the plot which is being put over the people of Western Australia, the backbenchers and supporters of the Government are afraid to move or even to protest; and therefore one often wonders whether it is worth while speaking, and endeavouring to submit arguments as to why we should have a second look at certain features of different pieces of legislation.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has another five minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM: Thank you; I do not think I will need five minutes. So far as speaking to the public is concerned, because two, three, or four pages of the newspaper is devoted to what is said—even to the questions put and the answers received—before a Royal Commission, and scarcely anything with regard to the debates in this Parliament, the public of Western Australia have no opportunity of deciding whether what is adduced by the Government side is more fair and reasonable than what is submitted from the Opposition side.

A solicitor stating his case for one section of an almost dead and gone so-called sport industry receives far more space than the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition—the largest political Party in the State of Western Australia. Speaking on the Supply Bill he might receive two or three lines or no mention whatever. But these crooks and criminals, and other people—let them make assertions, and they are reported almost word for word. Let counsel—one of the half-dozen or so—make an address, and there it appears, column after column. And so, if the organs of publicity were going out of their way to kill democracy, they could not do it better.

So far as members are concerned, because of the iron discipline—and whether they are afraid of the Press or of sausages I do not know; but they are afraid—it is of no use the Leader of the Opposition or any of us on this side speaking on a measure because it has no effect whatever. It is not possible for us to speak to the people because of this deliberate act of suppression, and the belittlement of members of Parliament and the parliamentary institution. But for all of those handicaps if we on this side of the House feel that a piece of legislation is blatantly rotten—as this is—we will not, I hope, on any occasion refrain from speaking our minds as deliberately and as forcibly as we feel inclined.

I hope and trust that I have left the Government in no two minds as to my attitude with regard to the Bill. I oppose the measure and I support my Leader and those who sit with him in my condemnation of it. I repeat my opening words: I never thought I would live to see the day when the rights of the Crown and of Government departments would be abrogated by a deliberate decision of a Government which, I believe, has entirely lost its association with the people of Western Australia.

MR. JAMIESON: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

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

Ayes—20.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Evans	Mr. Moir
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. Heal	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Norton
	(Teller.)

Noes—23.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Craig	Mr. Owen
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Watts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Lewis	*(Teller.)*

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. May	Mr. Mann
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Nulsen	Sir Ross McLarty

Majority against—3.

Motion thus negatived.

Point of Order

Mr. BRADY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I understand that last Thursday the Premier gave the House an assurance that we would not be sitting on Wednesday (Show Day). I draw your attention to the fact that it is now almost 12.30 a.m., Wednesday. Will the Premier stand by his original decision?

The SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot regard that as a point of order.

Mr. BRAND: We will finish off this day first.

Debate Resumed

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [12.28 a.m.]: Whilst on the surface this Bill purports to be a measure which will promote industry in the State, it has become abundantly clear from the debate that has ensued so far that it is only a means for the Minister to delegate his power to another authority; in other words, while he is in agreement that dirty deeds should be done, he is not prepared to do the job himself. Possibly in the near future several other Bills will be presented to this House to obviate the Minister having to attend to any of his ministerial duties. Possibly there will be one to constitute an authority for the North-West, and another one for the Railways Department, which will enable the Minister to return to his office in *The West Australian* newspaper buildings, where he rightly belongs if he desires to introduce legislation of this character

Lately it has become abundantly clear that even the Premier is waking up to the fact that we do not have to rely on Eastern States' markets. The Liberal Party section of the Government of this State has, for quite a long time, stated that we have to rely on the Eastern States to market our products.

Mr. Brand: When did they say that?

Mr. JAMIESON: Say what?

Mr. Brand: That the State had to rely on Eastern States markets.

Mr. JAMIESON: They have been saying that for years. They have stated that we would have to rely on the markets in the East, but it has been made abundantly clear to them that we cannot possibly compete against the industries already established in the Eastern States.

Mr. Roberts: That is only in your imagination.

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

Mr. JAMIESON: It is more fertile than the imagination of the member for Bunbury. If the Minister in charge of the Bill had paid more attention to administering his portfolio and promoting trade rather than concocting a Bill such as this, he would have been performing a service to the State.

Point of Order

Mr. OLDFIELD: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot hear the honourable member because of the conversation going on between the Minister for Lands and the members on the back benches on the Government side of the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Crommelin): I will take a note of the complaint made by the member for Mt. Lawley.

Debate Resumed

Mr. JAMIESON: On several occasions the Minister has objected and pointed out that all actions proposed to be done by this authority shall be subject to the approval of the Minister. Of course we realise only too well that on occasions, when matters are referred to him and he receives a majority recommendation from this authority, it is not likely that he will contest such a recommendation; because, after all is said and done, he will be one of the prime movers to establish the authority, and it is unlikely that he will object to any determinations made by this authority.

There are many aspects of the Bill that cause me a great deal of concern, including the fact that this proposed outside authority is to be delegated to recommend whether various State instrumentalities and organisations should be disbanded and what should be done with them. However, what concerns me even more are the so-called incidental powers that are proposed to be granted to this authority in the Bill. These were referred to by the last speaker,

and particularly that one which proposes to give the authority overall power to enter upon any land which the Minister indicated already exists in the State Electricity Commission Act.

If that is so—and I am accepting the Minister's word that it is so—the position is far different when similar power is granted to the commission in that Act. Such power would be justified, because members know full well that the Electricity Commission must have power to enter upon land and to perform certain acts to discharge the services that it has to render to the public. So to justify the powers proposed to be granted to this authority by stating that similar power is granted in another Act is a very ineffectual way of dealing with the proposition.

By the Bill proposing that the authority shall have power to remove from the land any earth, stone, or gravel, it would appear that the powers of the local authority to determine what shall be done in this respect could easily be overridden by this proposed authority recommending, under the guise of promoting industrial development, that certain concessions be made available for certain quarrying activities.

Mr. Roberts: Is not a similar provision contained in the Main Roads Act?

Mr. JAMIESON: If it is, it would be more definite than this provision, and would probably be contained in that Act for the same reason that similar power is granted to the commission under the State Electricity Commission Act; because, as I have already pointed out, that commission must enter upon land to render an essential service; and to do so it must have power to remove stone, earth, gravel, etc. Therefore, there is every justification for such a provision to be contained in those Acts. The fact that a similar provision is inserted in a measure to promote the industrial development of the State to my mind indicates that power is being taken away from the local government authorities in connection with the performance of these acts.

The proposed move by the member for Toodyay for deletion of that provision from the Bill will certainly receive my support, and undoubtedly the support of other members on this side of the House. All in all, the Bill is obnoxious in its object; and, in effect, it has no real purpose except to turn over State assets to the hands of certain chosen members of the community who have by their past records —as mentioned by the member for East Perth—rendered a disservice to the State by recommending, in their various capacities at certain times, that action should be taken to give away the assets of the State.

Indeed, if they live up to their reputations, they will continue to do that in the future; and if the Government now constituted lives up to the reputation of the previous coalition Government by accepting these recommendations, the State can look forward to being mulct a little more.

MR. MOIR: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

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

Ayes—20.	
Mr. Andrew	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Evans	Mr. Moir
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. Heal	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Norton
	(Teller.)

Noes—22.	
Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Craig	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Roberts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Wild
Mr. Lewis	Mr. I. W. Manning
	(Teller.)

Pairs.	
Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. May	Mr. Mann
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Nulsen	Sir Ross McLarty

Majority against—2.

Motion thus negatived.

MR. MOIR (Boulder) [12.42 a.m.]: I am very concerned with this measure. It is quite apparent that the Government is delegating its powers to representatives of private enterprise. The Government is not content with setting up machinery to dispose of the assets of the State to private enterprise, but it proposes to set up the authority mentioned in the Bill which will be composed of people who are to the forefront of private enterprise in this State.

I will not go over the ground covered by previous speakers, but there is one provision in the Bill with which I am very concerned; and it is the provision that usurps the rights given under the Mining Act of this State. The Mining Act of Western Australia is an Act of which we might well be proud, because it is outstanding in the protection it affords to people who work mineral deposits, and to people upon whose land those deposits may lie.

It may not be generally known to members that under the Mining Act, cultivated land cannot be mined if the person who owns the land objects. There are also other provisions in the Mining Act that protect people, inasmuch as Crown land can be pegged to be worked for minerals after the person who is liable to be affected, or whose property may be damaged by the mining operation, has protested or opposed the application which must be made to

the warden who hears the evidence. If the warden considers there is a possibility of damage being done to a person's property, then he can call on the company or the person proposing to do the mining to lodge a sum of money that will recompense the party who may be so damaged.

If this Bill becomes law it will confer overriding powers on the authority to be constituted under it. The relevant provision in the Bill says—

> Subject to this Act, the Authority, for the purposes of exercising and discharging its functions, powers, rights or obligations under this Act—

That is important. It does not mention any other Act—

> —may itself or by its officers, servants or agents, —
>
> (a) enter upon any land, street or place and survey and take levels thereof and take, fell, remove and carry away from the land any earth, stone, gravel, sand or other soil or timber or trees required to be used in any industry the subject of any actual or proposed contract as mentioned in this Act.

In the south-western part of the State we have minerals such as ilmenite, zircon, and monozite, which would be known to members from that area. These minerals are fairly widespread. The South-West portion of our State is fairly well settled, and already problems have been raised by mining companies desiring to work these deposits by taking over or entering on land owned by farmers. There have been cases where the land has not come under the definition of cultivated land and, therefore, it could be worked by the companies. Their right to work it, however, has been contested before the wardens.

There was a case of that nature at Capel some 18 months ago. The objections of the owner of the land were upheld by the wardens. If this Bill became law such a person would have no right whatever, because if the authority decided that in the interests of the people who desired to work the minerals it was going to exercise the power given to it by this Bill, it would merely enter upon the property concerned and take the soil, stone or earth that contained the mineral. That power is definitely given under this Bill; there is no question about that.

Earlier in the debate I heard some mention about clay; and of course the same thing would apply to any other mineral that may be on private property. The Mining Act lays down specifically that where the ground is cultivated it cannot be touched unless the owner of the land gives his permission. Where the land is not cultivated, the warden can decide whether or not the company or individual making application to work the deposits shall be given the requisite authority. Even the decision of the warden is not final, because either party has the right of appeal to the Minister.

In the case I referred to, the warden gave his decision in favour of the owner of the land. The company appealed to me, as Minister, and I upheld the warden's decision because I considered the company had not made adequate offers of compensation to the owner.

None of these rights is provided under the Bill before us, because the proposed authority is to be given absolute power to enter upon land and remove soil, earth, stone, and gravel thereon.

It is a matter of concern to me that a Bill should be introduced which will abrogate the mining laws of this State. Those laws have stood the test of time, and they are highly regarded by the other States of the Commonwealth and by other countries. It is a serious matter that the laws and the machinery set out thereunder are to be abrogated by the provisions of the Bill. The Minister in charge would do well to examine again that particular provision in the Bill.

MR. J. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [12.53 a.m.]: I oppose this Bill because I cannot see any justification to supplant an existing Government department which has performed the main functions to establish and develop industry in this State. The measure proposes to confer very wide powers on an authority of three members. In one part of the Bill, it seems that the authority may reach the stage where it is required to report on the capabilities of Ministers to administer their departments.

It is proposed to set up an authority of three members; and two of them are to be Mr. Brisbane and Sir Russell Dumas—both over 70 years of age. There is a provision in the Bill which states that a person under the age of 65, appointed to the authority, shall retire when he reaches 65 years of age. But the Government has started off by appointing two persons over 70 years of age. In the interests of the young men in this State, the Government should have selected younger members and given youth a chance. That has not been done. I have no doubt that the remaining member to be appointed will be one with a close liaison with private interests in this State. All his interests will lie in that direction, and the public interest will be overlooked by him.

Here I refer to the recommendations which the authority will have to make from time to time. A few years ago Mr. Brisbane and Sir Russell Dumas recommended that the Welshpool-Bassendean chord railway line should be sited around the river through Belmont. They made a nine-point recommendation to the Government, and the Government endorsed that recommendation. I took the matter

up and suggested to Cabinet that an examination should be made on the spot of what was proposed under the recommendation. The Government took notice of what I said, and examined the position, with the result that that railway line was not proceeded with.

Sir Russell Dumas was then the Director of Works, and he advised the previous Minister for Works. The Minister depended on his departmental officer's recommendation, and he tried to stand behind Sir Russell Dumas. When I put up the point of view that the young people in the district would not be able to make use of the Swan River in the vicinity of the proposed railway line, the Director of Works told him—the Minister—how the line could be built.

He proposed that piles be sunk in the middle of the river and that the line be built from Rivervale around the Sandringham hotel, and that from there it connect with Bayswater. I was beside him when Mr. McCulloch, the engineer from the Railway Department, was asked by the Minister for Railways where the line was to go. Mr. McCulloch knew what was required and suggested it should be along the contour of the river's edge. When I told Sir Russell Dumas what Mr. McCulloch had suggested he said, "What a damn fool he is!" The proposition of the Director of Works was that piles should be driven into the bed of the river and the line carried around the bed of the river.

Mr. Court: Which Mr. Brisbane was that? Was it not Mr. Dave Brisbane?

Mr. J. HEGNEY: The one who has been appointed to the proposed authority. If that is the type of recommendation which is to be made by Mr. Brisbane and Sir Russell Dumas, then this Government should not rely on them for advice. That was one occasion when they gave the wrong advice. Fortunately for this State and the district I represent, the proposed railway line was not built along that route. Time has proved that the right decision was made in regard to that recommendation.

It would be wrong for the Government to rely on the advice of men who are past their prime. Sir Russell Dumas has retired, and presumably he is in receipt of superannuation. Surely there are younger men in this State who could be appointed to the authority, to advise the Government. I have no doubt that the remaining member to be appointed to the authority will be of the same ilk as the two I have mentioned. On those grounds I oppose the Bill.

The proposed authority is to be used for the purpose of disposing of the State instrumentalities and assets. There is a special clause in the Bill which requires one Minister to make a report to another. It might be a good thing for the authority to be on their backs; it might spur them along. We have responsible Government in this State, and the Minister is in direct charge of a department; and the Minister and the head of that department should be the persons to carry on the administration. That is not to be so in the immediate future. This authority is to be set up as an oligarchy; it is going to override the departmental heads—men who are skilled to advise Governments. This authority is being set up to do all sorts of things and to make all sorts of suggestions to the Government for the purpose of getting rid of the public assets in this State.

It is a terrible thing that the assets of this State should be disposed of in the manner in which they no doubt will be if this Bill becomes law. The Department of Industrial Development has been in existence for a long time, and has been subject to the Minister for the time being. There is no question that it has done an excellent job. Probably if one or two younger men were brought into that department as liaison officers with the Government, the department would function admirably for the benefit of the State.

The development of new industries in this State is difficult. People from other parts of the world will come here if they see an opportunity of producing goods in competition with the eastern States of Australia, or if they can find a ready market in the countries adjacent to Australia. However, there does not seem to be much probability of substantially increasing the number of industries in Western Australia.

As was pointed out by the member for Mt. Lawley, the industries here already exist in Eastern Australia. The firms in the Eastern States, after satisfying the home market, dump their products in this State, and this adversely affects the industries which are struggling here. I would point out to the House that when my Leader was Premier, he issued a tremendous amount of propaganda so that people would buy locally-produced goods.

Many housewives are prejudiced against locally-produced goods. I had an experience some years ago when I visited Cairns in Northern Queensland. A storekeeper showed me around a fairly large shop, and on his shelves he had some Western Australian manufactured goods. He said, "You can send me as many of those goods as you can." I am told by the storekeeper in a shop behind my home in Inglewood that housewives will not take locally-produced goods; they prefer goods manufactured in South Australia. We will have to overcome that prejudice in order to establish industries in this State.

There is a psychological problem which will have to be overcome. We will have to create in the public mind that it is their bounden duty to support locally-produced goods as far as is practicable, having regard to price. In a self-service store

near where I live, my wife endeavoured to get certain locally-manufactured jam. The self-service stores get Eastern States' jams cheaper than local jams. Therefore, they stock and sell them. When one asks for the local jam, one is told a cock-and-bull story that it is not procurable. However, the fact remains that the Western Australian jam is superior to that of the Eastern States. This also applies to many other commodities.

I cannot see that the setting up of this authority will do any good from the point of view of attracting industry here. Industry will come here if it can see a market for its goods. That is the predominant factor. Had that condition been satisfied, we would have had industries here before now. We have a small population and, therefore, the question of markets is important. Whether Sir Russell Dumas and Mr. Brisbane have the superior knowledge necessary to create these markets and establish industries, time alone will tell.

Personally, I think the activities of the Government in this connection should have been carried on through the Department of Industrial Development. I am sure that that would have been much more satisfying to the people of Western Australia than the setting up of this authority, which is to become an overlord department that will be on the back of one Minister after the other.

MR. HEAL (West Perth) [1.7 a.m.]: I oppose this measure. I am sure that if Her Majesty the Queen were here this evening to hear the Opposition putting forward its views to defeat this measure, she would request the Minister for Industrial Development to adjourn the debate and have another look at the Bill. The honourable member who has just resumed his seat raised an important point when he mentioned the ages of Sir Russell Dumas and Mr. Brisbane who, it has been said, will be appointed to this authority. I have nothing against these two men. They have been brilliant in their time; but they are now reaching the age of 70 or more. Youth should be given some encouragement in relation to this job, which I am sure will be a full-time one. I feel that someone in the junior age group should be given an opportunity on this authority, if the Bill becomes law.

Mr. Court: We are after brain power, not brawn.

Mr. HEAL: One would not think so, looking at the Bill.

Mr. Lawrence: The Minister has neither, anyway.

Mr. HEAL: I do not know what this authority will cost the Treasurer. I am sure the Treasurer must be worried about the many demands on him at the present time. According to his policy speech, he is going to introduce legislation shortly to reduce taxes. That will reduce the amount of money available in the Treasury. I am sure that when he has to subsidise the two railway lines which are to be reopened shortly, it will cost so many thousands of pounds per annum that he will have to increase the imposts on the people of Western Australia to raise the money.

The following is portion of an article which appeared in *The West Australian*:—

> It will have wider scope than the department to work towards expanding industry and attracting investment.

I am sure the Minister for Industrial Development will agree with me that the present department which was set up by a previous Government and functioned for six years under the Hawke Labor Government, has done its job efficiently. I have made many requests to that department and have had a lot of success in relation to the expansion of industries that have been set up in this State.

I feel that in one way the Minister could improve our development by finding greater markets in the Eastern States. No doubt that would be one of the undertakings of this authority. I am sure the Minister has men who would be quite capable of doing this job without putting the Treasury to further expense.

There is one part in this Bill which gives overriding powers. It is as follows:—

> with the approval of the Minister for the time being administering any department of the Public Service of the State, or any public authority, and upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed, make use of the services of any officer or servant employed in the Public Service of the State or by the public authority.

I gather that under the authority of the Minister these people could go into the Railway, Forests, or Transport Departments and more or less demand that one or two officers set about a certain task.

Mr. Court: They could do nothing of the sort. That is not provided for in the Bill.

Mr. HEAL: I have just read a portion of the Bill which does make the provision.

Mr. Court: With the approval of the Minister.

Mr. HEAL: Under this Bill, one of these men could go upon any land of our State Forests Department and do what he deemed fit for the further development of the State. I believe these clauses and conditions are far too severe and overriding. I feel certain, and the Minister has not denied it, that the two mentioned are to be on the authority. Who the third will be we do not know; but I certainly hope it will not be the one who has been suggested, because I am sure that in a matter of six to 12 months we would have no State trading

concerns at all. I am confident that the Minister will agree that many of the State trading concerns have done great service to the State in the past and will continue to do so in the future. I oppose the second reading.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development—in reply) [1.13 a.m.]: We have had a most extraordinary debate on this Bill. I was expecting that in view of the nature of the subject before the House we would have a degree of constructive suggestion as to how best this problem of industrial development could be tackled in Western Australia.

Mr. Jamieson: How would you know what was constructive?

Mr. COURT: During this debate, we have had nothing but destruction and a picture of despair and gloom, the equivalent to that which was displayed during the discusssion on the Tourist Bill. The whole of the debate from the Opposition side has taken the form of what I thought to be a rather poor pinpricking misrepresentation of the many clauses in this Bill, all of which were very carefully conceived.

Mr. Heal: You can say that again!

Mr. Evans: Now you are speaking the truth.

Mr. COURT: Before being introduced in this House, the Bill had to run the gauntlet of the usual procedure so far as Cabinet is concerned. One would assume that members of this Cabinet are not interested in their own portfolios and responsibilities. I can assure members of this Chamber that one does not introduce through Cabinet a Bill which takes away rights and privileges and responsibilities from other Ministers, because they are fairly vigilant—in fact, very vigilant—so far as anything which affects their own portfolios is concerned.

Mr. Evans: What about the State Hotels Bill?

Mr. COURT: I think it is true to say that the only constructive suggestion was submitted by the member for Mt. Lawley who suggested a proposition of a fund being made available to local manufacturers so that they could indulge in a more highly specialised form of business promotion. That idea of financing those people who could not otherwise afford a large-scale promotion scheme in another State or country is well worthy of consideration, particularly as he based it on the idea of what was virtually a revolving fund.

Many of the remarks made during the debate have been extravagant in the extreme; and when we examine the real import of those remarks, we find they are not supported in substance at all. Claims have been made in respect of this Bill, which are just not correct; and had members taken the trouble to read the definitions into the actual machinery clauses of the Bill, they would have found that those fears mentioned so freely during the debate on this measure are completely unfounded.

I was rather amazed at the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition towards Western Australian industry. His was rather a defeatist attitude. He said that all the big industries are well established in the Eastern States, and what chance have we? We have plenty of chances if we go out after new markets which I envisaged when introducing this Bill. I particularly envisaged the new techniques of manufacture and merchandising. We have to learn them and they are not going to be easy to learn.

Mr. Hawke: The Leader of the Opposition did not say "What chance have we got?"

Mr. COURT: The import of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition was that we have very little chance of attracting these industries because in every case, practically, there were well-established industries in the Eastern States that could produce for the whole of Australia.

Mr. Hawke: I pointed that out as a difficulty.

Mr. COURT: But it is a difficulty that we can overcome by lifting our sights to another market where we do not have to face that particular problem. We have to reorient our ideas, and particularly in regard to manufacture and merchandising techniques.

Dealing in detail with some of the comments made—I will try to be as brief as I can; but in courtesy I want to deal with matters raised—the Leader of the Opposition criticised the reference to an industrial authority. This word, "authority," is in very general use and is very well understood throughout the world. We have the famous Tennessee Valley Authority. Everyone knows that for what it is—a great project. There are the harbour authorities of the United Kingdom. Throughout the world, the word is used in its proper sense and will be understood in this State.

Mr. Jamieson: Why not have a practical authority like the great Murray River Authority?

Mr. COURT: This authority is going to do something practical.

Mr. Jamieson: Yes?

Mr. COURT: We find this authority referred to as bureaucratic and totalitarian. I fail to see that any of those adjectives is well founded; because if we follow through the measure, there are no such provisions that promote bureaucracy or totalitarianism.

Reference was made by the Leader of the Opposition to the tenure of office. It provides that there will be a period not

exceeding five years, but there is also provision that they may hold office at the Governor's pleasure. That is not an unusual provision; and in this particular case it is more necessary than in most cases, because this is a dynamic thing. When trying to attract and promote industry, it could be that we might want to appoint someone to the authority for a particular period and for a particular phase. It is not always convenient to appoint a person for a definite period. It might not suit that person. A person may have to be seconded to this authority for a particular job; and therefore it is necessary to have the right to retain that person for what is more or less an indefinite period. Other people may want an appointment on a definite basis; and provision is made for both types of appointment.

Reference was made to 65 years of age for retirement. That is not unusual. Nor is the provision which gives the Governor the right to waive that condition. It is in the State Electricity Commission Act and many other pieces of legislation—and a very desirable provision, too. Because there are many men at 65 or 70 years of age who, on account of some particular experience or ability might be wanted on an authority such as this; not because of their brawn or nimbleness, or anything of that nature, but because of the brain and experience they have, and the advice they can pass on to others, particularly in the early history of the authority.

Mr. Rowberry: What is wrong with the present director?

Mr. COURT: There is no present director.

Mr. Rowberry: What was wrong with the director?

Mr. COURT: I am not referring to or criticising the previous director; and he is not under discussion, because there is no director in the department at present. The Leader of the Opposition made great play on this question of outsiders being brought in. He said this Government department was being wound up and outsiders were being brought in. We make no apology for bringing in outside blood to give this industrial authority a new look.

Mr. Jamieson: And some of their recommendations are not very good.

Mr. COURT: It is important to give this department a new look, and bring in people who know the language in which to talk to potential industrialists and gain their confidence; men with the experience and knowledge to explain their own experience and how these things can be developed in Western Australia. They are better people to give the necessary advice and gain the confidence of potential industrialists at this point of time, than a departmental officer would be. It could be that with the passage of time, the Government of the day might want to appoint departmental officers to some of the positions on the authority; and that will be up to that Government. We are not making legislation for this Government alone.

We are mindful of the fact that this legislation might easily have to be administered by another Government in years to come; and if it decides it does not want outside people to give their services on this authority, it can appoint people of its own choosing. The selection of people suitable for the particular time in our industrial history will be very important; because as times change and the type of industry we have changes, we will have to have a different type of person in the authority. During this difficult period, when we are trying to develop our indigenous resources, we require people with a certain type of vision. When we have overcome the initial problems of exploiting and developing some of these indigenous resources, it may be that we will have to have an entirely different type of adviser in regard to industrial development.

For those reasons I believe the selection of the individual for this job is a very important matter, and a question which will confront successive Governments as time goes on. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that there would be irresponsibility with regard to funds; funds which can be borrowed only with the approval of the Treasury. I say definitely that there will be not irresponsibility, but a greater sense of responsibility; because this authority will be vested with authority properly to police those funds. One of the problems which confronts us, in the matter of industrial development advances at present, is those advances that have been made, but which will never be repaid. They have proved to be unfortunate investments as far as the State is concerned; and unfortunately some of those advances have been made from one source and some from another; and what is everybody's business is nobody's business. From now on it will be somebody's business not only to invest the money carefully when advances are made to industry, but also to follow it up and advise and encourage those industries.

The member for Mt. Hawthorn referred to the Bill as subtle and diabolical; but having got those words out, he seemed to leave it at that; and I cannot comment much further on his speech. He did refer to the fact that the definitions of "department" and "industry" were all-embracing —and they were intended to be. If I had not arranged for those definitions to be included, I would have been criticised for having loosely worded definitions. There seems to have been some idea abroad that these definitions give the authority certain powers; but that is not so. They are definitions used in the normal way in an Act, so that when the words recur during the verbiage of the legislation people will know, for legal purposes, what is

meant. If those words are followed through the measure, there is nothing diabolical, sinister or subtle about them, as some members have suggested.

The member for Mt. Hawthorn wanted to know what the remuneration of these officers would be; and I could not tell him, as it will vary with the times and circumstances. He also referred to the question of superannuation for ex-Government employees; and there again, the provision in the Bill is not an unusual one; because there may be people, as there are on this occasion, drawing superannuation; and we do not want to prejudice that. How silly we would be if we expected people to prejudice their superannuation in order to give their services to the State at our request!

Mr. Heal: Have you made any offer at all to the gentlemen who are proposed to be on the authority?

Mr. COURT: No remuneration has been discussed. Those gentlemen have acted in an honorary capacity, working long hours and with great zeal, laying the foundation of what I think will be a successful period of industrial development. With their help we have been able to gain some time before the passage of the legislation; because we have had these men in an advisory capacity, so that certain preliminary work in connection with our long-term plan could be proceeded with. We have gained some months by using these men in an advisory capacity—

Mr. Jamieson: That is plausible, but not very convincing.

Mr. COURT: It happens to be true. I know the honourable member finds it hard to believe that there are men in Western Australia who want to serve this State entirely in an honorary capacity. These gentlemen have worked hard; and had the honourable member made as much of a contribution to the State as they have, he would have something to be proud of.

Mr. Jamieson: And if I had given away as much as they have I would be disgusted with myself.

Mr. COURT: I cannot follow the import of that remark, and will not try to do so at this hour of the morning. The member for Mt. Hawthorn referred also to the fact that, under one of the provisions of the Bill, the authority could make inquiries and investigations in respect of any industry. That is true, and it is provided as one of the functions and powers of the authority; but I invite attention to the fact that it is not a special power. It is a power which exists in every Government department in the State; it is automatic and inherent in them. I had this checked by the Crown Solicitor to make sure that there was nothing more in it than I thought there was; and he has assured me that there is no more power in those words than there is inherent in any department in the State.

We were most anxious not to be accused, at a later date, of hiding any of our intentions in respect of this authority. There are certain matters which we probably could have left out and which would have been inherent in the power and responsibility of the authority; but we felt that, as far as was practicable, the Bill should be a clear and simple statement of what we intend this authority to undertake. Perhaps that is where we incurred criticism, when we could have got by with less verbiage and with not making such a full disclosure as has been made in this legislation. I repeat that there are no special powers for investigation contained in that clause; nothing that an ordinary department or individual could not do if it were desirable.

The member for Guildford-Midland was concerned about the prospect of civil servants being engaged, and that was a reversal of some of the views previously expressed; but I can assure him that there may be circumstances in which it would be desirable to use the services of a number of public servants, and any Government would be unwise to go past the advice and services of such an officer, if one existed. It could be an officer with specialised knowledge and experience who, for a particular phase, had a role to play on this authority.

The same honourable member criticised the fact that one of the functions of this authority is to gather information. He rather ridiculed the fact that it will have to assemble statistics and general information concerning existing, or possible, or desirable industries established, or about to be established, within the State. The honourable member concerned speaks at rather a rapid rate and I tried at the time to interject; I could not do so, and I will now make the observation.

One of our greatest needs in Western Australia at present—strange as it may seem and in spite of all the Government departments—is to assemble the right type of statistical and other information regarding industry, on which we can go forward with our approaches to industrialists not only in this State and the other States, but also in other parts of the world.

Mr. Brady: If you model it on the same lines as in the railways you will ruin industry in Western Australia.

Mr. COURT: The type of statistics and information we need is very expensive to gather; and it takes highly specialised brains to get it. But we are convinced that we have no chance of attracting industry unless we can get this basic information; and I repeat, in spite of all the Government departments, statisticians, and the like, there is still not the right type of information or surveys that we need if we are to attract the right type of industrialists to this State. Victoria has had to

spend a fortune on getting a proper survey made on which it can go to the industrialists of the world and attract them to that State. We will have to do the same thing; because the type of people we want to attract here in the bigger industries will not take halfbaked information; it has to be really sound, provable information.

Mr. Lawrence: From the look of your last Budget they won't have a fortune to spend.

Mr. COURT: The member for Fremantle referred to the Bill as sinister.

Mr. Lawrence: South Fremantle.

Mr. COURT: I was referring to the member for Fremantle; I did not hear the member for South Fremantle getting to the stage of calling it sinister. The member for Fremantle referred to it as sinister; and I thought he made some very unkind, unfair, and unfortunate reflections on the character of two outstanding citizens in this State. I do not think I need say any more on his remarks.

So far as the remaining members are concerned, I do not want to weary the House by going over each one's remarks in detail, although I did my best to try to keep some notes of what they were talking about. Suffice it to say that in the main they repeated the pinpricking complaints regarding various clauses in the Bill, completely overlooking the significance of the definitions when they are read in conjunction with the appropriate clauses in the measure.

Mr. Fletcher: It is the effect that we are concerned with.

Mr. COURT: And it is the effect that we are concerned with; we are after industrial development in this State, and we think this is the best way to go about it. At least it will give us a chance.

Mr. Fletcher: We do not think it will.

Mr. Jamieson: You are only concerned about pounds, shillings, and pence.

Mr. COURT: We cannot sit back complacently because of what has happened in the last few years. Surely to give this matter a new look, a new atmosphere, and a new type of approach is worth a try to see if we cannot stimulate industry in this State.

Mr. Fletcher: A lot of industries have been established in my electorate over the last few years.

Mr. Jamieson: In mine too.

Mr. COURT: The member for Toodyay, in common with other members, referred to a clause to which exception has been taken. As far as I am concerned, if that particular subclause regarding the right of entry in connection with various timbers, soils, and so on, is removed, I am not going to be the least bit upset. However, I mention that it is a provision that has been in the State Electricity Commission Act for a long time.

Mr. Jamieson: They have to go through areas.

Mr. COURT: I am afraid I will never convince some members of the fact that we want to get something done. There could be circumstances where this authority, or anyone else acting for the Government in connection with an industry, would have to go into possession of the industry in the ordinary course of financial default, or something like that. There is one case that comes quickly to mind where this power could be necessary. However, I shall not persist with it. It seems to be the only point on which there is any real or valid cause for objection, and I shall not object if it is removed. If we find at a later date that the authority cannot function smoothly, or the Government's assets are prejudiced without the power, we can come back to Parliament and ask for it again. As far as I am concerned it is not a major issue, and it is not one of the principles at which this Bill is directed.

However, I respectfully point out that if members study the whole of the clause they will find it refers only to certain circumstances; and they are in respect of contracts. There is also provision in the legislation not only for the minimum damage to be done but also for compensation to be paid. However, if members feel that it would be better if the subclause were removed, I shall not be the least bit upset.

I just want to make this final observation before I conclude: It seems to be worrying some members that we want to press on with a migration programme in conjunction with our industrial development programme. That is factual. Any State that does not contemplate a migration programme, and have the courage to go after it, and go after an industrial programme to complement and supplement it, is doomed to stagnation. If industry is efficient, it must increase its productivity; and even if there is no increase in population, there will be problems of unemployment. That is the defeatist way of looking at the position. We want to go the aggressive and positive way about it, and be prepared to bring people here and attract industries to this State so that not only our existing people can be employed, and the State's industries be more productive, but so that we can also absorb more people into the community. This is an attempt to give industrial development in this State a new look, and I am convinced that if this legislation is given a trial it will do just that.

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

Ayes—22.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Craig	Mr. Owen
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Watts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. I. W. Manning
	(Teller.)

Noes—19.

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Evans	Mr. Moir
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. Heal	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Norton
Mr. Jamieson	*(Teller.)*

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Mann	Mr. May
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. W. Hegney
Sir Ross McLarty	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. Andrew

Majority for—3.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Roberts) in the Chair; Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2—Act No. 2 of 1952, section 6 amended:

Mr. HAWKE: The name of the proposed organisation is set out in this clause. The name includes the word "authority" to which I expressed my dislike in my second reading speech. In replying to the second reading debate, the Minister assured us that this is not a new word. We know it is not; but nevertheless it is a term that is used little in Western Australia and, in fact, it would be difficult to name more than one or two organisations which have this term applied to them except in a descriptive way. It is certainly not part of their legal names.

It is an unfortunate term to be chosen to be applied to an organisation such as is proposed to be set up under this Bill. Generally, people do not like the term. They feel there is inherent in it the power to push people around—the power to override—even if only in a limited way. It is not for me to advise the Government on this matter, but I should think that the term of Western Australian Industries Promotion Council or Commission would be more appropriate.

Perhaps there are other terms which I have not thought of which would be more appropriate still. Certain it is that this term "authority" is not proper, suitable, or acceptable. Should Parliament agree to the authority being called in the manner proposed in the Bill, then later on, when the authority is operating and is overstepping the mark, the people who feel bitter about the organisation, will give the term "authority" the "works" in no uncertain manner. The use of the term "authority" in itself will invite criticism and dissatisfaction.

I hope, even at this stage, that the Government will see the logic of what I am saying and try to save a lot of trouble that could easily be met by the organisation later, merely because of the word "authority." I would like to hear further from the Minister on this point.

Mr. COURT: I assure the Leader of the Opposition that great thought was given to this term "authority" before it was adopted. The three alternatives considered were, "committee," "commission" and "council." It was felt that none of them was as effective as the word "authority." We wanted to create the impression that this was to be a new body set up in Western Australia for the purpose of industrial promotion and expansion; and, after due deliberation, it was felt that "authority" was the proper word.

If anyone is worried about the term being offensive, it should be the Government; and it cannot see any reason why the term should be offensive, or why people should not negotiate with us. The acceptance of the term on a world-wide basis is as an organisation charged with a certain responsibility—which this proposed authority will be—and from my readings of the word "authority" abroad there did not seem to be any indication that it was repugnant; and, after proper deliberation, the word "authority" was inserted in the name.

Mr. HAWKE: I cannot agree that great thought was given to the selection of this term. It might be that much thought was given to it, but there was certainly nothing "great" about the thought given to the final selection of the term. If the Government had even included the word "promotion" by placing it in front of the word "authority" the name would have been softened considerably, although there would still have been ground for objection to the use of the word "authority."

By using this term in the name of the authority, I think the Government will be building up a lot of trouble for the members of the authority because of the criticism and opposition which might develop but which might not otherwise have developed, with the result that the standing of the authority will be considerably reduced. I make the prophecy that should the Bill become law and the organisation be set up under this proposed title, it will not be more than a year or so before Parliament will be asked to delete the word

"authority" from the title of the organisation with a view to substituting a more appropriate term.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

Mr. HAWKE: Provided no other member of the Committee wishes to discuss anything prior to the definition of "industry" I would like to have a lot to say about that definition and to relate what I say to paragraph (f) of clause 17 which is on page 6 of the Bill. When the member for Albany was making the early part of his speech, he referred to the Rural and Industries Bank and similar Government-owned and operated organisations; and he claimed that under this Bill the proposed authority could take action which could easily lead to the disposal of such undertakings as the Rural and Industries Bank.

The Minister for Lands and the Minister for Industrial Development tried to ridicule what the member for Albany was saying; but from my reading of the definition of "industry" and its connection with paragraph (f) of clause 17, the proposed authority will have this right should the Bill become law, because these provisions clearly cover the Rural and Industries Bank, the State Government Insurance Office, and every other activity operated by the Government, quite apart from all the State trading concerns. The definition of "industry" is as wide as the world; and in order that members might see the significance of what I am saying, I propose at this stage to read the definition of "industry"; and, with your approval, Mr. Chairman, also paragraph (f) of clause 17. Unless I do this my point will not be understood. The definition of "industry" is as follows:—

> "Industry" includes any trade and any business, and any activity or undertaking which has association with commerce or industrial activity whether carried on by a department or otherwise.

In other words, whether carried on by a department or not carried on by a department. It is difficult to imagine any Government activity which would not come within that definition. Paragraph (f) of clause 17 reads—

> To advise the Minister on the policy which should be adopted in regard to, and the best methods of undertaking, the transfer of State trading concerns and other industry controlled or carried on by or on behalf of the State or a department to the field of private enterprise, and assisting in any such transfer.

It is all-embracing; I am not sure that it would not cover Parliament House.

Mr. Court: That is stretching it a bit.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister will admit the definition is tremendously wide.

Mr. Brand: It is meant to be.

Mr. Court: Of course it is.

Mr. HAWKE: I do not think the Minister could cite one Government activity that is not covered. It is interesting to have both the Premier and the Minister for Industrial Development tell us that the definition of "industry" is meant to be wide. It shows that the Government is obviously out to dispose of not only State trading concerns but also the Rural and Industries Bank, the State Government Insurance Office, and many other Government undertakings. The Government is hell bent on destroying those organisations which have been built up over the years—some after parliamentary approval was obtained for their establishment. The authority contained in the Bill will, to a large extent, decide which of these Government organisations are to be disposed of and the terms on which they are to be passed over to private enterprise. The term, "field of private enterprise" is very loose and I am sure a court would have difficulty in interpreting it effectively.

It is true that in all the Government activities covered by the definition of industry, the Minister and the Government would have the final say as to whether the recommendation and advice of the proposed authority should be adopted. But we do not need to be far-sighted to know that to a large extent the Minister and the Government would be committed beforehand to accept the advice and recommendations of the authority. The relationship of the Minister and the Government to the proposed authority would be vastly different from that which exists between a Minister and his department, and the Government and the departments. A Government department is a Government department. The proposed authority will not be a Government department. According to the Minister it will be an organisation consisting of extremely brainy men with new blood, despite the fact that the ages of the three members, when added together, aggregate 210 years.

The members of the authority will not regard themselves as "chicken feed," or as normal departmental officers regard themselves. When a departmental officer puts forward advice or recommendations, he accepts the rejection of such advice or recommendations as a matter of course, well knowing that the Minister and the Government have the supreme say, and that he himself is a member of the Civil Service.

When members of the proposed authority put forward their advice and recommendations, under the definition of "industry," they will be very hurt if the advice or recommendation for the disposal of the Rural and Industries Bank or the sale of the State Insurance Office is rejected.

I know one of the two men whose names have been mentioned freely in this debate. I am aware that he can become quite hurt if his recommendation or advice is not looked upon as expert or worthy. When he and his colleagues put out advice and recommendations for the sale of the Government concerns which come under the definition of "industry" and they are rejected, he can become quite sore. If we look ahead and exercise some commonsense. we can see all sorts of difficulties developing under the proposed legislation.

As the Minister has assured us that the men chosen to dispose of the undertakings within the definition of "industry" will be very brainy men with new blood, new ideas, and a new look, then clearly the Minister is three parts committed to that advice and recommendation for the disposal of the State concerns. It is rather clear that the people who will decide upon the disposal of the Rural and Industries Bank, the State Insurance Office, and the other concerns will not be the Minister or the Government but the members of the authority; and they will decide the conditions under which those concerns are to go.

I can clearly visualise what could happen under the definition of "industry," and what one of the members of the proposed authority did to the State, its welfare and future interest, by giving away 120,000,000 tons of iron ore not so long ago. When we consider the term "industry" we have to keep clearly in the forefront of our minds the fact that the members will have a greater loyalty to big companies than they will have to the interests of the people of this State in general in regard to the disposal of the Rural and Industries Bank, the State Insurance Office and the other State-owned concerns, irrespective of whether or not they are known as State trading concerns.

The definition of "industry" is very dangerous and full of menace. I propose to move an amendment to delete the definition of "industry," to enable the Minister to draw up a less dangerous definition. The member for East Perth advises me that he wishes to move an amendment to an earlier portion of the clause. If you, Sir, have not accepted my amendment, I shall resume my seat to enable him to do that.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am in disagreement with the definition, in its entirety, of the term "department" because of the implications later on. I realise that this Chamber agreed that the Government should have the right to dispose of State trading concerns, nothwithstanding the attitude of the Opposition. The move for the disposal of State trading concerns to be subject to the prior approval of Parliament was rejected.

As the matter has been determined, it would be out of order to do anything to vary that decision. In my view the definition "department" could terminate after the word "concern" in line 13. I propose to move the following amendment:—

> Page 2, line 13—Delete all words after the word "Concern."

That will remove the reference to the Rural and Industries Bank. I do not think the Government will, by the wildest stretch of imagination or conservative extremism, contemplate handing over this institution to its political friends.

In relation to the Fremantle Harbour Trust, has the Government reached the stage when it is prepared to hand over the gateway to Western Australia to a coterie of private people and to hold the State to ransom?

Mr. Court: Your imagination is running riot when you read this term into the clauses of the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM: I shall refer to clause 17 (f) in due course. I submit to the Minister for Industrial Development that he will have to be working overtime to endeavour to produce from the words that power in that provision. The meaning that he is endeavouring to make us believe is explicit in the words appearing in it, is not so, or I do not understand the Queen's English. The words I seek to delete are "and any Crown instrumentality which controls or carries on an industry." The word "industry" is most interesting. If we look at the next definition, we will find that it includes everything. The word "industry" includes any trade and any business, and any activity or undertaking which has association with commerce or industrial activity.

Mr. Hawke: The Fremantle Harbour Trust; the State Electricity Commission; everything.

Mr. GRAHAM: Does not the Mines Department have association with commerce and industrial activity—the provision of water supplies; the conservation and production of timber; the erection of housing for workers; transport, including the railways and other forms of transport including shipping to the North-West; and the printing of our parliamentary papers? What activities of the Government are not associated with commerce or industrial activity? It can be seen in the definition that an attempt is being made by the Government to embrace anything and everything that is operated by the State. As the Leader of the Opposition said, it could even include Parliament House and the parliamentary institution. Do not we have an association with commerce and with industrial activity?

There is no question of a close liaison or being part and parcel of; it is merely any association with. That is what the Minister for Industrial Development seeks.

As I stated earlier, everything that belongs to Her Majesty; that belongs to Western Australia; and belongs to its people goes through this so-called authority, subject only to him—the Minister for Industrial Development—to be passed over to political friends of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Court: That is not so.

Mr. GRAHAM: It may not be the intention, but I would take a lot of convincing on that point. It is certainly what appears in the Bill before us.

Mr. Court: Nothing of the sort. You are reading something more into it than is there.

Mr. GRAHAM: Strangely enough, I am reading what is in the Bill.

Mr. Court: You are putting your own construction on it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not even doing that. Does the Minister deny that the Rural and Industries Bank could be included?

Mr. Court: I did not deny it was in the definition. The member for Albany was interpreting in the definitions clause the powers clause.

Mr. GRAHAM: That might work all right in the Liberal Party kindergarten but not in this Parliament. I refer members of the Committee to clause 17 (f), and the definitions are in the clause we are considering. These State trading concerns will come under the auctioneer's hammer; and the bidders, of course, will be a selected few. The State Saw Mills are up for sale for approximately £2,000,000. I can only speak for myself in this Chamber but I have not £2,000,000 to offer; therefore I would not be a starter. How many concerns have the necessary capital in order to be starters in that particular competition?

Set up this authority and it will recommend £250,000 to the Minister. I still could not be a starter, but that figure would no doubt interest some of the Minister's particular political friends. What this section of Parliament has already decided against the wishes of the Opposition is that the Government should have the right to dispose of State trading concerns. Because of that decision, in a democratic country, I concede it is right to engage in that sort of business if we cease at the word "concern". Then this authority could make its investigations, submit its advice to the Minister, and lay down the procedure under which these particular concerns could be disposed of.

Having said that, I insist upon a full stop. I move an amendment —

> Page 2—Delete all words after the word "Concern" in line 13, down to and including the word "industry" in line 18.

Mr. CROMMELIN: I move—

> That progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.

Motion put and passed.

[The Speaker Resumed the Chair]

Leave to Sit Again

The Chairman of Committees (Mr. Roberts) reported that the Committee had made progress and asked leave to sit again.

The SPEAKER: The question is—

That leave be given to sit again.

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

Ayes—22.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Burt	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Court	Mr. O'Neil
Mr. Craig	Mr. Owen
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Watts
Dr. Henn	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. I. W. Manning
	(Teller.)

Noes—19.

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Evans	Mr. Moir
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. Heal	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Norton
Mr. Jamieson	*(Teller.)*

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Mann	Mr. May
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. W. Hegney
Sir Ross McLarty	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. W. A. Manning	Mr. Andrew

Majority for—3

Question thus passed.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier): I move—

> That the House at is rising adjourn till 2.15 p.m. on Thursday, the 8th October.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 2.23 a.m. (Wednesday).

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 8th October, 1959

CONTENTS Page