

the same information, namely, a record of what has been done in the previous year and a statement of what it is hoped will be done in the following year. Strange as it may seem, the speeches are always on an optimistic note, and that is just what we would expect. In conclusion, I would like to comment that the Speech delivered the other day by His Excellency was not different from the speeches which have been delivered to Parliament for a long time.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. W. F. Willesee.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

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

That the House, at its rising, adjourn until 2.30 p.m. on Thursday, the 10th August.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 8.45 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 9th August, 1961

CONTENTS

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	Page
Apprentices—	
Number Registered	137
Number Engaged by Public Works Department Architectural Division	137
Betting Premises : Dimensions of Advertising Signs	134
Char and Coke Industry : Establishment at Collie	131
Child Management : Counselling Sessions for Parents	133
Child Offenders : Percentage from Unsatisfactory Homes	133
Convicted Persons : System of Probation	132
European Common Market : Effect of Britain's Membership on Australian Primary Production	135
Fingerprints : When Taken	132
Firle Dairy : Correspondence with Milk Board on Esperance Project	134
Hannan Street Level Crossing : Provision of Lights	133
Kalgoorlie Central School : Completion of Renovations	133
Kalgoorlie Children's Court : Children Charged and Number Committed to Child Welfare Department	133
Kalgoorlie Train : Making Up of Sleeping Berths	134

CONTENTS—continued

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—continued	Page
Milk—	
Standard for Schools	132
Supplies to Kalgoorlie Schools	134
Narrogin Housing : Current Programme for Rental and Purchase Homes	137
Northam Regional Hospital : Date of Construction	131
Off-Course Betting : Comparison of T.A.B. and Licensed Shops	135
Onslow Barge : Purchase Price, Maintenance Costs, and Operational Details, etc.	130
Oxidised Copper Ore : Tonnage Used in Copper-impregnated Superphosphate, etc.	136
Parole and Probation Officers: Appointment Pawns in Shark Bay : Possibility of Trawling by Liberty Fish Company	133
Proclamation Day : Celebration	131
South Kensington School : Education Department's Attitude to Proposed Closure "Sunset" Home Inmates : Pension Deductions for Health Benefits Scheme	132
Totalisator Agency Board: Treasury Obligations	129
Tuna Survey in Western Australia : Inclusion of North-West	136
Turf Club and Trotting Association: Payments by Treasurer from Revenue	131
Undersized Crayfish—	
Promulgation of Regulations	138
Sale	131
Unemployed—	
Number in Receipt of Unemployment Allowance	137
Number Registered	137
Water Rates : Request for Reduction	135
Willful Murder : Plea of Guilty	132
Wilson Drainage Scheme : Cost, Rates, and Maintenance	135

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE—

Railway Services : Cancellations in Metropolitan Area	138
---	-----

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY : SECOND DAY—

Speakers on Motion—	
Mr. Hawke	138
Mr. Tonkin	147

The **SPEAKER** (Mr. Hearman) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

"SUNSET" HOME INMATES

Pension Deductions for Health Benefits Scheme

1. Mr. **BRADY** asked the Minister for Health:
 - (1) Did he approve of the inmates of *Sunset* having deducted from their weekly pension the annual cost of health benefits scheme in two moieties?
 - (2) Were the inmates consulted in regard to the deductions?
 - (3) Is he aware that a number of inmates of *Sunset* feel that they have not been fairly treated?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) No. There is, however, a book-keeping system whereby annual payments are made on behalf of inmates. They recoup the annual payment on their behalf by fortnightly deductions from their pension. Some patients have agreed to pay the annual subscription in two moieties.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) No. However, it is possible that there could be some misunderstanding concerning the procedure.

SOUTH KENSINGTON SCHOOL

Education Department's Attitude to Proposed Closure

2. **Mr. GRAYDEN** asked the Minister for Education:

As rumours are circulating in South Perth to the effect that it is the intention of the Education Department to close the South Kensington State School, will he explain the departmental attitude in respect of the school?

Mr. WATTS replied:

The possibility is being investigated, but no decision has been arrived at.

ONSLOW BARGE

Purchase Price, Maintenance Costs, and Operational Details, etc.

3. **Mr. BICKERTON** asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) What was the purchase price of the barge that is to be used at Onslow?
- (2) What was the cost of necessary repairs and renovations?
- (3) What is the estimated cost per annum for maintenance on a craft of this nature?
- (4) What number of persons constitutes the crew and what salary and wages are paid per year?
- (5) What investigations were made to obtain a suitable barge before this one was accepted?
- (6) Were tenders called for the supply of a suitable barge; if not, why not?
- (7) What is the net carrying capacity?
- (8) What arrangements have been made for berthing and unloading at Onslow?
- (9) What arrangements have been made to ensure the safety of the barge during the cyclone period?

(10) Will the barge be capable of loading—

- (a) wool;
- (b) sheep;
- (c) cattle?

(11) When will it commence operations?

(12) What arrangements have been made to compensate the owner of the lugger at present being used at Onslow for any damage caused to that craft during its use by the Harbour and Light Department or Public Works Department?

Mr. WILD replied:

(1) £14,500.

	£
(2) Necessary repairs and renovations	1,500
New machinery	3,000
Fitting new machinery, etc	2,000
New work (modification and improvement)	2,000
Fitting new navigation, life-saving and cargo-handling equipment	2,000

The lighter is now fully equipped to proceed anywhere on the coast for other work.

A certain amount of money will be recovered on machinery and equipment taken out of the lighter to allow new installations.

(3) No firm costs are available, but it is estimated that £1,000 per annum will be ample.

(4) One coxswain responsible for navigation and maintenance of the lighter is employed permanently at an annual rate of £1,309 2s. 0d.

Additional crew up to three general hands are to be engaged as required at award rates.

(5) All local vessels offered were thoroughly investigated and, with the exception of the vessel purchased, were found unsuitable. The manager of the Harbour and Light Department was sent to the Eastern States to endeavour to locate a more suitable vessel and was unable to do so.

(6) Tenders were not called as time did not permit the building of a suitable vessel.

(7) 80 tons.

(8) A lighter berth—complete with facilities to handle passengers, general cargo, wool, and sheep—has been established.

(9) Permanent moorings have been sent on the vessel and will be laid immediately on arrival at Onslow. Beadon Creek is being investigated for suitability of establishing cyclone moorings.

- (10) The barge will be capable of loading all classes of goods and livestock except cattle.
- (11) Immediately on arrival—estimated to be the 15th August, 1961.
- (12) It has been agreed that any damage, etc. sustained by the lugger as a result of its use by the Harbour and Light Department or the Public Works Department will be made good by the Harbour and Light Department on the termination of the contract.

4 and 5. *These questions were postponed.*

NORTHAM REGIONAL HOSPITAL

Date of Construction

6. Mr. HAWKE asked the Minister for Health:

When is a commencement likely to be made on the work of constructing the proposed new regional hospital at Northam?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The year 1963-1964. This is dependent, however, on the availability of loan funds.

PRAWNS IN SHARK BAY

Possibility of Trawling by Liberty Fish Company

7. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) Is there any likelihood of the Liberty Fish Company of Philadelphia starting trawling for prawns in Shark Bay waters this season?
- (2) If the answer is "Yes", under what terms and conditions will they operate?
- (3) Will a royalty be payable on their exports?
- (4) Has he any knowledge of whether or not the Commonwealth Government agreed to the company's request to bring the trawlers into Australia duty free?
- (5) Did he make representations to Senator Henty in support of the company's application for a remission of duty?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) It seems most unlikely. I have received no word from this concern for some time.
- (2) See answer to No. (1).
- (3) See answer to No. (1).
- (4) The department has not received official advice, but I have reason to believe that the Commonwealth Government rejected the company's application.
- (5) Yes.

TUNA SURVEY IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Inclusion of North-West

8. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) Has he any knowledge of the intention of the Commonwealth Government to carry out a tuna survey in Western Australian waters?
- (2) In what area will this survey be carried out?
- (3) If the survey is confined to the southern part of the State, will he make representation to the appropriate Minister to have the north-west included?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The south coastal area.
- (3) Yes.

UNDERSIZED CRAYFISH

Sale

9. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) Is he aware that considerable canvassing of undersized crayfish for sale to merchants took place during the last crayfishing season?
- (2) Is he also aware that merchants who refused to buy undersized crayfish were refused legal size crayfish by fishermen or their agents?

Promulgation of Regulations

- (3) As the regulation giving inspectors the right to seize boats and equipment seems to have the effect of prohibiting the taking of varieties of ordinary pisces, would he give thought to immediately promulgating similar regulations in connection with crayfishing?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) There was some trading in undersized crayfish last season, but on a greatly reduced scale as compared with earlier years.
- (2) No.
- (3) Under the Fisheries Act crayfish are "fish" and the seizure provisions of the Act consequently apply equally to crayfish as to scale fish.

CHAR AND COKE INDUSTRY

Establishment at Collie

10. Mr. MAY asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

During September, 1960, I asked the Minister what stage the proposal to establish a char and coke industry at Collie had reached,

to which he replied: "Treasury officers could make no real progress in their investigations until the applicant company supplied information sought on the 9th August, 1960": Can he now advise whether the Treasury officers have received the information sought from the applicant company or whether the whole business of establishing the industry at Collie has been completely abandoned?

Mr. COURT replied:

The prospect of establishing this industry is being approached on a different basis from that proposed in September, 1960, and the information then being sought does not now have the same significance.

Efforts to establish an industry at Collie have not been abandoned. It is still being actively canvassed. It is too early to conjecture as to the prospects of success.

Sample quantities of char have been shipped to Japan for testing as to suitability.

Preliminary results of the tests are encouraging. Final results are awaited.

11. *This question was postponed.*

WILFUL MURDER

Plea of Guilty

12. Mr. EVANS asked the Attorney-General:

- (1) Is it permissible for a person charged with wilful murder to plead "guilty"?
- (2) If the answer is "No," what authority is there for this?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) Yes. It is very probable, however, that a judge would not accept such a plea until he was satisfied that the accused was aware of all the consequences of that plea, and without suggesting, in most cases, that the accused should plead not guilty. Instances of this nature are, however, extremely rare.

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

PROCLAMATION DAY

Celebration

13. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Will Proclamation Day (the 21st day of October) be celebrated this year on the next following Monday, the 23rd October, as a public holiday in accordance with the definition of "public holiday" in the Interpretation Act?
- (2) If not, why not?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) and (2) An amendment to the Bank Holidays Act in 1921 deleted Proclamation Day from the list of public holidays.

MILK

Standard for Schools

14. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the standard set for milk supplied to schools?
- (2) Would a treatment plant licensed by the Milk Board of Western Australia be capable of supplying milk of the required standard?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) That required under the Milk Act.
- (2) Not necessarily.

15. *This question was postponed.*

FINGERPRINTS

When Taken

16. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Police:

What offences render persons charged with same liable to fingerprinting?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

Irrespective of the offence, the Prisons Act provides that every prisoner taken into custody shall submit himself or herself to be photographed and to have his or her fingerprints taken. The term "prisoner" in the Prisons Act is defined as "any person committed to prison for punishment, or on remand or for trial or for safe custody or otherwise." Any photographs or fingerprints taken of any person under remand, or committed for trial, who shall not be ultimately convicted shall, with the plates be destroyed and not recorded.

CONVICTED PERSONS

System of Probation

17. Mr. EVANS asked the Attorney-General:

Has any consideration been paid to securing amendments to the Criminal Code, to set up a system of probation for convicted persons, under adequate and skilled supervision?

Mr. WATTS replied:

Yes. I am examining proposals for the establishment of an adult probation service to operate as an adjunct to our penal system.

PAROLE AND PROBATION OFFICERS*Appointment*

18. Mr. EVANS asked the Chief Secretary:
Re Press statements made by him indicating the Government's intention to appoint parole and probation officers, could he indicate what has been done in this direction?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:
A new appointment was made in April this year. Further appointments will be made in the light of experience and after an examination has been completed of any necessary legislative requirements.

CHILD OFFENDERS*Percentage from Unsatisfactory Homes*

- 19A. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Child Welfare:

What percentage of children charged before Children's Courts (a) in 1959 and (b) in 1960, come from what have been termed "unsatisfactory homes"?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

1959	Per cent
Boys approximately	54
Girls approximately	100
1960	Per Cent
Boys approximately	41
Girls approximately	100

CHILD MANAGEMENT*Counselling Sessions for Parents*

- 19B. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Child Welfare:

What provision is made by the department for counselling sessions to be given to parents on child management (on a voluntary attendance basis)?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

(a) The director and some of his senior officers give addresses to parent groups by invitation at fairly frequent intervals, approximately 70 in 1960.

(b) The department's two psychologists devote considerable time to counselling parents after investigating their children's needs.

KALGOORLIE CHILDREN'S COURT*Children Charged and Number Committed to Child Welfare Department*

20. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Child Welfare:

(1) How many children appeared before the Children's Court, Kalgoorlie, in—
(a) 1959;
(b) 1960;
(c) 1961 (till the 30th June)?

(2) What percentage of children charged as above, were committed to the care of the department in each of the periods 1960 and 1961 (till the 30th June)?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

(1) 1959—131 children.
1960—170 children.
1961 to the 30th June—84 children.

(2) 1960—36 per cent.
1961 to the 30th June—49 per cent.

HANNAN STREET LEVEL CROSSING*Provision of Lights*

21. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Has he seen reference in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* of the 25th July last to a further crossing smash at the Hannan Street railway crossing, Kalgoorlie, or has he otherwise been notified of this incident?

(2) Has the occurrence of this further accident at this site been communicated to the Level Crossing Protection Committee?

(3) Has the joint inspection by Main Roads and Railways Department officers, as mentioned per enclosure in his letter to me of the 30th June, 1961, of this railway crossing, taken place yet?

(4) When is it likely that the decision of the Level Crossing Protection Committee, re provision of lights at this crossing, will be announced?

Mr. COURT replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The Level Crossing Protection Committee is aware of this accident and has it recorded.

(3) Separate inspections and reports have been made by Railways and Main Roads Department engineers.

(4) The reports were discussed at a meeting of the Level Crossing Protection Committee on the 7th August, 1961, and the decision will be announced within a few days.

KALGOORLIE CENTRAL SCHOOL*Completion of Renovations*

22. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Education:

Would he please advise the date when renovations to the Kalgoorlie Central School, as referred to in my letter to the department—File No. 2138-52—on the 3rd February last, were completed?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) The loose lining boards and cover battens to the ceiling were repaired by the 18th May.
- (2) The crack in the masonry is to be included in a major contract for repairs and renovations which will be put in hand shortly.

BETTING PREMISES

Dimensions of Advertising Signs

23. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) Is there a regulation made under the authority of the Betting Control Act, still in vogue which places a limit as to size of signs used by off-course bookmakers to advertise, outside their premises, their names and the fact that they are licensed bookmakers?
- (2) Is there also a regulation, under authority of appropriate totalisator legislation, limiting as to similar dimensions, the size of signs used to denote that premises are used as branches of the T.A.B.?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) No.
- (3) (a) Policy of the Betting Control Board governed this matter.
(b) Policy of the Totalisator Agency Board governs the present position.

KALGOORLIE TRAIN

Making up of Sleeping Berths

24. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Is he aware that instruction has apparently been given to bunk porters, who are required to make up sleeping berths on the Kalgoorlie train, to omit placing a blanket under the bottom sheet and that in the case of a second-class berth, the bottom sheet, is accordingly placed direct on to the bare leather seat or support?
- (2) Have any complaints been received or made by any railway personnel re this new procedure?
- (3) What is the reason for this new procedure?
- (4) Is it anticipated that this particular instruction will be revoked?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) To provide additional top coverage for patrons travelling second class.

- (4) The arrangement is an attempt to provide greater comfort for travellers, and whether or not it is continued will be dependent on public reaction, which is being kept under observation.

FIRLE DAIRY

Correspondence with Milk Board on Esperance Project

25A. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Agriculture:

With reference to correspondence between Firle Dairy Pty. Ltd., Kalgoorlie, and the W.A. Milk Board, why has—

- (i) no reply been received by Firle Dairy from the Milk Board to a letter re an Esperance milk project, dated the 26th January, 1961.
- (ii) an application by the above dairy to the milk board to supply school milk in its own right, made on the 8th February, 1961, despite a letter and telephone calls in connection therewith, not merited a written or any reply?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (i) This matter is still receiving consideration.
- (ii) Several comprehensive replies have been sent to Firle Dairy Pty. Ltd. and to parliamentary representatives of goldfields constituencies.

MILK

Supplies to Kalgoorlie Schools

25B. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Why is milk provided for Kalgoorlie schools, transported at least 375 miles to Kalgoorlie, when a licensed milk treatment plant exists within two miles of all schools in Kalgoorlie?
- (2) Why has a licensed milk treatment plant, capable of supplying pasteurised milk to schools on the goldfields not been given consideration?
- (3) What number of complaints have been received from goldfields schools regarding bottled milk during the last five years?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) To enable children attending Kalgoorlie and Boulder schools to receive school milk in accordance with the standard required and to meet the wishes of the Goldfields Head Masters' Association. The milk treatment plant in Kalgoorlie receives the major portion of its milk from Perth.

- (2) It was given consideration. It refused to handle school milk supplied from Perth as formerly.
- (3) This information is not readily available.

EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

Effect of Britain's Membership on Australian Primary Production

26. Mr. KELLY asked the Premier:

- (1) In the event of Britain joining the European Common Market does he subscribe to the pessimistic and highly speculative outlook of the Prime Minister of Australia, and some of his senior Ministers, as to the effect Britain's membership would have on Australian primary production?
- (2) Has State Cabinet fully and thoroughly examined possible reaction to the wheat, wool, and dairying industries of Western Australia?
- (3) What action does he propose to take to ensure that the best interests of primary producers are safeguarded?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) to (3) The possible effects of Britain's entry into the European Common Market can only be speculative at this juncture. The Government is keeping in close touch with the Commonwealth Government, which conducts the international negotiations and is satisfied that our interests are being protected.

At this stage, however, it is felt by a number of authorities that there is no cause for undue pessimism in rural industries.

It might be recalled that the communique issued after recent talks recorded the assurance of Mr. Sandys on behalf of the United Kingdom Government that, if negotiations took place, it would be the intention of the United Kingdom to secure satisfactory arrangements to protect Australia's trading interests.

WILSON DRAINAGE SCHEME

Cost, Rates, and Maintenance

27. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) What was the initial cost of the Wilson drainage scheme?
- (2) What amount of money has been received as rates since its inception, and the rate received each year?
- (3) How many ratepayers were there two years ago, and how many are there now?
- (4) What has been the annual maintenance cost since the inception of the scheme?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) £171,875 14s.
- (2) First rating 1952-1953.

Date	Rates	
	£	s. d.
30th June, 1953	292	6 10
1954	688	17 4
1955	1,056	3 11
1956	1,159	3 0
1957	1,674	8 10
1958	2,185	10 8
1959	2,370	7 7
1960	2,425	4 11
1961	3,433	2 7

Total to the 30th June 1961 £15,285 5 8

- (3) Two years ago there were 530 ratepayers. At present date there are 535 ratepayers.

Year	Maintenance	
	£	s. d.
1949-1950	203	16 4
1950-1951	247	8 8
1951-1952	414	10 11
1952-1953	1,968	12 7
1953-1954	3,619	15 6
1954-1955	3,339	7 9
1955-1956	4,951	11 6
1956-1957	5,641	13 7
1957-1958	5,995	1 4
1958-1959	6,258	16 3
1959-1960	5,785	14 0
1960-1961	6,052	14 4

Total to the 30th June, 1961 £44,479 2 9

WATER RATES

Request for Reduction

28. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has he given consideration to the request forwarded to him by myself, on behalf of the civic fathers of Albany, i.e. for an immediate reduction of 25 per cent. in the present water rate?
- (2) If the answer is "Yes," what is his decision?
- (3) If the answer is "No," why has no decision been arrived at as the letter was forwarded to him on the 17th April, 1961?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) to (3) Serious consideration has been given to the request in conjunction with requests from other towns, but it has not been found possible to agree to any reduction.

TURF CLUB AND TROTTING ASSOCIATION

Payments by Treasurer from Revenue

29. Mr. TONKIN asked the Treasurer:

- (1) Is he aware that in last Saturday's issue of *The Weekend News*, the following statement attributed to the Chairman of the W.A.T.C. appeared:—

"I'm quite happy with the progress being made except that at the present stage of T.A.B. operations the club is entirely dependent on the Government for revenue from off-course?"

- (2) Is that portion of his statement other than that which consists of expression of an opinion, correct?
- (3) What is the total amount of money which he, as Treasurer, has made available from revenue to the Turf Club and Trotting Association respectively since the T.A.B. commenced operations?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) W.A. Turf Club, £28,574 18s. 6d. W.A. Trotting Association, £13,556 6s. 5d.

These payments have been made in accordance with the Government's undertaking to pay to the clubs the same percentage share of revenue from off-course betting as they received under the previous system.

In this respect, it has to be borne in mind that as from the 31st December last the clubs lost their previous statutory entitlement to a proportion of off-course betting taxes, all the proceeds of which are now taken to Consolidated Revenue.

Mr. Graham: No money for the unemployed?

Mr. BRAND: Give some of your salary.

30. *This question was postponed.*

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Treasury Obligations

31. Mr. TONKIN asked the Treasurer:

- (1) Is he aware that the major portion of the amount of between £12,000 and £14,000 which the Chairman of the Totalisator Agency Board said recently would be available for distribution to racing and trotting clubs has resulted from the application of regulation No. 36, the validity of which is to be the subject of court action in connection with which a writ has already been issued against the T.A.B.?

- (2) If the T.A.B. distributes the abovementioned amount and is faced with an adverse judgment will he, as Treasurer, be obliged to provide the T.A.B. with funds?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) As the board does not keep separate records of this aspect of its transactions, the proportion of the amount of between £12,000 and £14,000 resulting from the application of regulation No. 36 is not available.
- (2) No.

OFF-COURSE BETTING

Comparison of T.A.B. and Licensed Shops

32. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) In what respects is the present system of off-course betting any improvement on the system of licensed shops which it has superseded?
- (2) Who has benefited from the change?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) (a) Off-course betting will be greatly reduced.
- (b) Unlimited credit betting will be restricted.
- (c) Off-course betting will be properly controlled.
- (d) Proprietary interest on off-course betting will be eliminated.
- (e) Undesirable features of an organised off-course starting price system will be eliminated.
- (f) Adequate facilities for off-course betting will be provided without encouraging it.
- (2) The general public both by reduction of total volume of off-course betting and also better value for money invested on the totalisator as compared with off-course starting price bookmakers, and the racing clubs and trotting association have benefited by greater attendances.

33. *This question was postponed.*

OXIDISED COPPER ORE

Tonnage Used in Copper-Impregnated Superphosphate, etc.

34. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What tonnage of oxidised copper ore has been used in copper-impregnated superphosphate, distributed in Western Australia in the years 1955 to 1961, inclusive?

- (2) In what centres has the ore been mined?
- (3) What are the relative tonnages and percentages at each source?
- (4) What is the current cost of fine ground basic copper delivered at superphosphate works?
- (5) What tonnage of copper-impregnated superphosphate was used in Western Australia in the years 1955 to 1961, inclusive?
- (6) How many dry milling plants are grinding copper oxide ore in Western Australia?
- (7) What price per ton is charged for fine grinding?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) 1954-55 N.A.
 1955-56 N.A.
 1956-57 10,700
 1957-58 14,500
 1958-59 14,300
 1959-60 13,600
 1960-61 10,100
 On basis of 7.5 per cent. copper.
- (2) Main centres—Meekatharra (Thaduna) and Marble Bar (Copper Hills).
- (3) 1960 production—
 Thaduna—3,520 tons of 6.75 per cent. copper.
 Copper Hills—2,499 tons of 12.09 per cent. copper.
 Total all fields 7,726.81 tons averages 9.7 per cent. copper.
- (4) Average cost at all works £27 per ton on 7.5 per cent. copper basis.
- (5) 1954-55 N.A.
 1955-56 N.A.
 1956-57 58,800
 1957-58 79,900
 1958-59 78,800
 1959-60 75,000
 1960-61 55,000
- (6) Two.
- (7) £4 10s. to £5 per ton, which includes handling and bagging.

NARROGIN HOUSING

Current Programme for Rental and Purchase Homes

35. Mr. W. A. MANNING asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

What is the programme for both rental and purchase houses in Narrogin for the current year?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

At the 30th June, 1961, there were 12 houses under construction. A further 19 houses will be built in Narrogin during the year 1961-62.

APPRENTICES

Number Registered

36. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Labour:

- (1) What number of apprentices were registered in each of the years ended the 31st July, 1959, 1960 and 1961, for—
 carpenters,
 plasterers,
 bricklayers,
 painters,
 fitters,
 motor mechanics?

Number Engaged by Public Works Department Architectural Division

- (2) How many apprentices were engaged by the Public Works Department Architectural Division as at the 31st July, 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

To obtain the overall apprenticeship figures up to the 31st July in each year would take some considerable time as all apprentices' cards would have to be examined. The figures to the 30th June, however, are as follows:—

Apprentices Registered as at

	30th June, 1959	30th June, 1960	30th June, 1961
(1) Carpenters	542	415	435
Plasterers	48	32	36
Bricklayers	58	40	36
Painters	196	184	189
Fitters	257	252	242
Motor Mechanics	604	603	644
(2) 31-7-58, 224.			
31-7-59, 126.			
31-7-60, 65.			
31-7-61, 42.			

UNEMPLOYED

Number Registered

37. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Labour:

- (1) What number of—
 males (single),
 males (married),
 females
 are registered with the Commonwealth Employment Department as at the 31st July, 1961?

Number in Receipt of Unemployment Allowance

- (2) What number were in receipt of employment allowance at above date?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

The figures requested can only be procured from the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service, which advises that as yet they are not available.

When the figures are released there will be no break-up for married and single males.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

RAILWAY SERVICES

Cancellations in Metropolitan Area

Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Railways:

Is it a fact that a decision has been made to cease running metropolitan passenger services on Sundays; and, if so, from what date will the new arrangement commence?

Mr. COURT replied:

This question was asked by the member for Guildford-Midland yesterday, and I told him I had no knowledge of it, but that I would consult the commissioner on the matter. He tells me there is no current proposal for the cancellation of services on Saturdays or Sundays.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by Mr. I. W. Manning, leave of absence for one month granted to Mr. Burt (Murchison) on the ground of ill-health.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: SECOND DAY

Motion

Debate resumed from the 3rd August, on the following motion by Mr. Craig:—

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor and Administrator in reply to the Speech he has been pleased to deliver to Parliament:—

May it please Your Excellency: We, the members of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [4.54 p.m.]: The debates which have taken place in this House during the last 24 hours or so have

enabled those members who were so inclined to cover many subjects. However, I have something more to say about the action of the Government in selling, at bargain prices, the State Building Supplies, and of throwing in for good measure the very valuable Railways Department's timber mill at Banksiadale.

We know that in this matter of the sale of State trading concerns, the Government and particularly Liberal Party spokesmen, have for a great period of time been indulging in very destructive propaganda against these concerns. For instance, in June last year the Liberal Party headquarters in Perth issued a most vicious leaflet against State trading concerns—the leaflet being headed, "Plain Facts About the Sale of State-Owned Trading Concerns."

That leaflet was extremely misleading and was written and circulated obviously for the purpose of giving the public an entirely wrong idea about the financial results which had accrued from the operation of State trading concerns. In one part the circular said, and I quote—

In four years under the Hawke Government losses on State Trading Concerns reached £7,570,517.

The truth is that the financial operation of State Trading Concerns for the five-year period 1953-54 to 1958-59 was as follows—and these figures are taken from the official records—

State Brickworks and Sawmills—losses—£114,000.

Wyndham Meat Works—profit—£184,000.

W.A. Meat Export Works—profit—£39,000.

State Hotels—profit—£19,000.

State Engineering Works—profit—£455,000.

State Shipping Service—losses—£8,400,000.

Those official figures show a net loss of £7,817,000 for the five-year period, with the total loss on the State Shipping Service of £8,400,000. In other words, the actual State trading concerns involved together earned a net profit of £583,000.

So Liberal Party headquarters in this leaflet were able to produce deliberately misleading information only by the dishonest process of putting into their figures the heavy financial losses recorded by the Government in the running of the State steamships to the north-west and to Darwin. I have said before in this House, and it is worth repeating, that the State Shipping Service is not a trading concern. That service has been run for a great many years by Government after Government in Western Australia, essentially for the purpose of providing a reasonable transport service to people and industries

in the north-west at the lowest possible freight charges. It is a wonder the people who prepared this Liberal Party leaflet did not include the financial transactions of the Railways Department and bury that in a leaflet as a State trading concern and so increase the losses!

I have not heard any suggestion from this Government that it will sell the State Shipping Service; and I cannot imagine any private company that would want to buy that service, because private companies are not interested in running a service which is not profitable and which could not be made profitable. To make the State Shipping Service profitable in the financial sense freights would have to be raised to such levels as would drive most of the people and most of the industries now located in the north-west out of it. I am sure no member on the other side of the House would advocate a proposition of that kind.

I think it appropriate to also point out that for the same year period which I quoted previously—that is, from 1953-1954 to 1958-1959—the financial result of the operations of the Rural and Industries Bank showed a profit of £215,000; the State Electricity Commission, a profit of £540,000; and the State Government Insurance Office, a surplus of £380,000, or a total in all for those three concerns of £1,135,000. Those figures do not find any place in the Liberal Party leaflet; and obviously they did not find a place in it because it did not suit the pernicious purpose which the Liberal Party was pursuing in the compilation and distribution of that leaflet.

However, I would say—and I think most members would agree—that the Rural and Industries Bank, the State Electricity Commission, and the State Government Insurance Office are much more State trading concerns than the State Shipping Service is or is ever likely to be. So it is as clear as anything can be that the State Shipping Service figures were put into the leaflet and the figures covering these other concerns—the State Electricity Commission, the State Government Insurance Office, and the Rural and Industries Bank—were left out in order that the answer which the Liberal Party had arrived at at the beginning, and which the circulation of the leaflet was to promote among the people, might be on the surface made to appear to have some foundation.

From what has happened since that time, it seems fairly clear that the leaflet in question was prepared and issued as a sort of softening-up process to try to brainwash the public of Western Australia into believing that State trading concerns were involving the taxpayers in tremendous financial losses and thereby causing taxation to be maintained at very high levels and maybe to be increased from

time to time. I think the official figures which I have quoted, and the statements I have made clearly prove that the leaflet was dishonest in the purposes which it sought to achieve, and that those State trading concerns in Western Australia, which can legitimately be described as such, have not only not operated at a financial loss to the people but, on the contrary, have operated at substantial profits.

I asked the Treasurer yesterday to give particulars of the years during which losses were made on the State timber mills and the State brickworks, and the years in which profits were made; and he gave the reply to the House. Losses were made in only nine years of the 42 years during which these concerns were owned and operated by the State. In the other 32 years profits were made.

I also asked the Treasurer how much income, approximately, was lost to the State Building Supplies during the last two financial years as a result of the policy applied to the concern by the present Government. The Treasurer replied:—

Any loss of income would have been the result of more competitive quotes from private enterprise for business previously directed to the State Building Supplies.

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

I have here a report from the General Manager, State Building Supplies (Mr. Gregson), for the financial year 1959-60. It is more than interesting to note that this report is addressed by Mr. Gregson to the Minister controlling the State Building Supplies. I think if members gave a moment's consideration to what has happened in recent weeks to the State Building Supplies they will agree that the use of the word "controlling" is not at all appropriate and it is very misleading, because obviously the Minister who is supposed to be controlling the State Building Supplies during the last two years has not been controlling them at all but has been undermining them and preparing to hand them over at ridiculous bargain prices to a tremendously wealthy private company.

However, on this question as to the effect of Government policy during the last two years on the financial results of State Building Supplies, I now quote from Mr. Gregson's annual report, and this is what he wrote:—

At the same time the Government has allowed more freedom to State Building Supplies to operate as a business enterprise, and while Government business to the extent of

approximately £450,000, excluding cement, has been lost, new avenues for sales have been developed and are today fully offsetting this loss. The loss of Government business was, however, far more immediate in effect than the slow pick-up of new business.

So clearly, for that financial year, and I presume that the succeeding financial year would have been the same or worse, the loss of financial income to the State Building Supplies as a result of deliberate Government policy was in the vicinity of £500,000 per year, which would account, I should think, completely for the financial loss which the concern made in the year 1959-1960 and in the financial year 1960-61.

Mr. Court: It lost more the year before.

Mr. HAWKE: In addition, the credit squeeze had, beyond any doubt, a depressing effect as compared with what otherwise would have been the situation upon the business transactions of this concern. We know that the credit squeeze had a particularly detrimental effect upon the building industry, and the State Building Supplies, as the name indicates, is concerned mostly with the production and sale of goods which are used in the building industry.

Surely it is not completely accidental that the Government chose to sell this concern at a time when this credit squeeze was hard on industry in Australia; and at a time when the Government had deprived this concern of £1,000,000-worth of Government business in a period of two years; and at a time when, as a result of these things, the concern was showing financial losses! Is there any private member on the other side of the House who would think that was the time to sell? Of course not! And you, Mr. Acting Speaker, as a businessman, would know better than most of us that there could not have been a worse time to sell the concern, taking the period of the last 15 or 20 years.

The recorded official value in the books of the Government covering this concern was in the vicinity of £4,000,000. In these days of depreciated currency that is not a very big amount. I think the number of timber mills included in the State Building Supplies would be at least five, most of them big ones. The number of brickworks would be three. There was a new modern drying kiln; there were timber yards and joinery works in various parts of the metropolitan area; hundreds of dwelling houses; a vast quantity of plant and equipment; the bush landing facilities as related to each timber mill; the valuable timber concessions which each of these timber mills had from the Forests Department, covering some of our best jarrah timber and our karri timber; and many other assets which I do not, at this time, intend to detail.

Does anyone know of any industry which is a going concern which has lost value since the end of World War II? I think there would not be such an industry still in existence. Obviously, as the value of the Australian pound has fallen—and I think it has fallen from approximately 15s. in 1949 to about less than 6s. today—the book value of each concern would be far below, in the great majority of instances, the real value of the concern in relation to these currency values. Surely that is commonsense. Yet we were told publicly by the Premier before Parliament met that the Government wrote down the book value of this concern by £1,600,000, and consequently agreed to sell the whole of the concern, all of its assets, and all of its rights to an enormously wealthy company for the lousy sum of £2,200,000.

Mr. Graham: In 20 years!

Mr. HAWKE: I understand this particular company has a capitalisation of over £300,000,000 and last year, from all of its activities, made over £30,000,000 profit. Not only did the Government sell this concern, with all its assets included, to this wealthy company at this amazing bargain price of £2,200,000, but it agreed to sell the concern on remarkably easy long-term conditions of time payment. The cash deposit was £200,000 and payments of the balance are to be spread over a term of 20 years. There is no doubt about who will pay these yearly instalments for the next 20 years. They will be paid in full, and more than paid in full, by the users of bricks and timber in Western Australia.

We know that a few days after the sale was made, the timber combine put up the price of timber, and one does not need to have mystical powers in order to know that the same combine will again put up the price of timber.

Mr. Court: If you call the Associated Sawmillers' Association a combine, then of course the State Building Supplies was a very active member of it.

Mr. Graham: In every respect but price.

Mr. HAWKE: Even to the question of price during the period of office of the present Government, but not during the period of office of the previous Government.

Mr. Court: We made no change in the policy.

Mr. HAWKE: I would not know about that.

Mr. Graham: Oh yes you did!

Mr. Court: We made no change in the policy so far as the association was concerned.

Mr. Tonkin: The policy was changed whether you did it or not!

Mr. Court: The manager is the manager, and if he changed the policy it was not Government-directed.

Mr. Tonkin: Keeping in tune with the Government!

Mr. HAWKE: I am grateful to the Minister for Industrial Development, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and the member for East Perth for giving me a short breather. I think I deserve it.

Mr. Court: We are always co-operative!

Mr. HAWKE: As I was saying, the timber combine will doubtless put up the price of timber again and again, and several times again, during the next 20 years. I am sure the brick combine will put up the price of bricks again and again and again during the next 20 years. Therefore, obviously the people of Western Australia, and particularly those who use bricks and timber, will pay the instalments for the company.

All I have said in regard to this transaction is bad enough—almost as bad as anyone could possibly imagine it to be. It is certainly a political scandal, ranking with the worst which have ever taken place in Western Australia.

Mr. Graham: Hear, hear!

Mr. HAWKE: However, this Government went further than that. For good measure—and for nothing—it threw in the railway mill at Banksiadale.

Mr. Court: Do you call £250,000 nothing?

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister for Industrial Development cannot get away with that sort of snide proposition.

Mr. Court: That is not a snide proposition.

Mr. HAWKE: He knows as well as I do that the only thing that has happened in regard to the £250,000 in relation to the Banksiadale mill is that the accounts of the Railways Department have been credited with that sum.

Mr. Court: They are relieved of that debt to that extent.

Mr. HAWKE: What difference does that make?

Mr. Tonkin: Debt? I thought you said it was an asset yesterday.

Mr. Court: It makes plenty of difference.

Mr. HAWKE: It makes no difference whatever. Let me repeat again that the book value of the State Building Supplies was almost £4,000,000, and that did not include the Banksiadale railway mill.

Mr. Court: You are over-stating that figure.

Mr. HAWKE: That mill was not part of the State Building Supplies. It was completely separate. The Government wrote down the book value of the State Building Supplies from nearly £4,000,000 to £2,200,000, and that is the figure at which his sale took place. Is it not pertinent

and logical to say, as I have already said, that the railway mill at Banksiadale was then thrown in for good measure?

Mr. Rowberry: Otherwise Hawker Sideley would not have bought it.

Mr. HAWKE: Let us look at the Banksiadale railway mill. It is, I think, probably the most efficiently operated timber mill in Western Australia, and it is located in the best jarrah forest country in the south-west.

Mr. Rowberry: In the world.

Mr. Roberts: Where else is jarrah grown?

Mr. Graham: That is an important point, isn't it?

Mr. Roberts: Don't be so childish!

Mr. Graham: What would you know about it? You do not know about anything except moving the gags.

Mr. HAWKE: This Banksiadale timber mill was owned and operated by the Railways Department, and it was a tremendously valuable proposition from its point of view. It was most efficiently and profitably conducted and—perhaps more important still—it was saving the Railways Department each year at least £100,000.

Mr. Court: How do you arrive at that figure?

Mr. HAWKE: We will arrive at it without any difficulty in 12 or 18 months' time.

Mr. Court: It is just a plain guess.

Mr. HAWKE: I would not be surprised if at that time—in 12 or 18 months—when the real facts are available with which to make a comparison, the loss to the Railways Department will be at the rate of well over £100,000 per annum.

Mr. Court: Nonsense!

Mr. HAWKE: Because clearly the Railways Department will have to pay much more in future for the sleepers it buys and for other substantial timber requirements it has to purchase from time to time.

Mr. Graham: The price has already gone up 3s. extra per 100 super ft.

Mr. HAWKE: Taking the book value of £3,800,000 to meet the rather more delicate objection offered by the Minister for Railways to the other figure of nearly £4,000,000, and adding to it a very conservative valuation of the Banksiadale railway mill and all the assets and rights associated therewith, we arrive I should say, without the slightest exaggeration, at a total figure of £4,400,000. Yet this Government, in its anxiety to please the big business people who are anxious to see these State trading concerns sacrificed, and who are anxious to receive the smiling nod of approval from the biggest men in the business world in this State, and in other State capital cities—and in overseas cities, some of them—sold the State Building Supplies for £2,200,000—and threw in the Banksiadale railway mill for nothing.

Mr. Court: I do not want to interrupt your line of thought; but where do you get the book value as being £3,800,000?; because in the balance sheet of the 30th June, 1960, the figure shown is £3,400,000.

Mr. HAWKE: There would have been capital additions to the concern after that date and before the date of the sale.

Mr. Court: Very limited; and you are only guessing, because depreciation also comes off at the same time.

Mr. HAWKE: We know that the Minister for Railways has his back to the wall in this matter.

Mr. Court: No fear!

Mr. HAWKE: In his usual fashion he is brushing off as of no consequence things which did take place and which he cannot deny took place. He brushes them off as being immaterial or as being of very little importance.

Mr. Court: Let us stick to the official figure.

Mr. HAWKE: All right. Let us take his figure of £3,400,000 as at the 30th June, 1960, for the State Building Supplies—not including the Banksiadale railway mill. If we include the Banksiadale railway mill we would raise that figure from £3,400,000 to at least £3,900,000.

Mr. Court: The book value of the Banksiadale mill is only £250,000

Mr. HAWKE: I know all about these book values.

Mr. Court: They are the values recorded and approved.

Mr. HAWKE: Of course they are the book values recorded. However, as I said earlier, I do not think we would find one industrial concern in Australia, if it is still a going concern, where the book values would have any relationship at all to the sale price which the owners would require, and the Minister for Industrial Development better than anyone in this House knows that to be absolutely true.

Mr. Court: I can tell you some Government trading concerns in this State that are grossly overvalued.

Mr. HAWKE: Of course, we can all do that. We can, here and there, pick trading concerns, as the Minister calls them, which are not trading concerns at all, such as I mentioned in connection with the State steamships.

However, let us stick to this argument. I have compromised considerably with the Minister to arrive at a figure of £3,900,000 for the State Building Supplies and the Banksiadale railway mill, yet the Minister for Industrial Development, of all the Ministers, was mainly, if not completely, responsible for selling these two concerns at ridiculous bargain prices and under the easiest long-term payment system imaginable to one of the wealthiest companies

in the world. I emphasise to members that the State trading concerns and the Banksiadale railway mill were not the property of this Government as such: they were the property of the people of Western Australia.

The concerns included in the State Building Supplies were established away back in 1912, I think, and they have functioned successfully, even on a financial basis, in the years since under Labor Governments, Liberal Governments, and Liberal-Country Party coalition Governments. Yet this present Government has chosen to sacrifice the people's interest in them and the people's ownership of them.

To greatly advantage the company which has been lucky enough to get these concerns, the people will have placed upon them not only this financial loss because of a sale at a far lower price than was reasonable, but also other losses, which will have to be met through the years, in relation to interest payments and so on, and the balance of the capital invested over the years in the concerns, which capital has not been wiped out by the purchase price agreed upon by the Government and the company.

No doubt other members will discuss this matter; therefore I propose to leave it now and to say something on another subject which I consider to be of very great importance. Yesterday on more than one occasion I referred to what I consider to be the great danger in the economy of this country; namely, the never-ending pursuit of record profits every year by the bigger companies in Australia. I pointed out that this ruthless and endless pursuit of record profits year after year was having the effect of lifting the price levels all the time and, consequently, of lifting the levels of production costs. That process of course must, in the long run, undermine the stability of all our industries; and those industries which are first and hardest hit are, of course, industries which cannot pass on their increased costs of production in the prices which they receive for the goods they sell.

It is all right for the big business concerns which chase record profits year after year and, by putting up prices, get them; they can write their own tickets. But it is a different proposition altogether for those other people engaged in industry who have to take for the products which they sell the price which is offered.

I could not help but read in the newspapers in the last day or so what happened to tobacco leaf grown in the Manjimup and other areas down south by hardworking men, hardworking women, and hardworking children, when the tobacco leaf was offered for sale in Perth this week. I think we all know that the tobacco companies make terrific profits: certainly

record profits year after year. When they do not make these record profits year after year by putting up prices, they apparently make them by exploiting the growers. And, of course, the growers have no redress; they cannot put any price upon their tobacco leaf and be sure of getting it. They can put a reserve price on it at the auctions, but if the tobacco companies please not to pay up to that price, that is the finish. However, I do not wish to go deeper into that subject because the member in this House most directly concerned—

Mr. Rowberry: Go for your life!

Mr. HAWKE: —is the member for Warren, and I have no doubt that he will have a lot to say about it.

I think we know, as I said yesterday, that wages and salaries, generally, in Australia are fixed by tribunals set up under Acts of Parliament. The members of these tribunals have an obligation upon them, in fixing wages and salaries, to take into consideration the ability of industry to pay; and they must also take into consideration the necessity to maintain the stability of the economy.

Wage and salary workers who want to receive some increase in their wages and salaries to enable them to keep somewhere reasonably close to the cost of living have to spend tens of thousands of pounds every year sending skilled advocates before these industrial tribunals. These advocates have, for months before, to prepare in great detail the cases they are to present. They have to organise witnesses, and they have to be prepared to stand up to evidence which will be put before the tribunals by the employers' advocates—highly-skilled advocates. In the Commonwealth court those advocates are, in most instances, legal men; but fortunately in Western Australia, under our State Industrial Arbitration Act, legal men are prohibited from appearing in cases in which wage and salary claims are being argued and decided. That is one side of the picture.

We know what the Federal Arbitration Court did to the progress of Australia in the 1953 judgment. On that occasion the court declared that the economy of Australia and the stability of Australia's main industries could be safeguarded only by taking away from the workers in Australia coming under Federal Arbitration Court jurisdiction the cost-of-living adjustments to which they had been previously entitled. That decision was maintained until a few weeks ago.

In the interim period of eight years, the workers of this country were deprived of tens of millions of pounds in wages and salaries; and consequently in their living standards they fell far below the levels which should have been maintained; and,

of course, they fell well behind the cost of living as it increased from year to year largely by this ruthless pursuit of record and ever-record profits by the bigger companies.

So we have rigid control of wages and salaries in the economy but no control worth talking about in regard to price levels, because the people who produce the goods in this country, apart from primary producers, write their own tickets in connection with the prices which they shall charge to the people to whom they sell their goods; and these prices, of course, are finally paid by the general public. As I said the other day, prices are not produced by any method of magic; they come from the prices charged for goods and services, and the greater the price the greater the profit, generally.

So we have in operation a system under which wages and salaries are directly controlled, presumably for the purpose of giving the working people a reasonable deal, and also for the important purpose of ensuring that wage and salary levels do not go too high and thereby endanger the stability of industry and the stability of economy; yet, at the other end, we have uncontrolled prices and profits, which means that a comparatively few men in Australia can push price levels and production costs higher and higher from year to year.

I briefly remind members that, from 1939 to the end of 1953, we did have an Act for the prevention of profiteering in Western Australia. The legislation was introduced into Parliament by a Labor Government. It had to be renewed each year, and it was so renewed by Labor Governments, and Liberal Party-Country Party coalition Governments alike in every year from 1940 until 1952. The 1952 renewal meant that the Act would continue to operate until December, 1953, when most people anticipated that another renewal Bill would be passed.

However, a Labor Government came to office in this State early in 1953, and when that Government brought a continuance Bill before this Parliament to enable the prevention of profiteering legislation to be continued for another year, every Liberal Party member and every Country Party member in each House voted against it; and, of course, brought about its defeat in the Legislative Council.

Obviously it was a choice between the interests of big business—between those who wanted to push prices and profits higher—and the general welfare of the people. In that choice, the Liberal Party members, and the Country Party members, also, be it said to their shame, chose to serve the interests of big business, particularly the profiteering section of the business world.

In this Parliament, in recent years, we have heard a good deal about unfair trading, and I think all of us who are present here today know the history of what happened in that field. I was extremely interested and considerably amused to hear a radio item the other evening that Sir Garfield Barwick, Attorney-General in the Commonwealth Government, had convened a conference in the Eastern States and that the Minister for Labour from Western Australia and one or two of his officers were going over to this conference to inform those present of the provisions of the legislation now upon our State statute book and of the manner in which that legislation was administered.

[The Speaker (Mr. Hearman) resumed the Chair.]

I would say that the visit of our Minister and his officers to the Eastern States for the purpose of attending this conference would be a shocking waste of time and an even more shocking waste of public money, because the legislation now upon our statute book is worthless. It does nothing whatsoever to protect any member of the public from profiteering or from exploitation. Nothing whatsoever! It is not worth a row of pins! Therefore, it is so much pretence on the part of this Government to try to lead the public to believe that the Minister for Labour is going to take some valuable information to this conference in the Eastern States in relation to the control and suppression of unfair trading activities.

I have before me a copy of *Time*, which is a weekly news magazine published in America, and the date of this publication is the 17th February, 1961. Therefore, it is a fairly recent issue. I wish to quote a portion of an article which is headed, "Corporations", and sub-headed, "The Great Conspiracy." That portion of the article reads—

In a tense and packed Philadelphia court room last week a drama took place that U.S. business will long remember—to its shame. The cases before him, said Federal District Judge J. Cullen Ganey, were "a shocking indictment of a vast section of our economy." They were more than that. They showed clearly that the executives of a mighty industry, publicly devoted to the concept of competition, had privately conspired to rig prices to the detriment of their customers on a scale so vast that it embraced everything from the Tennessee Valley Authority to the private utilities that supply the nation's light and power.

That is the end of that portion of the article. I will now quote another portion, which is as follows:—

Despite other pleas attesting to the public usefulness and position of the defendants, the federal judge handed

out the greatest number of jail terms ever in an antitrust proceeding. He gave 30-day sentences to George E. Burens, 55, G.E. vice-president and division manager, Lewis J. Burger, 49, G.E. division manager—both demoted from those positions since the indictment—Edwin R. Jung, 58, vice-president of Clark Controller Co., and John M. Cook, 56, vice-president of Cutler-Hammer Inc. He fined the 29 electrical companies a total of 1,787,000 dollars, levied fines ranging from 1,000 to 12,500 dollars on the individuals, and gave 21 other executives suspended 30-day jail sentences—advising some that they would also have gone to jail except for reasons of age and health.

Mr. Jamieson: It is just as well that legislation is not here, because the Minister for Industrial Development would never be free again.

Mr. HAWKE: I emphasise the point that the men who were prosecuted, found guilty, and gaoled in these proceedings were not small men, but were giants in the management of big business in America; and some of the people in Australia who indulge in similar unfair trading practices not only get away with it because there is no law against it, but they find themselves among those in Australia, who, from time to time, are recommended by Liberal Party Governments for knighthoods; and, of course, when they are so recommended they receive the knighthoods.

Is it any wonder that inflation in this country is continuing, and is certain to continue so long as those who make their objective the making of record profits year after year have absolute freedom to pursue their merry way irrespective of any detrimental result which their activities might have upon other industries; upon the economy of Australia generally; and upon the welfare of the general public?

I have here, also, a radio news item used by the Australian Broadcasting Commission on the 1st September, 1960. This item covers restrictive trade practices in Australia. Amazingly enough, it quotes a statement from a Liberal Party member in the Commonwealth House of Representatives—a Mr. Sneddon—and reading from this statement one can clearly see in one's mind's eye the former member for Nedlands, Mr. David Grayden, standing up on the Government side of the House and not only condemning out of hand unfair trade practices, but also taking specific action to get legislation through this Parliament to control unfair trading practices in this State.

To those members of the House who do not know, I would say that when Mr. David Grayden took that action in this

House he wrote his own political death certificate so far as the Liberal Party was concerned, and at the succeeding election he was defeated. One could wish that his brother, who is now the member for South Perth, would think along similar lines to the thoughts of David Grayden when he was here some years ago and also along the lines of the thoughts of Mr. Sneddon, M.H.R.

I wish to quote, briefly, from what Mr. Sneddon was reported to have said. It is as follows:—

An informal group of Federal members of Parliament has estimated that there are between five and six-hundred examples of restrictive trade practices operating in Australia.

In another paragraph of his statement, Mr. Sneddon said—

The main objects were to fix prices and avoid competition or to divert trade to particular people and exclude others. The practices were enforced by collective boycotts, fines or expulsion from an association.

Finally, he said—

The effects of these practices were to increase prices, to reduce the quality and variety of goods, and to deprive people of the opportunity to compete.

In the A.B.C. National News of the 27th July, 1961, the following item was broadcast:—

The retiring President of the Queensland Retailers' Association, Mr. D. J. Lambert, has accused some Australian manufacturers of what he calls "standover methods."

Mr. Lambert said in his annual report to the association today that a group of manufacturers had demanded an undertaking from retailers throughout Australia that they would buy only British Commonwealth goods. The manufacturers had also demanded a list of goods not of Commonwealth origin held by the firms.

Mr. Lambert said that retailers who refused to comply were threatened with less advantageous discounts on goods bought from Australian manufacturers.

He finally said—

The ultimatum was withdrawn when the Retailers' Association in Queensland referred the manufacturers to the Profiteering Prevention Act.

I am almost certain that nothing in this news item—which was a tremendously important one—appeared in any of our newspapers in Western Australia, which only goes to show how news is selected by the

newspapers; how they publish what suits the particular interests they represent, and how they suppress that which does not suit them. I have other items under the heading of "Profiteering," "Profiteering Prevention," "Unfair Trading," and "Unfair Trading Prevention," but I think the information which I have given to the House is adequate for present needs.

I will deal with only one other item, and I will be brief on that. It has to do with the proposal by the Government and the other interests concerned for the exploitation of the bauxite deposits in the Darling Ranges of this State. This matter is not new to me, because it was our Government which granted the Great Western Mining Corporation—I think that was the company—a license to prospect for bauxite in the Darling Ranges. That was some three, or, perhaps, three and a half years ago. If I remember correctly, we also gave that company the right to take up a coal prospecting area near Wilga, or somewhere down Collie way.

The ideas which the representatives of that company had on this matter at that time were, firstly, to pursue a very vigorous policy of prospecting in the Darling Range area where bauxite deposits were known to exist, to ascertain whether the quantity and quality of the raw material would justify further action by the company; and, secondly, provided the search was fruitful, to set up in Western Australia a total industry for the reduction of the bauxite ore into alumina firstly, and finally into the metal aluminium. We were given to understand that in the event of the search for bauxite being satisfactory in the results it produced, the whole of the industry would be established in Western Australia.

One can imagine my very great surprise and intense disappointment when I read in the newspapers a few weeks ago that an Australian-American combined type of company had been formed; that it had been given by the State Government exclusive rights to take this bauxite in approved areas over a great mileage of country in the Darling Range; and subsequently to partially process it in Western Australia, but only very partially.

We were told that the approximate amount of capital money which would be invested in the total industry would be £40,000,000, but that only £7,000,000 or less would be invested in the State. The balance of over £30,000,000 was to be invested in Geelong in Victoria. Here we have another instance of Western Australia having valuable raw materials, with the State and its citizens getting only a partial and a very small benefit out of the processing of the raw material. Nearly all of the capital money is to be invested in Victoria, and obviously nearly all of the employment in that industry will go to Victoria, and not Western Australia.

Something was published in the newspapers about the availability and price of coal being the deciding factor, in relation to the main processing industry.

Mr. Court: That is so.

Mr. HAWKE: That is the industry which reduces the alumina to the final metal product of aluminium. I am not by a long chalk satisfied with that arrangement.

Mr. Court: The company concerned has spent a lot of money trying to prove the deposits. It is satisfied that it cannot economically produce aluminium here.

Mr. HAWKE: I say without hesitation this company would not have much difficulty in satisfying the Minister for Industrial Development, because he would be falling over backwards to get a pat from it.

Mr. Court: Do not be personal. I am telling you the facts.

Mr. HAWKE: I am telling the Minister my view. We have the raw materials.

Mr. Court: We only have a marginal case for alumina production.

Mr. HAWKE: Without the raw materials the company would not be able to do anything. So we have a mighty powerful bargaining weapon. It is the same old story. We had it in connection with the iron ore deposits previously, when the Liberal Party and the Country Party together gave away huge deposits of high-quality iron ore at Koolan Island and Cockatoo Island to Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. for nothing, and with not one ton of that iron ore to be processed in Western Australia, but with all the ore transported to New South Wales for processing.

We know the miserable subterfuge put up by the Government at that time in putting through the legislation to ratify the agreement. I say to the great credit of the member for Murray, who was then Premier, that I am certain he genuinely believed in his heart that Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. would, in return for what the State had done for the company, establish a fully integrated iron and steel industry in Western Australia.

Mr. Court: Which it is going to do.

Mr. HAWKE: The same old Minister for Industrial Development with the same old tricks!

Mr. Court: You would run out of something to say if I were not here.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister interjected by saying, "Which the company is going to do."

Mr. Jamieson: After the Minister has emptied the other pocket of the State.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister knows as well as I do that Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. will not establish the proposed iron and

steel industry in Western Australia in return for the iron ore deposits at Koolan Island and Cockatoo Island, which a Liberal coalition Government gave to the company a few years back.

Mr. Court: It is all part of the concept.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister well knows that the Government gave an additional huge quantity of valuable iron ore to this company before it would sign, seal, and deliver an agreement to establish a fully-integrated iron and steel industry here.

Mr. Brand: When I was on Koolan Island I saw evidence where Brasserts started to design an establishment to export iron ore to Japan, under a Government of which you were a member.

Mr. HAWKE: The Government is now preparing to export iron ore to Japan.

Mr. Brand: On that occasion your Government agreed to the export at 3d. a ton royalty.

Mr. HAWKE: Why not stick to the argument before us?

Mr. Brand: You stick to the whole question. You were a member of the Government which was prepared to sell iron ore to Japan at 3d. a ton.

Mr. HAWKE: I say that the Hawke Labor Government did not.

Mr. Brand: I am referring to the Willcock Labor Government.

Mr. HAWKE: The Hawke Labor Government took a very different line to the one being taken by the present Government. Our line was to export iron ore to overseas countries if the Commonwealth would grant a license; and our aim was to use the net proceeds for the purpose of establishing a fully-integrated iron and steel industry in the State.

Mr. Brand: Your Government was prepared to sell the ore at 3d. a ton.

Mr. Jamieson: You are selling tomatoes at 3d. a lb.

Mr. HAWKE: The Premier is incapable of following the argument which has been put forward. The policy which my Government was pursuing was to sell the iron ore at the best price on the world's market. Had the Commonwealth Government granted us the export license, and it had no justification for refusing, we would have received far more per ton for this iron ore than the present Government will receive for any iron ore which is exported from this State to Japan or any other overseas country.

Mr. Brand: I am talking about the previous arrangement to sell the ore to Japan.

Mr. HAWKE: What has that to do with the conditions of sale at the present time?

Mr. Brand: It has plenty to do with the principle. Your Government approved the sale of iron ore to Japan on a small royalty.

Mr. HAWKE: What did the McLarty-Watts Government receive per ton by way of royalty for the iron ore from Koolan Island and Cockatoo Island?

Mr. Brand: About 1s. 6d. a ton.

Mr. HAWKE: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. Tonkin: It was 6d. a ton.

Mr. HAWKE: This amount of 6d. a ton would be worth only 1d. a ton in the days when a Labor Government was prepared to sell it at 3d. a ton.

Mr. Court: But in this case the ore is to be processed in Australia.

Mr. HAWKE: Yes; and the finished product to be sent to Russia, Communist China, Fascist Japan, and Fascist Italy.

Mr. Brand: Your Government was prepared to sell the ore to Fascist Japan.

Mr. HAWKE: There was no Fascist Japan during the time the Premier is referring to.

Mr. Brand: Call it what you like.

Mr. Court: The Prime Minister had to stop your Labor Government from doing that.

Mr. HAWKE: It is a bit early in the session for the Premier to become heated. He is not able to display a reasonable amount of self-control, or a reasonable amount of mental lucidity. I hope that with practice during the session he will become more or less normal later in the year.

Mr. Brand: The same old thing—bringing personalities into it!

Mr. Court: You broke off at the stage here you were telling us how to process the bauxite economically in this State.

Mr. Brand: Not forgetting that Queensland has to send its ore to Japan for the same reasons.

Mr. HAWKE: Surely I am not expected to show how the company can produce aluminium cheaply in Western Australia.

Mr. Court: If you want to attack these agreements you have to have a constructive approach.

Mr. HAWKE: I am saying that this State has the raw materials.

Mr. Court: Only the bauxite.

Mr. HAWKE: Therefore we have a pretty big bargaining weapon.

Mr. Court: Except that there is a lot of bauxite in the world.

Mr. HAWKE: We know there is a lot of bauxite in the world. Surely the Minister does not want us to believe that the Australian-American powerful interests which are involved in this proposition are going to the Darling Range in Western Australia to get bauxite when they can get it from other places more economically.

Mr. Court: You should give us credit for getting those interests to this State.

Mr. HAWKE: Clearly this big, wealthy and powerful company only chases the raw materials in places where those materials are easiest and cheapest to mine, and are of the best quality available. Those people are not children. I am not blaming this company for laying it down that such an industry could only be established at Geelong, and not at Bunbury or Collie. It knows what it is doing; it knows which is the best proposition from the profit-making point of view. Good luck to the company!

However, it seems the Government surrenders too easily to the propositions which these people put up. It is a tragedy to Western Australia that our raw materials are being taken away from the State, with the State getting little or no advantage from the export—nowhere near the advantage which it should derive and which it would derive if those valuable raw materials were almost fully processed in Western Australia.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

MR TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [7.30 p.m.] : Yesterday I had on the notice paper a few questions relating to the Totalisator Agency Board, that caused a few members—and particularly the member for South Perth—to refer somewhat disparagingly to the fact that those questions were being asked. I cannot help feeling that quite a number of members have the idea that a subject like betting, or the Totalisator Board, is something from which one should keep right away and which should be completely taboo; and now that the Totalisator Board has been set up it should be left to its own devices and be permitted to do what it likes irrespective of the effect upon the community.

We are the properly-elected members of Parliament representing the people of Western Australia, and there is a bounden duty on every one of us—because of our privileged position in this Parliament—to highlight what we regard as operations which are against the public interest; and however much we may be disinclined to shoulder our responsibility I think we have to face up to it whether we like it or not.

The Totalisator Board—as I propose to show with direct evidence—has developed into something which, in my view, is a public scandal. It is a creation of the Government. It is the pride and joy of the Minister for Police. Either he is the greatest hypocrite possible, or he does not know what is going on.

I shall not deal with the aspect of the matter which is to be the subject of a court action in a week or two. I could say quite a lot about that, but I shall leave

it completely aside until the matter is dealt with by the court. There are a number of ways in which this board is breaking the law. Yesterday I asked three questions of the Treasurer. The first one was—

- (1) Has the Totalisator Agency Board paid betting tax on all bets made by it on its own behalf in accordance with the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Tax Act, 1960?

The Treasurer said "No". There is a legal obligation on the board, when it bets like any other punter, to pay totalisator tax on its investments. What is the difference between the Chairman of the Totalisator Board investing 5s. each way on every horse in every race, and the man in the street going to the counter and investing 5s. each way? Each one is trying to get a dividend and hoping he will be the only one to get the dividend. That is the reason why the T.A.B. is taking tickets in the pool. The law lays it down that on all the turnover of the totalisator, totalisator duty of 5 per cent. shall be paid. But the Treasurer says that the T.A.B. is not paying this. It is not subject to legal dispensation.

My next question was:—

Has the T.A.B. paid investment tax on all bets made by it on its own behalf in accordance with the Betting Investment Tax Act, 1959-1960?

The answer to that was "No".

The Government imposed a 3d. tax on every investment under £1 and a 6d. tax on every investment of £1 and over. The T.A.B. makes an investment of 5s. on every horse in every race in the Eastern States. It invests 10s. per horse. There is an average of 20 horses, so it invests an average of £10 a race. The T.A.B. is liable for investment tax on those investments, but is not paying it; and to that extent the Treasury is not getting the revenue which Parliament said it should get in such circumstances. I mention that because it shows clearly that there are two instances in which the law is not being observed.

I asked also the following question:—

Where is the authority for the T.A.B. to use any part of its funds for the purpose of punting?

When any person or body invests money on a horse in a race for the purpose of obtaining a dividend, that person or body is punting. That is the dictionary explanation for that action. The Minister gave the following answer:—

The board is not punting, as claimed by the honourable member, but is merely following the standard practice of all totalisator companies and all racing bodies throughout Australia who conduct totalisators.

Apart from being wrong, that has got nothing to do with the question. It is wrong because it is not standard practice for totalisators to do what the T.A.B. is doing. The T.A.B., according to its own statement, invests on every run for a win and a place in every race both Melbourne and Sydney; whereas the standard practice on racecourses is for the totalisator manager to invest only on those horses in a race upon which no investment has been made at time of starting—and there are quite a number of races where the totalisator manager would not invest at all.

In connection with these operations the board the Minister informed me that up to date £1,706 10s. has been so invested by the T.A.B.; and not a penny piece in investment tax or totalisator tax has been paid on any of those investments. I say that is contrary to the law.

There are blatant departures from the policy which we were told was to be followed. The Totalisator Board was going to correct a lot of the things which we disagreed. As late as this afternoon the Minister gave this reply to the question I asked. My question was—

In what respects is the present system of off-course betting any improvement on the system of licensed shops which it has superseded?

The answer was—

Off-course betting will be greatly reduced.

I think that is probably right; but not to the extent the Minister imagines because a lot of the betting will still go on illegally. In this connection I might say that I am informed—and the Premier will be able to contradict me if I am wrong—that after a recent meeting of the W.A.T.C., when one of the members present complained about the extent of illegal betting, the chairman of the board supported the statement which had been made at the W.A.T.C. meeting. I am told that it did not suit the Premier, who immediately got in touch with the Totalisator Board and told the board it had better backpedal on this line of argument. After that day's meeting the chairman did not think there was much illegal off-course betting. The Premier will know whether or not that is true.

Mr. Brand: I know it is not true. Have never been in touch with them at all.

Mr. TONKIN: Has the Premier attended a meeting of the board?

Mr. Brand: No; of course I haven't.

Mr. TONKIN: Does the Premier deride that he discussed this with the chairman?

Mr. Brand: I have not discussed this with the chairman.

Mr. TONKIN: I mean this question of illegal off-course betting.

Mr. Brand: No.

Mr. TONKIN: Then I accept the Premier's assurance. I am informed that a message came from the Premier. It may not have come directly from the Premier, but through his Minister. There must have been a good reason because the chairman changed his front in a matter of 24 hours. However, I accept the Premier's assurance.

Mr. Hawke: It is best not to accept it.

Mr. Graham: It seems ugly.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister said this afternoon that unlimited credit betting will be restricted. I propose to open the eyes of members in connection with this matter. We all know that it was the deliberate intention of this Assembly to make credit betting impossible. The Minister declared this as a matter of Government policy in more than one statement, and the legislation was designed for that purpose. In order to refresh members' memories I quote from page 1615 of *Hansard* 1960 in which the Minister said as follows:—

I think it can fairly be claimed that this legislation, if it is accepted by Parliament, will bring about a measure of social reform in that the existing incentive to promote off-course betting under the present law will largely disappear; and the substitution of betting against deposits held by the T.A.B. for credit betting at present made possible by legislation of this Parliament in off-course betting shops sited to tempt wage-earners within their doors will, I hope, result in money required for providing essential family needs being spent for such purposes and not for payment of losing credit bets.

A substantial drop in turnover through the off-course totalisator as compared with off-course betting shops has been allowed for, because credit betting off-course in totalisator regions will no longer be legal, and bets will be possible only in cash or against cash deposits or winnings held by the T.A.B.

Can anything be clearer?

Mr. Graham: Another Government assurance.

Mr. TONKIN: Why is it that the T.A.B. wants to go against the law; go against the Minister's statement; and develop credit betting? Why does it run that risk? Because surely it must know that it could not get away with it. The reason is that it is not achieving the turnover which is necessary to enable it to function properly. I pointed that out when the legislation was before this House; and if members care to check later on they will find that I had this to say at page 1827 of *Hansard* 1960—

Its solvency, or otherwise, will completely depend upon the margin which exists between the revenue and the cost of getting it. How is it proposed

to pay the agents in the country? Are they to be encouraged to tout for business?

Because that is what is going on, as I shall prove later on—not just state it, but prove it. I continued—

Are they to be paid on a commission basis? If so, they are going out to tout for business—the very thing the Minister says is undesirable.

One of the Minister's aims is to reduce the volume of off-course betting. Can anyone tell me that any agent engaged in the country on a commission basis is not going to encourage people to invest money? Is that the way to reduce the volume of off-course betting?

I ask members to listen to this. The Minister interjected—

He won't be able to encourage credit betting.

Not much, as I shall prove in a moment or two! Our Act was drafted upon the lines of the Victorian Racing Totalisator Extension Act, No. 6619; and I shall quote from the Victorian Act. This section of that Act is word for word with ours, and it deals with credit betting. It states—

No bet shall be accepted by the Board, or by any of its officers or agents, or any of their employees unless made—

- (i) by the deposit of the amount of the bet in cash at an office or agency of the Board in accordance with this division and the rules of the Board; or
- (ii) by letter sent through the post or by telegram or telephone message received at an office or agency of the Board in accordance with this division and the rules of the Board.

No bet made by letter or by telegram or telephone message shall be accepted by the Board, or by any of its officers or agents or any of their employees on any event unless—

- (i) the person making the bet has, before the beginning of the race meeting at which the event is held, established with the Board in accordance with the rules of the Board a credit account sufficient to pay the amount of the bet and has maintained that account up to the time of making the bet and the bet is charged against that account; or
- (ii) alternatively, in the case of a bet made by letter or telegram, the amount of the bet is forwarded through the

post with the letter or payment thereof is arranged by telegram in accordance with the rules of the Board.

That is the Victorian statute where they operate on strict totalisator rules, and there are no bookmakers acting as agents. That was intended to make credit betting absolutely impossible and our Act is word for word with that Act.

The board wants credit betting to build up its turnover, so what does it do? It tries to see if it can get around the Act, which is to prevent credit betting. It does not go to the Crown Law Department to find out, like it does with other matters. The Crown Law office drafted the Bill and the T.A.B. did not go to the Crown Law Department to find out whether there was a way to get around the Act and bet by credit. No. It went to Parker & Parker.

Mr. Perkins: You can't bet without having a deposit here.

Mr. TONKIN: Oh yes you can!

Mr. Perkins: No.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister has something to learn, and before I finish I will tell him how to do it.

Mr. Bovell: Anyway, the board is not permitted to go to the Crown Law Department.

Mr. TONKIN: Is that so?

Mr. Bovell: That is right.

Mr. TONKIN: Then why has it gone there up to date? I suggest to the Minister for Lands that he ask the Minister sitting alongside him whether it goes to the Crown Law Department or not.

Mr. Perkins: It has to go through the Minister.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes; but is the Minister going to deny that the T.A.B. obtained advice from the Crown Law Department?

Mr. Perkins: Yes; but it goes through the Minister.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes. The Minister told me that the board has been advised by the Crown Law Department. If that is so, why did it not go through the Minister on this occasion? No; because there would be only one answer.

Mr. Perkins: I thought you had lost faith in the Crown Law Department.

Mr. TONKIN: So I have; but that does not alter a very important point with regard to this. And do not forget this, Mr. Minister: that the Crown Law Department, on your assurance to this House, set out to make credit betting without a deposit impossible.

Mr. Perkins: There is no credit betting going on with the T.A.B. without a deposit. I can assure you of that.

Mr. TONKIN: Well, wait a minute, and we will see! When the board wanted to encourage credit betting, and to see if there was a way around this Act, it did not ask the Crown Law Department for advice; it went to Parker & Parker. The Minister gave me a reply in connection with this matter when I asked about it the other day. It was certainly a very clever reply; but, of course, it does not tell the full story.

Mr. Perkins: You give me too much credit. I was not trying to be clever.

Mr. TONKIN: No. The Minister did not make the reply; the chairman of the board did. It was sticking out a mile.

Mr. Perkins: You would be surprised.

Mr. TONKIN: I asked the Minister—

On what points did the board seek the advice of Parker & Parker?

In reply I got a whole rigmorole which could be construed to mean anything. What the chairman of the board overlooked was that he had already made a public statement some weeks before saying what he had gone to Parker & Parker about. The Minister told me that he could not put Parker & Parker's advice on the table because it was confidential. It is so confidential that the chairman of the board has read it over to bookmakers who have told me what is in it. That is how confidential it is! It cannot be tabled here for members of Parliament to see, but the chairman of the board can read it over to bookmakers!

Mr. Perkins: Are you sure the bookmakers reported to you faithfully?

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister will have his opportunity later, and I will be anxious to hear what he has to say about these things.

Mr. Graham: He will be dumb in several senses.

Mr. TONKIN: This is what the chairman had to say—

The problem which faces the T.A.B. is that before a day's racing begins, an agent may lend money to a credit bettor by adding to the client's account.

Does the Minister know that the chairman of the board suggested that to the bookmakers? He told them that was what to do, and it was upon that point that he sought the advice of Parker & Parker. Yet although this report is confidential so far as we are concerned, Parker & Parker told the T.A.B. that a bookmaker could accept a token deposit from a punter and then he could lend him as much money as he was prepared to lend him for the rest of the day and let him carry on credit betting. Parker & Parker said that if the bookmaker did that he would not be able to recover in a court of law the money so lent if the bettor neglected to pay. The chairman of the board told

a bookmaker, whose name I am at liberty to use, and who is prepared to swear an affidavit, that they would go into the matter and have the law amended so that the bookmaker could recover money so loaned.

Mr. Perkins: I have never heard about this.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister is hearing it now.

Mr. Perkins: How are they going to amend the law?

Mr. TONKIN: That is for the Minister to think about later on. I am telling him what happened.

Mr. Perkins: I am very doubtful whether your information is correct.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister is doubtful?

Mr. Perkins: Yes.

Mr. TONKIN: Will he give me an opportunity of proving it?

Mr. Perkins: Apparently you are taking the opportunity now.

Mr. TONKIN: No; my saying it here does not prove it, because I have to bring this bookmaker to the Minister and he will swear an affidavit. If the Minister would like a couple I can bring two of them.

Mr. Perkins: I would like to know who the bookmakers were first.

Mr. TONKIN: I will tell the Minister later on. I do not want to make his name public here, although he told me that I could. Quoting again from *The West Australian* of the 21st July—

Mr. Maher said the board had sought legal opinion about agents lending money to credit bettors.

That was not in the reply the Minister gave me. My question was—

In view of his assurance to Parliament last session that under the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act credit betting off course in totalisator regions would no longer be legal, why did the T.A.B. obtain advice from the firm of Parker & Parker in connection with a certain aspect of this matter?

The Minister's reply was as follows:—

In contemplating the employment of agents, the Board sought legal opinion for the purpose of ensuring that any agents appointed to handle cash and forward cash (deposit) betting, would be properly instructed in how to comply with the relevant Act and Regulations.

A very cleverly worded reply, but it overlooked entirely the statement which the chairman of the board had given to *The West Australian*, and which was reported on the 21st July. I quote—

Mr. Maher said the Board had sought legal opinion about agents lending money to credit bettors.

Why did the board seek legal opinion about that? Because it wanted to institute the practice. The board has been told the agents would be within the law. However, if the agent contravenes either the Act or the regulations, or even if he acts legally but allows his clients to run into debt, he will be dismissed. What a lot of nonsense, in view of what he told the bookmakers!

He told them that they could accept a token deposit of £1 or £5 from the men with whom they had been betting on credit for years, and they could continue in the same manner; and he sought legal advice as to whether it could be done. He even drafted a letter which was handed to a bookmaker, and which he could then copy and send to his clients, and which they would sign and send back.

I am going to read this letter to the House. It is authentic, as members can see; it is on the official paper. I did not see him do it, but I am informed by a person who gave this to me that this was dictated by the chairman of the board whilst he was at the board. The letter reads as follows:—

Dear —,

I have established a credit account with the Totalisator Agency Board under Section 33 (b) of the Act and the relevant regulation. I may lose money in the course of my betting transactions—

Not an unlikely event, but that is not in the letter;

—and be unable to get into your office to pay in the money necessary to maintain the account. I should be obliged, therefore, if you would personally lend me whatever sum is necessary from time to time to maintain the account at its present figure of £—, and pay the money so lent to the board on my behalf. I undertake to repay you on demand.

Is that encouraging credit betting or is it not? This was the plan: To build up turnover in the agency; to get the agents to contact their old clients who used to bet on credit and say, "Why worry? You can still do what you did before."

Mr. Perkins: Where are these old clients betting now?

Mr. TONKIN: I would say a lot of them are betting illegally.

Mr. Perkins: With whom?

Mr. TONKIN: If they are betting illegally they must be betting with illegal bookmakers.

Mr. Perkins: I would not be surprised if they are betting with some of the people you have been talking to.

Mr. TONKIN: That may be; so what?

Mr. Perkins: You are putting a lot of faith in people who are breaking the law.

Mr. Hawke: What did this Government do?

Mr. Perkins: They are a nice lot of people to take advice from if the position is as you say it is.

Mr. Graham: That goes for you, too.

Mr. Perkins: You are taking advice from people who you admit are breaking the law.

Mr. Graham: The Chief Justice told you what the law was.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister is beginning to realise that all is not right with the T.A.B.

Mr. Perkins: There is nothing wrong.

Mr. TONKIN: Does the Minister mean there is nothing wrong with this; that it is perfectly all right, and is not encouraging credit betting?

Mr. Perkins: As far as I know, nobody who has not a deposit with the T.A.B. is betting with the T.A.B.

Mr. TONKIN: Let me read an extract of the Minister's speech which appears on page 1914 of *Hansard* of 1960. The Minister was speaking in connection with the Bill and he said—

The honourable member has quoted New Zealand and Victoria as examples of what has been done elsewhere. Of course, in those places legalised off-course betting shops have not been set up. Parliament, at an earlier stage, accepted the principle of providing legalised off-course betting. Some of us disagreed with that. I was one of the members who disagreed. I did not at the time, and I still do not, approve of anything which will encourage gambling.

Now, has the Minister changed his mind?

Mr. Perkins: No, I have not, but—

Mr. TONKIN: Very well. If the Minister did not approve of anything that would encourage gambling, he cannot approve of this letter. The Minister should take time to think over this matter and consult with the T.A.B. and get the answers to these questions, because I am not going to let this pass on the interjections of the Minister. This is far too serious a matter for that. The Minister assured us that credit betting would be impossible; the Act was designed for that purpose; and yet here we have the board endeavouring to encourage it.

Does the Minister know that one of the questions which was discussed at the special meeting which the representatives of the trotting association and the racing club had with the chairman of the board was this very question of credit betting? And it was not a bookmaker who told me about it; it was somebody who knew what had transpired at the meeting. I would not be at all surprised—although this is a straight-out guess on my part—if this were

one of the reasons which actuated Mr. Meares, Chairman of the W.A.T.C., in getting off the board.

Mr. Perkins: He did not give that to me as the reason.

Mr. TONKIN: He may not have done. He gave a reason which I cannot accept; if that is the one that was published.

Mr. Perkins: Don't you think he told me the truth?

Mr. TONKIN: I do not know what he told the Minister. All I am saying is the reason that was published is one I cannot accept as the sole reason, because he said it was pressure of W.A.T.C. business.

As a matter of fact the work of the board was far more onerous in the initial stages than it is now, because most of the agencies are established. Yet the Chairman of the W.A.T.C. remained on the board when there was more racing, and more important racing going on, and when the work of the board was more strenuous; and now he gets off the board when there is less racing, and less work for the board to do; and he gets off on the ground that he is too preoccupied by the W.A.T.C.

Mr. Perkins: You think the chairman overrode the turf club and the trotting association?

Mr. TONKIN: No; I am not thinking that at all. I say that this very subject of the adoption of illegal credit betting—which Parker & Parker said would be within the law, but which I venture to say Crown Law would have said is not within the law, because the law was designed to prevent it—was one of the main points of discussion at that meeting. So the W.A.T.C. and the W.A.T.A. know very well that the board is out to encourage credit betting. I have had this arrangement confirmed by individual bookmakers, not one of whom knew I had been talking to another.

They all told me the same story, with the exception that only one of them said that the chairman told him that the board would go into the question of amending the law to allow the agents who lend money in this way legally to recover it. Only one told me that. But they all told me that the proposition was that they could build up their turnover by harnessing this volume of credit betting which was not now coming to the board.

The chairman suggested to these men, "Well, now, you have been betting with these clients. You know the good payers and the bad ones; so you allow those good payers to bet on credit with you on a token deposit." One bookmaker said to him, "What happens if these good payers are unable to pay?" The chairman replied, "That is your loss, because the full payment has to be made to the board." So the bookmaker then said, "Well, for 5 per cent. commission that proposition would be no good to me." So he turned it down.

That bookmaker is prepared to swear an affidavit that that was the proposition put to him on those terms; and I have had that confirmed by separate discussions with other persons. Why, after training a number of totalisator managers, did the chairman, last week, call eight of them together and suggest to them that they should stop being managers and take over the agencies on a commission basis? Why did he do that? What inducement did he give them? So much commission on their business; and pointed out if they did that then, in his view, they would make more money than they made as managers on a fixed salary.

So they were to encourage credit betting; they would do the very thing which the Minister said this legislation was designed to prevent.

Mr. Perkins: The result is reduced betting in the areas where the T.A.B. has taken over.

Mr. TONKIN: That has nothing whatever to do with this question; nothing at all. I am afraid the Minister takes for gospel everything that the chairman tells him without checking it for himself.

Mr. Perkins: Do you suggest the chairman does not check this with the board?

Mr. TONKIN: I am suggesting the chairman does not always tell the truth.

Mr. Perkins: I will bear that statement in mind.

Mr. TONKIN: I am not going to leave it there, because that would be unfair. I am going to pursue it a bit. The chairman has such a close contact with his work that he knew the details of certain events. He knew the details quite clearly. Here is one example, and I quote from *The West Australian* of the 22nd July, which reads as follows:—

£1,000 quinella pool expected with the opening of agencies in Bicton and Willagee today. The Totalisator Agency Board expects that its quinella pool on the Whittlesea Handicap at Moonee Valley will reach £1,000. Last Saturday T.A.B. held a record quinella pool of £890 on the Murrumbeena Handicap at Caulfield.

That was more than £200 above the board's record pool the previous week. So he knew what the pool was the previous week, and then he knew this—

If Ascended had finished second instead of third to Comiquita in the Murrumbeena Handicap one quinella system backer would have received more than £750.

He knew that; but when the representative of *The West Australian* asked him if he knew if there had been any races on which no investor had supported the winner and the board had got all the money he said he did not know. Let me read it;

and I quote from *The West Australian* of the 6th May of this year. It reads as follows:—

Mr. Maher said that he did not know whether there had been any cases in which there were no investments on winning horses.

"If it has occurred, the board has retained the full pool but it cannot happen in future because the board now takes a win and place unit on every runner in each race," said Mr. Maher.

Is it not rather strange that the chairman could know of that detail about the quinella, the amount of money in the pool, and what the dividend would have been if the result had been slightly different and one horse ran into a different place? He knew all that; but when asked if there had been any pools at all where the T.A.B. had scooped the pool, he did not know.

The West Australian could not swallow that one. In its leading article of the 20th May, it had this to say—

The upper limits on Eastern States dividends are not much less iniquitous than the limits the S.P. bookmakers contrived. The idea that the tote should benefit through a winner being unbacked is contrary to the pari-mutuel conception and the chairman's statement that he does not know whether this has occurred is astonishing.

I'll say it is! More especially as there were no auditors at the time. They were not appointed until June. Who is going to accept the answer that the chairman did not know? He is in control of these operations. It is his business to know what is going on in each pool. He could give the exact detail with regard to a quinella; he even knew the names of the horses that ran into the places. But he did not know whether there had been any occasion when punters had failed to pick the winner. Do you think you would know, Mr. Speaker? I am sure I would.

In view of the fact that a number of people know what is in this legal opinion of Parker & Parker, I suggest it would strongly support the Minister's case in reply and rebuttal if he were to table it. It is not confidential, because the chairman read it over to a number of bookmakers. Therefore, it would be a good idea if the Minister put it on the Table, to prove or disprove what the points were upon which the board sought advice and why the board sought that advice. It is perfectly obvious that it was intended that sort of thing should never be permitted. That is credit betting. It opens the door to this kind of thing—where a person can ring up and wager with his bookmaker and settle a week after.

The Victorian Act was designed to stop it and so was ours. It was intended that no bet should be made unless the money was there beforehand. But the board intended to get around that by telling the agents they could keep on lending money to punters and credit their accounts with it in the books without the punter having to find a shilling until the races were over. That is the proposition which was put to a number of bookmakers and one which most of them, so far, have turned down.

The Minister also made a great issue of the previous legislation permitting licensed premises being near hotels. However, this board has gone out of its way to perpetuate that. The Minister talked about shops being near hotels to tempt wage earners within their doors—and that is still being done. I will give a pretty picture about this.

Mr. Perkins: You were a big crusader to support it. Tell us why it should not be done.

Mr. TONKIN: I am not telling the Minister why it should not be done. He should stand up to what he has said in this House. When a Government sets down a policy and gets legislation through, it is not entitled to depart from it on the ground that somebody else did something else.

Mr. Perkins: We have considerably reduced the amount of betting at any rate.

Mr. TONKIN: Let us have a look at that.

Mr. Heal: You sent a lot underground!

Mr. TONKIN: In Maylands there were two betting shops: one on the main road and in the shopping centre; and one in a dead end, both being near hotels. The one on the main road was a better premises. It had the larger turnover; it was in the shopping centre; and it was close to the Maylands Hotel. The other one was in a dead end. The premises were not so good and the turnover was smaller. The board declared this area a T.A.B. area and so closed up both shops. Negotiations were opened up with the owner of the premises—who was also the occupier—near the Maylands Hotel.

So keen was the T.A.B. to get these premises, it wanted to buy them—wanted to buy the freehold. The owner was not prepared to sell; but never at any time was the question of rent discussed. However, the chairman wanted to buy. Later on a funny thing happened: Preparations were made to open the agency alongside the Peninsula Hotel, for which the bookmaker who was there previously paid a rental of £49 per month, which was subsequently reduced to £8 or £9 per month when the Government increased the taxation.

Strangely enough, the board has secured these premises at a rental of £4 10s. per week; and the story in the district—this is

pure hearsay, but may be proved later on—is that the new licensee of the Peninsula Hotel, who has only been there a few months, knew before he took the lease that the agency was going to go there. He is paying part of the rent. I am told the board is paying £4 10s. and the hotel-keeper £3. I have to admit that up to this stage that is only talk. It is the talk of the district that the new licensee knew that this agency was going there before he took the lease, and that he is paying portion of the rent.

It seems a remarkable thing that premises which were previously being rented at £49 per month should now be available for rent at £18 per month, which is what the T.A.B. is paying. So in the words of the Bill where the Minister made provision "for any constable who had any reasonable grounds for suspecting" to go along and arrest somebody, I say there are reasonable grounds for suspecting that the publican is subsidising the rent. Is it not strange that the board no longer had any interest in the premises which it was anxious to buy? It never even inquired what the rental would be. Instead, it went to a dead end and rented these premises.

Let us contrast that with what I regard as a completely proper procedure in another locality not far away. There were licensed premises in Claisebrook Road next door to the East Perth Hotel, but on a dead end. There were licensed premises next door to the Norwood Hotel, but in the shopping centre and on the main road. The T.A.B. had to make a choice, so it closed up the one on the dead end and took the one in the shopping centre on the main road. Why did it not do that with regard to the Peninsula Hotel and the Maylands Hotel? Obviously, because there was some inducement on the part of somebody to get the agency alongside the Peninsula Hotel.

The owner of the premises on the main road in Maylands, who was also the bookmaker, told me that never at any time did the T.A.B. inquire from him at what rent his premises would be available. He has three or four premises in the locality and one, I think, is being let at £3 10s. per week. So it was quite a possibility that those premises which the board was anxious to buy could have been available at a rental lower than the figure the board is paying for the premises near the Peninsula Hotel—but the board had no further interest in those premises. It dropped the matter all of a sudden and in went the agency alongside the Peninsula Hotel where a former bookmaker is the licensee in company with a big contractor in this city.

This requires some explanation; and I do not want any cock and bull story from the chairman of the board either, like some of those that have been put up in reply to questions and statements to the paper.

Mr. Perkins: Would not the members of the board know all about these things you are talking about?

Mr. TONKIN: I do not know. I have no idea how the board works inside or what the liaison is. The Minister told me that he has very little control over it.

Mr. Perkins: You seem to know a lot about some things and yet you are very innocent in regard to others.

Mr. TONKIN: I ask the Minister, "How could I know that?" I am not a member of the board. I do not know what power the board has given the chairman. I do know he makes a lot of contradictory statements.

Mr. Perkins: You made some statements a while ago which illustrated that you knew what happened inside the board room.

Mr. TONKIN: In that case the bookmaker concerned was in the room and the letter I read came from him. He said that when he was there he asked the chairman what he could tell the punters they must write so they could start the business off: So the chairman very obligingly dictated the letter in the offices of the T.A.B. while he was there and gave it to him. If the Minister would like to find out which typiste typed it, that is all right with me so long as he gives it back to me.

Mr. Hawke: What, the typiste?

Mr. Perkins: You are not suggesting that I will start thieving them, are you?

Mr. TONKIN: Take this cock and bull story—

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Extension of Time

Mr. W. HEGNEY: In accordance with Standing Orders, I have much pleasure in moving—

That the honourable member's time be extended.

Motion put and passed.

Mr. TONKIN: I thank the House. I had hoped that I would cover the ground more quickly than I was able to; but that has not been possible. I was referring to the story put up in explanation as to why the board started to operate its own pool after an assertion was given in this House and in another place that for six months at least the board would operate on the basis of paying out on the dividends declared on the racecourses in the Eastern States. The Minister knows that is perfectly true, and I hope he does not want to put me to the trouble of finding the reference in *Hansard*.

The Ministers concerned in this House and in another place both stated that as yet no satisfactory scheme for running a totalisator on Eastern States races had

been devised, and therefore it was proposed to have a six-month experimental period. But what did we find? The board did not carry that out for a single day. Instead, it started to operate a pool, and the reason given by the chairman, and by the Minister in this House was that it was because the board was concerned at the squeal of the bookmakers, who said they would go broke. The board is supposed to have taken pity on them and so did not make them pay out at odds on the course.

Let us examine that. If that is the reason, and the objection of the bookmakers was a genuine one—that they were obliged to pay out more money if they adopted the dividends on the course—then all the arguments of the Government in this House were useless, because that was exactly what the Opposition stated about it. We said that, and the Minister said it was not true.

It also proves, if it is a fact, that the bettors or punters would get more money if they were being paid at the odds declared on the course than they are under the existing situation where, because the bookmakers complained, the board was prepared to place a burden upon the bettors and accede to the desires of the bookmakers.

Mr. Perkins: I will never cease to marvel at your ingenuity!

Mr. TONKIN: That is no ingenuity. That is the reason given.

Mr. Perkins: One minute you are concerned about the bookmakers, and the next you are concerned about the punters.

Mr. TONKIN: I am concerned about the truth and righteousness of this matter, not the interests of this side or that. However, I expect there to be some logic in connection with this matter. The Minister cannot argue against the proposition here and then go outside and do the very opposite. Yet that is what is happening in this connection.

If it is not an advantage to the bookmakers to allow them to pay out at the local pool price, why did the board agree to it? It is an advantage to the board also and a bookmaker told me—he has since ceased operations—that anyone operating under the local pool prices would make a fortune. A bookmaker who is operating on the racecourse told me that the difference in pay-out is so appreciably greater having regard to prices on-course compared with local pool prices, that if a bookmaker could confine his operations to that business only his fortune would be assured.

Mr. Perkins: That is the Eastern States totalisator?

Mr. TONKIN: Yes; that is right.

Mr. Perkins: I agree it is profitable. We have been trying to close up the gap.

Mr. TONKIN: We told the Government that if the local T.A.B. adopted the rule it was laying down and paid out at prices on-course, there would not be sufficient margin to function; and that is the reason it put its own pool into operation, not because the bookmakers wanted it to do so. But the chairman of the board told the public that the reason the T.A.B. adopted the method of its own pool was to help the bookmakers.

Mr. Hawke: The Minister backs the board in that one.

Mr. Perkins: They might have been impressed by your argument that the Government would go broke.

Mr. TONKIN: There are other aspects of this which will come up later, more especially after the court action has been decided. Therefore, I will leave that subject there. I am anxious to hear what the Minister has to say in reply.

As a note of warning, I would tell him that I have a lot more information and proof than I have provided here this evening.

Another matter about which I desire to say something is that which was dealt with at length by my leader. It is therefore not necessary for me to say a great deal about it. I am referring, of course, to the sale of the State Building Supplies. I was surprised to hear the Minister for Industrial Development, by interjection, trying to show that the book value of assets was generally higher than the real value. Any accountant ought to know that that is the No. 1 method of setting up secret reserves in a business. Excessive amounts are written off to depreciation, and book values of assets are reduced. In that way an asset is provided in the business which is not disclosed.

There would be a dozen members in the House who would know that to be so: and that is the reason why some companies from time to time write up the assets and then issue bonus shares. They have kept on reducing their assets to such an extent that they only appear at a nominal amount in the accounts, whereas their real value is many hundreds of thousands of pounds in some instances above their book value. Then from time to time they take advantage of that and they increase the value in the books and issue bonus shares to cover it. I am told that the banks themselves are companies which follow this policy extensively. Some of them have valuable premises worth thousands of pounds which have been completely written off in their books.

Mr. Court: They were certainly not written off in the case of the State Building Supplies.

Mr. Graham: You are wrong. You do not know the first thing about it if you say that.

Mr. TONKIN: I would say that it is pretty fair assumption in most cases the book value of the S.B.S. was below the real value; and in the case of the Banksiadale mill, if the book value was £250,000 I would say without any fear of being wrong that its real value would be at least double that.

Mr. Court: Real value to whom?

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister has a reputation as an accountant to uphold. So would like to ask him what is his view of the real value of the Banksiadale mill.

Mr. Court: I think we have a very fair price for it.

Mr. TONKIN: That is a very good answer.

Mr. Court: And in due course I will demonstrate how wrong you are in these values.

Mr. TONKIN: That answer is somewhat difficult of interpretation in actual figures; and the Minister's disinclination to risk his reputation—

Mr. Kelly: What reputation?

Mr. TONKIN: —on this question show the value is considerably higher than stated.

Mr. Court: I said we have a very fair price, and I am being quite emphatic about that.

Mr. TONKIN: How about answering the question? What is your idea of its real value?

Mr. Court: If you want my frank opinion, I would not have paid £250,000 for the Banksiadale mill.

Mr. Graham: You are certifiable in the case.

Mr. Court: And certainly not a penny more than Hawker Siddeley is paying for the lot.

Mr. TONKIN: I have talked to one man who is satisfied that he could have floated a company which would have been prepared to pay £600,000.

Mr. Court: You will always get those smart alecks after the event—those who back the winner after the race is run.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, like the T.A.B!

Mr. Brand: And others!

Mr. TONKIN: In my opinion, the Dwellington mill is worth more than the Hawker Siddeley group is paying for the Banksiadale mill.

Mr. Court: You are romancing!

Mr. TONKIN: What does the Minister think it is worth?

Mr. Court: It was a problem to your Government, as you know.

Mr. TONKIN: What does the Minister consider it is worth?

Mr. Court: I am not going to answer your questions one by one. I will answer you in my own way.

Mr. TONKIN: When one tries to obtain the opinion of the Minister he always evades the issue!

Mr. Roberts: No; he is abiding by Standing Orders!

Mr. Graham: When was the Dwellingup mill opened?

Mr. Court: It was a headache to us.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. Graham: You do not know the first thing about it!

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! One member must speak at a time. I am not attempting to apportion the blame for this; but if there is any more of it, I will have to take some action.

Mr. TONKIN: One aspect of this which has been completely overlooked is that the Government found it necessary to raise the freight rate last year to the tune of over £1,000,000. That was necessary when the Railways Department owned a sawmill of its own where it was able to obtain its sleeper requirements at a basic cost. Now if it is obliged to pay more for its sleepers because it can no longer provide them itself, a burden will be placed on its operations.

Mr. Court: It only ever supplied 20 per cent. of its sleeper requirements.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes; which is a pretty big slice of its requirements.

Mr. Court: You are implying that it supplied the lot.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister declined to answer a question I asked him earlier as to the value of the mill because he knew why I wanted the information. He admitted that the mill was an asset to the department, and I have no doubt that if we could gain access to the figures we would find that it would mean an appreciable amount. That is why the commissioner expressed his view purely from the railway aspect. What other viewpoint was he expected to take? That is why he objected. I would like to know what he said about this when he was informed of the proposal. It seems to me that, without the slightest doubt, this will throw an additional burden of cost upon the railways, and that this cost will have to be recovered through freight charges. So the people in the country will be penalised because this mill, which was a great asset to the department, is no longer available to the department for its use.

Mr. Court: It will be peanuts compared to the cost of operating the railways.

Mr. TONKIN: Every mickle makes a muckle.

Amendment to Motion

In order to afford members an opportunity of discussing this question as it ought to be discussed and debated, I consider that some amendment should be made to the Address-in-Reply. I therefore move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion:—

Finally we strongly condemn the action of the Government in selling State Building Supplies and the railway mill at Banksiadale at bargain prices and on extremely generous time payment conditions to an enormously wealthy private company, and consider a Royal Commission should be set up thoroughly to investigate the transaction.

Debate (on amendment to the motion) adjourned, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development).

House adjourned at 8.48 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 10th August, 1961

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Geraldton Housing : Roofing Materials	158
Iron Ore : Tonnage Shipped from Cockatoo Island, and Royalty Received	158
Jetty Facilities at Broome : Early Cabinet Decision	159
Jetty Facilities at Napier Broome Bay : Provision, and Tabling of Surveyor's Findings and Recommendations	159
Kununurra Houses : Number Built, Cost, and Source of Funds	158
Manganese Ore : Tonnage Shipped from Port Hedland, and Royalty Received	158
Ord River Club : Cost, Source of Money, Ownership, and Use	158
BILL—	
Supply Bill, £25,000,000—	
2r.	159
Com. ; report ; 3r.	171

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.