

I am somewhat confused about it and apparently we have no alternative but to accept the Minister's amendment without knowing a great deal about the ramifications of the inquiry. I think we should have a bit more detail, and it is a pity we did not have a little longer time to examine the matter before we took a vote on it.

Debate adjourned, on motion by The Hon. G. Bennetts.

House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 23rd October, 1962

### CONTENTS

	Page
<b>GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—</b>	
Precedence .....	1901
<b>CLOSING DAYS OF SESSION—</b>	
Standing Orders Suspension .....	1901
<b>LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....</b>	<b>1901</b>
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>	
Bookmakers' Licensed Premises : Closure at Gosnells and Kelmescott .....	1898
Bus Stops : Numbering .....	1898
Kewdale Marshalling Yards : Tenders for Earthworks .....	1897
Legal Practitioners : Holders of Annual Practice Certificates .....	1899
Local Authorities' Fee Simple Land— Re-zoning of Claremont Location 1366 Utilisation for Public Recreation .....	1899
<b>Mandurah—</b>	
Bore : Depth, and Quantity and Analysis of Water .....	1894
Opening of Bar .....	1894
Mineral Claim No. 292— Effect on Minister's Decision .....	1898
Exclusion of Prospecting Area 284 .....	1898
<b>Missing Persons—</b>	
Number Found .....	1897
Number Reported .....	1897
Morley Park Shopping Centre : Installation of Crosswalk .....	1898
<b>Ord River Dam—</b>	
Boilermakers : Wages and Conditions of Employment .....	1896
Construction Difficulties .....	1896
Methods of Farm Irrigation .....	1896
Responsibility for Delay in Completion Work on Irrigation and Drainage Channels .....	1896
<b>Railway Employees—</b>	
Annual Leave: Negotiations for Increased Period .....	1899

### CONTENTS—continued

#### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—continued

Railways : Reopened Lines— Dates of Wheat and Superphosphate Haulage .....	1895
Earnings and Cost of Full-time Operation .....	1895
Operating Expenses and Tonnages Carried .....	1895
Shire Councils : Ministerial Visits— Exclusion of Parliamentary Representatives .....	1895
State and Private Hospitals : Number of Trainee and Registered Nurses .....	1899
Swan Brewery Co. Ltd. : Acquisition of Other Breweries, Hotels, etc. ....	1900
Tuberculosis : Incidence in Western Australia .....	1896
Wire Netting Delegated Agency : Applications and Approvals for Advances .....	1895

#### QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE—

Ord River Dam : Tabling of Engineer's Progress Report .....	1900
--	------

#### BILLS—

Supply Bill (No. 2), £22,000,000— Standing Orders Suspension .....	1901
Message : Appropriation .....	1901
Committee of Supply .....	1901
Committee of Ways and Means .....	1949
Intro. ; 1r. ....	1949
2r. ....	1949
Com. ; Report .....	1956
3r. ....	1956
Plant Diseases Act Amendment Bill : 2r. ....	1956

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

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

#### MANDURAH

##### Opening of Bar

1. Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Works:

When is it expected that plans will be completed for the permanent construction of the opening for the Mandurah Bar?

Mr. WILD replied:

A preliminary plan and estimate have been prepared. Before the plan is adopted it is intended to carry out a model study and this will take from six to nine months to complete.

##### Bore: Depth, and Quantity and Analysis of Water

2. Mr. RUNCIMAN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:
  - (1) At what depth was water obtained in the Mandurah bore?
  - (2) What is the quantity of water and what is its analysis?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) The bore at Mandurah was drilled to a total depth of 2,000 feet and aquifers occurred at intervals over the full depth of the bore. The lowest salinity aquifer, which is the aquifer being tested, was located from 440 feet to 630 feet.
- (2) The quantity and quality varied from aquifer to aquifer.  
The aquifer from 440 feet to 630 feet yielded 6,000 g.p.h. under natural artesian flow but is being tested at 11,000 g.p.h. The quality of this aquifer is 113 g.p.g. of sodium chloride but could vary before the test is complete.

### WIRE NETTING DELEGATED AGENCY

#### *Applications and Approvals for Advances*

3. Mr. CORNELL asked the Minister for Lands:

With reference to question No. 15 asked by me on the 16th October last, regarding Wire Netting Delegated Agency advances:—

- (1) How many applications for advances were submitted during each of the following years ended—  
the 30th June, 1960;  
the 30th June, 1961;  
the 30th June, 1962?
- (2) How many individual advances were approved in each of these three years to—  
(a) clients of the Rural and Industries Bank;  
(b) other borrowers?
- (3) What particular conditions, if any, are imposed that may limit applications or approvals?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) and (2) To the 30th June, 1960—  
one application submitted but withdrawn.  
To the 30th June, 1961—nil.  
To the 30th June, 1962—nil.
- (3) (i) The funds of this delegation are for rabbit-proof netting.
- (ii) Cleared areas only to be enclosed.
- (iii) The bank requires a first charge over the security and needs to be satisfied that the applicant—  
(a) cannot purchase the necessary wire and netting otherwise than with the help of a loan under this delegated agency;

- (b) will be able to purchase the posts and erect the fence without further loan assistance;
- (c) will be able to repay the loan within a period not exceeding 15 years.

### SHIRE COUNCILS: MINISTERIAL VISITS

#### *Exclusion of Parliamentary Representatives*

4. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Premier:  
Is it by Government direction when Ministers visit shire councils for the purpose of discussing local matters, that Ministers request shire presidents to exclude Legislative Assembly or Council parliamentary representatives from such meetings?

Mr. BRAND replied:

No. Occasions may arise, however, when Ministers may wish to discuss matters of Government policy on a confidential basis with shire council representatives. In such cases, it would not be unreasonable to propose that the discussions be held in camera.

### RAILWAYS: REOPENED LINES

#### *Dates of Wheat and Superphosphate Haulage*

5. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Railways:
  - (1) For what periods during the 1961-62 wheat and superphosphate season were the following sections of the railways opened for traffic:—  
(a) Burakin-Bonnie Rock;  
(b) Lake Grace-Hyden;  
(c) Katanning-Nyabing?

#### *Operating Expenses and Tonnages Carried*

- (2) What were the operating expenses in respect of each section?
- (3) What was the tonnage of—  
(a) grain;  
(b) fertilisers;  
(c) general goods  
hailed on each section during this period?

#### *Earnings and Cost of Full-time Operation*

- (4) What were the earnings in respect of each section during this period?
- (5) What is the estimated cost of keeping these lines open on a full-time basis?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) (a) The 8th January, 1962, to the 7th August, 1962.

- (b) The 8th January, 1962, to the 16th June, 1962.  
 (c) The 11th December, 1961, to the 13th April, 1962.

- (2) (a) £34,708.  
 (b) £32,064.  
 (c) £18,315.

These figures exclude interest on line assets, which is not now chargeable by the Treasury in respect of loan capital tied up in sections of line on which traffic has been suspended.

	Grain Tons	Ferti- lisers Tons	General Goods Tons	Total Tons
(3) (a)	46,141	6,270	589	53,000
(b)	33,695	7,431	268	41,394
(c)	15,082	6,033	381	21,496
(4) (a)	£27,832.			
(b)	£21,250.			
(c)	£9,388.			

- (5) In the last full year of operating these three sections, i.e., 1956-57, the losses were as under—  
 (a) £47,805.  
 (b) £46,352.  
 (c) £54,707.

Although there has been an increase in freight charges in the meantime, wages and other charges have also increased. It is considered that if the lines were operated on a full-time basis there would be little improvement on the 1956-57 results.

Figures shown in No. (2) above may be varied slightly as results for all sections are not yet finalised, but any alteration will be of a minor nature only.

## BUS STOPS

### Numbering

6. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Does the Metropolitan Transport Trust intend to number all bus stops on its various routes as a guide to passengers?  
 (2) If so, will the work be carried out before the forthcoming Commonwealth Games?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) The Metropolitan Transport Trust is investigating ways and means of numbering bus stops so as to evolve the most efficient system.  
 (2) Due to essential additional administrative work and organising bus transport for the games it is unlikely that investigations will be complete and the system in operation by that time.

## ORD RIVER DAM

### Methods of Farm Irrigation

7. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) When was the decision made to install pumps upstream from the Ord River diversion dam for the purpose of providing water for crop planting on the first five farms to be commenced next year?  
 (2) What methods were used to irrigate the present farms?  
 (3) Were not they irrigated from a pumping station situated upstream?  
 (4) Is it the intention to use these pumping stations in the event of the dam not being completed before the "wet"?

### Construction Difficulties

- (5) Was not the preparation of the foundation for the concrete buttresses for the radial gates delayed considerably by a collapse of the temporary coffer dam early in the programme?

### Work on Irrigation and Drainage Channels

- (6) What relationship is there between the number of rivets driven per day and the work still to be done on the irrigation and drainage channels?  
 (7) How many boilermakers are employed on the irrigation and drainage channels?  
 (8) Who is responsible for the completion of the irrigation and drainage channels?  
 (9) In the event of the dam being completed and the channels not, would it be possible to complete earthworks after the advent of the wet?

### Boilermakers: Wages and Conditions of Employment

- (10) Are the boilermakers working on the dam employed on a piecework or on a day-work basis?  
 (11) Is there any reference in the terms of the boilermakers' engagement to any specified number of rivets to be driven per day?  
 (12) What authority is responsible for the number of rivets (125) that were expected from these men daily?  
 (13) What is the average wage earned by boilermakers on the Ord River diversion dam for a week of 40 hours?  
 (14) How does this compare with the wages offered by one Mr. Bill Lonnie [*vide* the Middlesbrough (England) *Evening Gazette*, Tuesday, the 2nd October, 1962] of £29 per

week for carpenters, £24 for cabinet makers, and £26 per week for mechanics, plus a good house, and a first-class Australian climate?

- (15) Can the climate at Ord River dam be described as "first-class"?

*Responsibility for Delay in Completion*

- (16) In the light of the foregoing, does he still persist in his contention that the boilermakers are solely responsible for the conjectured delay of the completion of the Ord River diversion dam scheme?

Mr. WILD replied:

I would point out that Nos. (5), (10), (11), (12), (13), and (14) were referred to the contractors, Messrs. Christiani & Nielsen (Australia), who supplied the answers to those portions of the questions.

- (1) Decision not yet made.
- (2) to (4) The only farm worked to date is the pilot farm, which is irrigated from its own pumping station and channels. Neither the location or capacity of this station is suitable to irrigate the new farms.
- (5) No. The reconstruction of the coffer dam after the last wet season was foreseen.
- (6) None.
- (7) None.
- (8) C. R. Keath Earth Moving, the contractor for this portion of the project.
- (9) Yes, but working conditions for earthworks would be difficult.
- (10) The boilermakers are on a day-work basis.
- (11) No.
- (12) The rate of driving rivets is obviously governed by the circumstances, and no figures are suggested or laid down by any authority. Nevertheless, the progress has been a disappointment to the contractors.
- (13) The boilermakers are paid according to the Metal Trades (Ord River) Award which provides an award rate of £23 12s. 6d. for a 40-hour week plus free board and lodging. These men earn on the average £45 per week, including overtime, and receive free board and lodging.
- (14) Answered by No. (13).
- (15) The climate has been described as follows in the official document issued in connection with applications for the first five farms—  
It can be seen that the wet season extends broadly from early December to the end of

March. In the dry season, from April to the end of September, the climate is very pleasant and probably the most trying months are November and December before the wet season commences.

- (16) It is considered that the boilermakers have contributed in a major way to the conjectured delay in the completion of the contract.

## KEWDALE MARSHALLING YARDS

### *Tenders for Earthworks*

8. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Railways:

When will tenders be called for the earthworks associated with the Kewdale marshalling yards?

Mr. COURT replied:

It is anticipated that tenders for the first portion of the earthworks will be called late this financial year.

## MISSING PERSONS

### *Number Reported*

9. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) How many persons were reported as missing to the police in this State for the years 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1962?
- (2) Of the persons reported missing—  
(a) how many were females; what were their respective ages; and  
(b) how many were males and what were their respective ages?

### *Number Found*

- (3) How many females were found or traced by the police for the same years and what were their estimated ages?
- (4) How many males were found or traced by the police for the same years and what were their estimated ages?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) 1958—533.  
1959—622.  
1960—689.  
1961—739.  
1962—583.
- (2) (a) 1412—717 under 21—695 over 21.  
(b) 1754—790 under 21—964 over 21.
- (3) 1958—234.  
1959—260.  
1960—294.  
1961—343.  
1962—271.  
717 under 21—685 over 21.

- (4) 1958—283.  
1959—341.  
1960—369.  
1961—365.  
1962—261.  
734 under 21—885 over 21.

10. *This question was postponed.*

### TUBERCULOSIS

#### *Incidence in Western Australia*

11. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Health:

As there seems to be a controversy as to whether tuberculosis has become more active in other States, can he advise the House as to whether there has been an increase of the disease in this State during the last three years, stating the figures for that period?

Mr. BRAND (for Mr. Ross Hutchinson) replied:

The tuberculosis case-rates for the three metropolitan mass compulsory X-ray surveys are—

Survey commenced 1954—1.4 new cases diagnosed per 1,000 X-rays taken.

Survey commenced 1957—0.7 new cases diagnosed per 1,000 X-rays taken.

Survey commenced 1961 (still in progress)—0.5 new cases diagnosed per 1,000 X-rays taken.

As these surveys are conducted with as complete a coverage of the population as possible, case-rates should be a reasonably accurate reflection of the relative community prevalence.

Total notifications for this State in the last three years were—

1959—354.

1960—330.

1961—250.

The anticipated total for 1962 will be about 270.

Notification figures can be misleading as indicators of community prevalence, as there is some variation in case-finding activity from year to year.

### MINERAL CLAIM No. 292

#### *Exclusion of Prospecting Area 284*

12. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Does not the recommendation of the warden, N. J. Malley, on the application of Depuch Shipping and Mining Co. Pty. Ltd. for mineral claim No. 292 specifically exclude the ground previously granted to the claim holder of and comprising prospecting area 284?

#### *Effect on Minister's Decision*

- (2) If the reply is "Yes," in what way does or can the ground comprising prospecting area 284 affect the decision of the Minister for Mines in approving or disapproving of the warden's recommendation in respect of mineral claim No. 292?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) For reasons already given, this matter is considered to be *sub judice*, and the Minister declines to answer the question.

### MORLEY PARK SHOPPING CENTRE

#### *Installation of Crosswalk*

13. Mr. TOMS asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Has he seen the Press reports in the *Daily News* of the 17th October, and *The West Australian* of the 18th October, wherein the coroner has stressed the need for a crosswalk at the Morley Park shopping centre?

- (2) Will he take this matter up immediately with the department concerned and have same installed before further fatalities occur in this dangerous area?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) The matter is already under consideration between the Main Roads Department and the Shire of Bayswater. The department is awaiting the receipt of traffic and pedestrian counts from the shire council.

### BOOKMAKERS' LICENSED PREMISES

#### *Closure at Gosnells and Kelmscott*

14. Mr. D. G. MAY asked the Minister for Police:

Will he advise the reasons for the excessive time—eight months—which elapsed between the closing of the Gosnells licensed premises bookmaker and the closing of the Kelmscott licensed premises bookmaker, having regard to the close proximity of both bookmakers?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

In February, 1962, Mr. M. F. Schofield was accepted as the board's agent for Riverton. As he was arranging the construction and financing of the building at Riverton it was agreed that he would continue as the licensed premises bookmaker at Kelmscott until the agency at Riverton was ready for occupation. After the foundations were put down for the agency at Riverton the local

authority stopped progress because the particular area concerned had not been re-zoned to permit of the erection of the agency. This caused considerable delay in the completion of the building.

15. *This question was postponed.*

#### **RAILWAY EMPLOYEES: ANNUAL LEAVE** *Negotiations for Increased Period*

16. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) When were the awards or agreements for the following types of employees registered:—

W.A.A.S. of R.E.;  
Boilermakers;  
Engineers;  
Electricians;  
Carpenters?

- (2) What are the respective periods of annual leave?
- (3) Are negotiations for new awards taking place for three weeks' leave?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) The employees are covered by Award No. 3 of 1961 registered with the Court of Arbitration on the 13th January, 1961.
- (2) The award provides for a basic grant of two weeks' annual leave to all workers with additional leave being granted to "shift workers", and workers in isolated areas.
- (3) No; but an application for leave to apply to amend the award in this respect has been lodged with the Court of Arbitration by the unions parties to Award No. 3 of 1961.

#### **STATE AND PRIVATE HOSPITALS** *Number of Trainee and Registered Nurses*

17. Dr. HENN asked the Minister for Health:

How many—

- (a) trainee nurses;
  - (b) registered nurses;
- are there at present working in—
- (a) State hospitals;
  - (b) private hospitals;
- throughout Western Australia?

Mr. BRAND (for Mr. Ross Hutchinson) replied:

Employed in State Hospitals—

- (a) Registered nurses, 1,379.
- (b) Trainee nurses, 1,079.

Private Hospitals—

The two large private training hospitals employ—

- (a) Registered nurses, 152.
- (b) Trainee nurses, 84.

No accurate information is available regarding a number of smaller private hospitals.

#### **LEGAL PRACTITIONERS**

##### *Holders of Annual Practice Certificates*

18. Mr. GUTHRIE asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

Adverting to question No. 11 on the notice paper of the Legislative Assembly for Wednesday, the 17th October, 1962, and the answer to No. (2), how many of the legal practitioners, included in each category, in the answer to such questions were employed in the service of the State or Commonwealth Governments?

Mr. COURT replied:

Three in 1928, and 10 in 1961. All in the metropolitan area.

#### **LOCAL AUTHORITIES' FEE SIMPLE LAND**

##### *Re-zoning of Claremont Location 1366*

19. Mr. CROMMELIN asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

- (1) Did the Town of Claremont request that location 1366, held by it in fee simple, be re-zoned as flats?
- (2) If so, did he refuse to re-zone this area of land?
- (3) Did the Zone "B" District Planning Committee, after examination of the case put to it by the Town of Claremont, recommend to the Town Planning Authority that the Claremont Council be given the requested permission to re-zone and alienate location 1366 unless the Region Planning Authority is prepared to pay compensation equal to what the council would obtain on the immediate alienation of land as proposed by the council?
- (4) Did the Town Planning Authority accept or reject this recommendation?
- (5) If it rejected it, what were the reasons for so doing?

##### *Utilisation for Public Recreation*

- (6) Has the Town Planning Authority advised any local authorities other than the Town of Claremont, which hold blocks of land in fee simple, that it intends to declare these said blocks of land as public open space?
- (7) If so, how many authorities have been affected by this decision, and what were their names and the number of blocks affected?
- (8) If any other local authorities have been affected, have they raised objections?

- (9) Has the Town Planning Authority paid compensation to any local authority whose land, held in fee simple, the authority has sought to declare as open space?
- (10) Does the interim development order override section 266 of the Local Government Act?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Yes.  
 (2) Yes.  
 (3) Yes.  
 (4) The Metropolitan Region Planning Authority did not accept the recommendation.

- (5) The authority agreed with the recommendation of the Stephenson-Hepburn report that the subject land is required to meet the recreational standards for the Nedlands-Claremont planning area.

The authority regarded the short term advantage to the Claremont Council of being able to realise funds by the sale of part of the land as being outweighed by the desirability of securing the long-term recreational needs of the district as a whole.

Other local authorities in the region own land used or intended to be used for recreational purposes. The authority was not prepared to expend moneys from the metropolitan improvement fund to compensate local authorities in such circumstances.

- (6) to (8) The only method of notification has been by examination of the Stephenson-Hepburn report and plan (1955), the interim development order, and discussion during the preparatory stage of the metropolitan region scheme now open for inspection. Open space reservations were examined by all local authorities and no other objections relating to land held by councils in fee simple have been recorded.
- (9) No.
- (10) No. The interim development order does not restrict the sale of land.

#### SWAN BREWERY CO. LTD.

*Acquisition of Other Breweries, Hotels, etc.*

20. Mr. J. HEGNEY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Is it a fact that the Swan Brewery Co. Ltd. has acquired or is in the process of acquiring all brewery interests in Western Australia, i.e., Kalgoorlie, Merredin, Redcastle, and the Globe Breweries?

- (2) Is it a fact that the Swan Brewery Co. has purchased a substantial interest in a prominent wine and spirit business in Perth, which sells Eastern States stock to the exclusion of Western Australian stock?

- (3) Is it not a fact that the Swan Brewery Co. has acquired many hotel properties in Western Australia and the trend is for a complete take-over?

- (4) Is it not a fact that many small liquor businesses in the State are seriously affected by this monopoly trend and practice?

- (5) Will he have this matter thoroughly investigated to see what effective action can be taken to restrict and prevent such monopoly?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) The Swan Brewery Co. Ltd. holds a controlling interest in the breweries mentioned.

- (2) It is understood that the Swan Brewery Co. Ltd. has purchased 49 per cent. of the shares in John-son & Harper Pty. Ltd., wine and spirit merchants.

- (3) The latest information in the possession of the State Licensing Court shows that there are 452 publican's general, wayside house, and hotel licenses in force in Western Australia; and, of these, the Swan Brewery Co. Ltd. owns 64, and the Emu Brewery Ltd. five; and 383 are held by others.

- (4) In view of the answer to No. (3), this does not appear to be so.

- (5) An investigation does not appear to be necessary.

#### QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

##### ORD RIVER DAM

*Tabling of Engineer's Progress Report*

Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Works:

Will he lay on the Table of the House the engineer's progress report to the Public Works Department from time to time on the Ord River diversion dam project since its inception?

Mr. WILD replied:

I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for giving me notice of this question. I will lay the report on the Table of the House for seven days.

*The report was tabled.*

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by Mr. O'Neill, leave of absence for four weeks granted to Mr. Burt (Murchison) on the ground of urgent public business.

## GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

### *Precedence*

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough—Premier) [4.49 p.m.]: I move—

That on and after Wednesday, the 31st October, Government business shall take precedence of all motions and Orders of the Day on Wednesdays as on all other days.

This is a motion that comes before the House at this time of the year in each session. It is one that has been accepted in the past in the interests of getting Government business through by granting it priority.

However, as has always been the case, an undertaking is given by the Government on this occasion to deal with all private members' business now on the notice paper and to give it a reasonable place in order that it is not rushed at the end of the session. I do not think there is anything more I can add except to say that the notice paper, whilst carrying a number of items at the present time, is not heavily overloaded. As far as I am aware there are no more than half a dozen Bills to be introduced other than those that have already been publicised or given notice of.

**MR. HAWKE** (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [4.51 p.m.]: On the basis of the assurance given by the Premier I have no objection to the motion.

Question put and passed.

## CLOSING DAYS OF SESSION

### *Standing Orders Suspension*

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough—Premier) [4.52 p.m.]: I move—

That until otherwise ordered, the Standing Orders be suspended so far as is necessary to enable Bills to be introduced without notice, and to be passed through all their remaining stages on the same day, all messages from the Legislative Council to be taken into consideration on the same day they are received, and to enable resolutions from the Committees of Supply and of Ways and Means to be reported and adopted on the same day on which they shall have passed, those Committees.

Again this is a formal motion which is moved at this time of the session and has as its objective the speeding up of legislation through both Houses, enabling a Bill to be dealt with in all its stages in one day.

As new members will have seen, it takes a number of days under normal Standing Orders to even get a Bill introduced; and in order to expedite the business of the House I am moving this motion.

**MR. HAWKE** (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [4.53 p.m.]: The moving of this motion indicates the approach of the close of this year's session. There is a good deal of merit in this motion; and I think that, in some respects, it could be applied during the whole of the parliamentary session. However, I have no objection to the motion.

Question put and passed.

## SUPPLY BILL (No. 2), £22,000,000

### *Standing Orders Suspension*

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough—Treasurer) [4.54 p.m.]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable resolutions from the Committees of Supply and of Ways and Means to be reported and adopted on the same day on which they shall have passed those Committees; and also the passing of a Supply Bill through all its stages in one day.

Question put and passed.

### *Message: Appropriation*

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

### *In Committee of Supply.*

The House resolved into Committee of Supply, the Chairman of Committees (Mr. I. W. Manning) in the Chair.

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough—Treasurer) [4.55 p.m.]: I move—

That there be granted to Her Majesty on account of the services the year ending the 30th June, 1963, a sum not exceeding £22,000,000.

Earlier this financial year the Supply Act (No. 1) provided £25,000,000 which consisted of the following components:—

	£
For the Consolidated Revenue Fund .....	18,000,000
For the General Loan Fund .....	5,000,000
For the Advance to Treasurer .....	2,000,000

Expenditure on the services of the State has been made against this authority; and, by the 30th September, 1962, amounted to £14,558,000 from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and £3,607,000 from the General Loan Fund. In addition to these amounts a further sum of £4,523,000 was expended from the Consolidated Revenue Fund on those services which are authorised by special Acts.



These services include interest payments, pensions paid to retired employees, and other commitments of a continuing nature.

After taking account of total disbursements of £19,081,000 from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and allowing for revenue collections of £18,507,000, a deficit of £574,000 was incurred in the first quarter of this financial year. Whilst the experience of three months is insufficient to give a clear indication of the final outcome for the year I will say that transactions to date have been in accordance with Budget expectations.

The Bill now under consideration is for an amount of £22,000,000 and consists of £17,000,000 from the Consolidated Revenue and £5,000,000 from the General Loan Fund. This request is identical with the amount made available in the second Supply Act of 1961 and is necessary to provide for the services of the State until the Estimates, now in the hands of members, have been passed.

In moving this motion I would again point out that it is a formality. For many years it was the procedure in this Parliament to simply read out the words of the Bill itself without giving any further explanation; because, in fact, this is only an authority by Parliament for an advance to the Treasurer in respect of each of the funds and in accordance with the titles mentioned in the Bill in order that the State might carry on until the estimates of expenditure have been approved.

Advantage has been taken over a number of years recently of entering into some fairly lengthy debates; and I would point out to members that as we still have the general Estimates before us and quite a big part of the Loan Estimates, points that may well have been raised on the Supply Bill can be raised and debated on the estimates of expenditure from the General and the Loan Funds.

**MR. HAWKE** (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [4.58 p.m.]: I want frankly to say I was not favourably impressed with what the Treasurer said during the last 50 or 60 seconds of his speech.

**Mr. Brand:** As long as I impressed with the first bit!

**Mr. HAWKE:** It is true the Revenue Estimates and also the Loan Estimates are still before us for consideration and for such discussion as individual members on both sides of the House feel inclined to indulge in. However, we have seen the notice paper in this House expand quite considerably during the last two or three days in relation to the amount of Government business in the way of Bills upon the notice paper; and what the Treasurer has said regarding the opportunity which the Estimates offer would have been much more acceptable by members on this side of the House a week ago.

However, today it is clear that much of the remaining time available to the House this session will have to be taken up in discussions on proposed legislation. Consequently there will be far less time available to members during which to discuss the remaining Revenue Estimates and the Loan Estimates. So I would suggest that any member of the House who feels he has some information to place before the House, or who feels there is some subject which he wishes to discuss in the House, should take advantage, and full advantage, of the opportunity which is now in our hands.

**Mr. Brand:** Far be it from me to urge them not to speak, but I was pointing out that there would be other opportunities.

**Mr. HAWKE:** Should members hold off and wait until the Revenue and Loan Estimates come up again, they might easily find that those Estimates might not come up again for discussion until the last two or three days of the session. Those of us who have been here for some years know how the situation and the atmosphere change during the last two or three days of a session; during the last week of a session.

**Mr. H. May:** I think any part of a session.

**Mr. HAWKE:** A very strong tendency during the last few days of a session is for members to economise greatly in the use of words inside the Chamber, and to abandon the good intentions which they had developed earlier in relation to discussion of departmental estimates and of Loan Estimates.

So, from my point of view, this appears to be the last very good opportunity which will be available to members to enable them to discuss subjects—any number of subjects or that matter—because the debate is not limited; and I certainly trust that members will take advantage of the opportunity which is offered.

I was one of those who spoke on the general debate on the Budget. In that speech I covered a fairly wide field and consequently said most of what I had in mind to say in relation to the general administration of the Government—in relation to its financial policies and major lines of expenditure under the headings both of revenue expenditure and of loan expenditure.

However, I want to discuss one subject today because I feel it is of very great importance to all members of the House, and certainly of the greatest importance to the taxpayers. This matter has direct relationship to the occurrence at the West Northam State School, when the whole roof of one of the new sections of the school was completely blown off and blown off at a time which was only about eight to nine months after the school building had been completed; after it had been constructed.

I am not discussing this matter only in relation to the West Northam State School, because I think it has a very important and wide application throughout the whole of the State. The design for this school was drawn up by a private architect, after the Government had given the private architect concerned the green light to go ahead; and the building was constructed by a private builder and contractor. When I asked questions of the Minister for Works in this House regarding the complete blowing away of the whole of the roof of one section of the building—the brick section—the Minister put forward the reasons which he thought were responsible for the happening. However, under pressure of subsequent questioning he changed his ground quite a deal.

Initially, the reason he gave to us and to the public was that there had been cyclonic winds in the vicinity and the roof had been blown off by those cyclonic winds. He even sought, by giving other information, to show that school roofs could be expected to blow off whenever the wind in a particular area was strong enough; because in one of his answers he advised that a similar sort of thing had happened to a prefabricated school at South Bunbury a few years ago.

In the normal course of events, his answer about the roof blowing off the prefabricated school at South Bunbury would have left the impression that the prefabricated school in question was a new prefabricated school, and could also have left the impression that the building at West Northam, from which a roof had been blown off, was also prefabricated.

However, fortunately, in the interests of the complete truth surrounding the situation at South Bunbury, the ex-Minister for Works—the now Deputy Leader of the Opposition—recalled that the prefabricated school at South Bunbury was secondhand; and when I put up questions in this House at a later date to the Minister he had to admit that the prefabricated building at South Bunbury was secondhand. He had to tell us the building had previously been located in another situation and had remained in that situation for some seven years before being dismantled to whatever extent was necessary and then being transported to the new site at South Bunbury and re-erected there.

So in real fact there was no comparison—no logical comparison—with what happened to the secondhand prefabricated school building at South Bunbury and what happened to the brand new brick section of the new State school building at West Northam; no logical comparison at all. When the Minister gave to us originally the information about the South Bunbury School, he was undoubtedly misleading the House by not giving all the facts, and was also, in effect, trying to

cover up the far more dangerous happening which had occurred in connection with the new school at West Northam.

The Minister subsequently told us some officer of the electrical section of the Public Works Department had suggested the West Northam School roof could have been blown off or could have come off the brick building because of some electrical fault in the building. Well, I hope the Minister really did not expect any of us to believe that, and I hope he did not believe it himself. I saw the wreck of this school roof at West Northam only two days after the occurrence had taken place; and the roof had been lifted bodily, as it were, and had been carried by such wind as existed over the brick building and into the bitumen-surface playing yard.

It was something in the nature of a near miracle that the children were not in the school at the time the roof left the building. The day in question was Royal Show day in Perth. I understand the Education Department give schoolchildren in the metropolitan area two holidays during Royal Show week—People's Day and Children's Day—and that schoolchildren in country areas are entitled to have the same number of days if the schoolteachers wish to close down their schools for two days—one day for the local show, and one day for the Royal Show.

The headteacher at the West Northam School was of the opinion that closing the school down on Royal Show day was a waste of good time, and a waste of good opportunity. His own strong opinion and inclination was to keep the school open—and the children were in favour of that, too. However, when he had some talks before the day with the teachers at the other State schools in Northam they indicated that the day was available as a rest day, as a holiday for the children and for the teachers; and as special holidays like the one in question were not easy to get from any Government, it was their belief that in point of principle they should take the holiday; and the headteacher at West Northam, not wishing to be out of line with his other teacher colleagues in the town and in the area, decided to close the West Northam State School on the Thursday.

That was a near miracle. Clearly, had the children been at school that day some of them must have been killed—there could not have been any possibility of avoiding deaths in such a happening; and many, many of them would undoubtedly have been seriously—very seriously—injured, and probably a number of them maimed for life.

The avoirdupois weight of the roof and of its supports was very great. I think it worked out somewhere near 70 tons, if I remember rightly. It is easy to imagine what would have happened even had the children been in the classroom; but had they been in the playing area, when the

roof and its supports, and flying asbestos, and the rest of it, was landing there would, of course, have been a very great tragedy.

When the Minister for Works answered my first set of queries in regard to this matter, he told us the roof on the brick section of the new school at West Northam had been affixed to the building in the normal way. That, of course, immediately set up in my mind a feeling that if indeed and in fact the roof in question had been affixed to the new brick building at West Northam in the normal way, then every other school roof in Western Australia which had been affixed in the same way could, with the help of a strong wind, be lifted off the building and blown into the vicinity of the building.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.15 p.m.]: The Opposition will strongly oppose the granting of supply to the Government; and, for reasons which will become apparent as I proceed, it will contend that the Government has forfeited its right to continue to govern.

In *The West Australian* of the 15th October, an article, under the heading "Victorian Businessmen Look to the North", appeared. It read—

Victorian business houses in Victoria must lead the development of northern Australia, the Victorian Employers' Federation said today.

In a policy statement, the federation said that the responsibility of the south to develop the north was great, and the stakes to be won were high.

On the 16th August last I asked the Premier a question; and I quote now from *Hansard* No. 4 of this year, page 520—

- (1) Was a firm proposal in writing submitted to the Government last year by Mr. Duncan, world chief of Rio Tinto, under which he offered to proceed immediately to invest many millions in iron ore development in the vicinity of Duck Creek near the Hamersley Range?
- (2) Did the proposal involve the company in providing all the money necessary fully to carry out its undertaking to build a port to take vessels up to 40,000 tons, provide requisite housing and provide a railway, all without cost to the Government?
- (3) Did Mr. Duncan further undertake to make a much larger investment to establish an integrated iron and steel industry in the north?
- (4) Will he lay upon the Table of the House Mr. Duncan's letter containing the proposals?

The Premier replied as follows:—

As I had no notice of the question—and I am not being critical about that as it has been done from time to time—

Mr. May: He is drawing attention to it now.

Mr. BRAND: It is being asked merely to draw attention to the matter? Is that what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition intends?

Mr. Tonkin: No.

Mr. BRAND: I am sorry.

Mr. Tonkin: That was not my idea. I want the information.

Mr. BRAND: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had given me some time, I might have been able to give the information. But this I want to say to the House: Mr. Duncan, as world chief of Rio Tinto, had discussions of a confidential nature with the Government and, as far as I am aware, the letters which followed were of a semi-confidential nature. Certainly Rio Tinto did not put up to the Government any firm proposals involving all these items the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has referred to.

Mr. Curran: What does "semi-confidential" mean?

Mr. BRAND: The member for Cockburn had better keep quiet or go back on the wharf and talk about semi-confidential things.

Mr. Jamieson: Better than selling apples!

Mr. Tonkin: Don't get nasty so early in the sitting.

Mr. BRAND: I would like to say that as far as the suggestion of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is concerned with regard to the laying of the files on the Table of the House, at this stage at least we do not propose to do so.

I would point out to the House, too, that following the discussions which took place when Mr. Duncan was here, the Government made final decisions on the areas which were to be allotted to the various companies for exploration over a period of two years; and Rio Tinto, along with other companies now associated with it, was one of those which received a very large area with which, I understand, it is very, very satisfied. I am sure that Mr. Duncan would not like the affairs of the company discussed in this House, nor any

of the discussions and communications which took place prior to the final decisions of the Government over the leases.

You can see, Mr. Chairman, there was a denial by the Premier that a proposal, differing from negotiations or discussions, had been submitted to the Government.

I came across an article in the *Melbourne Age* of the 30th March, and I have taken a photo copy of the article, which deals with a meeting of Rio Tinto Mining Co. of Aust. Ltd. at which Mr. Blake Pelly (the chairman) made this announcement—

While acknowledging this, the Pilbara deposits apparently represent the first long-range possibility to show up on the Australian horizon of a second integrated iron and steel industry.

Later in the article we find this—

A proposal for the development of the area had been submitted to the W.A. Government, Mr. Pelly said.

So in this Chamber we had the Premier denying that a proposal had been submitted by Rio Tinto; but Mr. Blake Pelly informed his shareholders that a proposal had been submitted.

I decided to go a little further to verify the situation, so I endeavoured to obtain—and I succeeded in obtaining—a copy of the April issue of the *Stock Exchange* which, under the heading "The Rio Tinto Mining Company of Australia Limited" contains a full report of "The Chairman's address to shareholders at the Third Annual General Meeting held in the Conference Room, Messrs. Cooper Brothers & Co., 4th Floor, 360 Collins Street, Melbourne, on Thursday, March 29, 1962, at 11 a.m. In moving the adoption of the Reports and Accounts, the Chairman, Mr. Blake Pelly, said:—" Obviously I have not time to read the whole of the report—nor is it necessary—but I propose to read extracts, as follows:—

It is a source of great pride to us and a matter of the greatest credit to our English parent company that, apart from the repayment of certain loans, not one penny of the dividends from the operations of Mary Kathleen Uranium Ltd. has yet been repatriated to the United Kingdom. All surplus funds have been re-employed in Australia to support our diversification programme.

This programme, details of which are discussed later, is progressing very rapidly, and the Company is approaching a stage where it will be able to contribute to Australia's development in a wide variety of fields whilst maintaining its basic character of a mining company.

On page 26, Mr. Pelly had this to say—

In Western Australia in the Pilbara area some very interesting iron ore deposits have been discovered in conjunction with Messrs. Hancock and Wright. Drilling has been commenced, and a proposal for the development of the area has been submitted to the Western Australian Government.

Ten Temporary Reserves of 50 square miles each have been granted to your Company and 24 further Reserves have been applied for as a result of our work in this area. Information has been received from Mr. Griffith, the Minister for Mines, Western Australia, that a recommendation to grant Temporary Reserves to this Company covering substantially the areas applied for will be considered today by the Executive Council.

Large deposits of iron ore have been located and although great problems exist in the development of this very isolated area, considerable further expenditure is considered justified in an effort to prove that an economic development is feasible.

Mr. Lang Hancock, a pioneer station owner in the Pilbara area, located the first of these deposits and this company has extended the discoveries over a considerable area. Our exploration team is to be congratulated on a fine effort of very imaginative prospecting which may well prove of Australian and world-wide significance, although a great deal of work will be necessary before the industrial value of these deposits may be assessed.

As a natural development arising from Rio Tinto's proposed merger with Consolidated Zinc Corporation Limited, we have invited Consolidated Zinc Pty. Ltd. and Kaiser Steel Corporation to be associated with us in the exploration and development of these iron ore deposits.

An examination of the economics of both an iron ore export business and also of a domestic industrial development will be made as and when the quantities and grades of the ore are established.

On our invitation, Mr. Thomas Price, Vice-President of Kaiser Steel Corporation, recently visited these deposits in the company of our own officers, together with Mr. Haddon King of Consolidated Zinc Pty. Limited. Both Mr. Price and Mr. King share our views of the potential of these deposits.

The proposal which the company put to the Government was that it would, out of its own funds, and without asking the Government for a single penny, expend £25,000,000. It would build its own port facilities; it would, without asking the

Government for a penny, build its own railway; and it would provide its own housing and hospitalisation.

Mr. Brand: In return for what?

Mr. TONKIN: In return for a lease of iron ore deposits at Duck Creek.

Mr. Brand: How big?

Mr. TONKIN: I do not know.

Mr. Brand: No.

Mr. TONKIN: But the Premier said there was no proposal.

Mr. Brand: I am just asking you how big.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes; and I am telling the Premier what he said. When he was asked straight out whether a firm proposal had been put to him he said, "No." Yet here is evidence that a proposal was put to the Government. Now one asks: Why the prevarication? Why was the proposal turned down? Surely because of the sinister influence of the Broken Hill Pty. Co. Ltd., which does not want a competitor in the field.

Mr. Court: Nonsense!

Mr. TONKIN: One must look for a very substantial reason which would justify the Premier standing up in his place—if he could be justified in such circumstances—and giving an unequivocal denial to a statement that a proposal had been submitted when, in fact, such a proposal had been submitted to the Government and was far beyond the negotiation stage. Just imagine the chairman of Rio Tinto telling his shareholders that a proposal had been submitted to the Government if no such proposal had ever been submitted! The thing is preposterous.

Mr. Court: What did he tell his shareholders?

Mr. TONKIN: He told them that a proposal for the development of the area—

Mr. Court: That is the difference.

Mr. TONKIN: —had been submitted to the Government. When we asked that the papers be tabled so that we could become aware of the nature of the proposals, we were told there were no proposals; that there were negotiations only; that the letters which followed were of a confidential nature; and that therefore, on those grounds, it was not proposed to table such papers.

I cannot imagine any circumstances at all that would justify the Premier giving a straight-out denial to the statement when, in fact, such a proposal had been submitted to the Government.

When the Premier would go to the length of doing that, one is obliged to look for a substantial reason for what he did; because here was a proposal which would not have cost the Government a shilling. The company was prepared to pay a royalty on the iron ore—a royalty, I have

no doubt, as much as, if not more than, the B.H.P. is paying for the iron ore reserves it has been given—to develop the north at a time when the pastoral industry was languishing and when we were crying out for something big to happen in our north-west. Here was a heaven-sent opportunity, but it was turned down; and we, in Parliament, were not told the facts of the situation. One might very well ask why it was necessary to cover up. Why could there not have been some frankness about the situation if the Government had its reasons for not agreeing to the proposals for the development of the north?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) (5.31 p.m.): When the clock stopped me a quarter of an hour ago I was dealing with the situation which developed at the West Northam State School, and particularly with the angle of the situation where the Minister for Works had told Parliament and the public that the roof of the school had been affixed to the building in a manner which was normal and which had been accepted in accordance with the standard relating to the affixing of roofs to State schools accepted throughout the years and in all parts of the State. Yet at West Northam we find, when the first heavy blow comes up, after the roof had been affixed, it leaves the building and finishes up in the school playing yard.

More recently, I asked the Minister for Works, by way of parliamentary questions, how many inspections of the building during the course of its construction had been carried out by the appropriate officers of the Public Works Department. To my amazement, the Minister replied: "None."

Here we have a situation in which the taxpayers provide all the money required to have these school buildings constructed and yet the Public Works Department—which is surely charged with the responsibility of ensuring that such buildings are solidly, faithfully, and safely constructed—does not make one inspection of the building during the course of its construction and, presumably, no inspection worth the name when the building is finally constructed.

Mr. Graham: Couldn't care less!

Mr. HAWKE: That seems to me to have established a very serious state of affairs in Western Australia in relation to the construction of Government buildings. This could apply not only to school buildings, but also to hospital buildings and other public buildings where the buildings in question are designed by a private architect and constructed by a private builder and contractor. Surely the taxpayers of the State—and I should think the Government itself—would wish to have some reasonable method of inspection by Public

Works officers of every Government building under construction, irrespective of whether the building is being built according to the design by the Government or by a private architect; irrespective of whether it is being constructed by a private builder or by the building organisation of the Public Works Department, if any such organisation is still functioning!

Under the present set-up, where a private architect does the designing, obviously the taxpayers and the Government have no protection except that which the private architect himself gives them. It does not matter how reliable, faithful, and skilful a private architect might be, it seems to me that with the construction of Government buildings—especially school buildings and hospitals—the taxpayers and the Government itself should have the protection of periodical inspections during the course of the construction of such buildings and should, of course, have the protection of an official, thorough inspection when the construction of such buildings has been completed.

There seems to have been something radically wrong with the methods used to affix the roof on the brick part of the new West Northam State School. There must be something radically wrong, something weak, something lacking, something incomplete because, on the day in question, when the roof was blown off, that part of Northam was not the worst affected by the blow. There was a much stronger wind—or winds—blowing in other parts of the town. I asked the Minister what damage, if any, had been suffered by other buildings in the West Northam area and he had to answer that no damage of any consequence had been suffered by other buildings. This new building should have stood up much better to the wind which was blowing then than other buildings in the locality because, judging by appearance, it would not take much to cause damage to the other buildings, most of which have verandahs, lattice work, and so on in their construction.

However, the wind was much stronger at that time in north Northam, because TV antennae were bent over in north Northam, but there was not one bent antenna on any house adjacent to the West Northam State School. I am extremely concerned about the safety of the schoolchildren, as well as being concerned about the interests of the taxpayers. I would be the last one in this Parliament to try to create any scare or try to bring about anything approaching panic or likely to cause panic, but I say the happening at the West Northam State School causes me a great deal of concern.

We know that under the policy of this Government other schools are being built under the same system, and additions to existing schools are being built under the same system. Presumably, some of the smaller hospitals are being built under the

same system, with no inspection whatsoever being made at any time during construction by any Public Works Department officer; no inspection of any kind worth mentioning being made at the completion of the construction job. What happened at West Northam could, in relation to Government buildings constructed under the same set of conditions, happen in other places. Further, it could happen on days when the children were at school, in contradistinction to the happening at West Northam when, fortunately, all the children were having a holiday because there was a Royal Show being staged in Perth.

So I am saying to the Government quite frankly that it should do something drastic about this. For instance, I would like to know who made the decision that officers of the Public Works Department, trained and skilled and with plenty of experience in safeguarding the construction of Government buildings should no longer be allowed even to enter and inspect buildings under construction where those buildings were designed by a private architect and constructed by a private builder. Who made the decision? Did the Government make it, or did the Minister for Works, on his own initiative, make it?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order! The Leader of the Opposition's time has expired.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [5.42 p.m.]: I am informed that if the Government had agreed to make the iron ore deposit I was discussing available to Rio Tinto the company would, after it had commenced the initial expenditure of £25,000,000, have proceeded to expend a further £40,000,000 in the establishment of a fully-integrated steel industry in the north. So the prospect for the Government was the immediate expenditure of £25,000,000 without its having to find a shilling, and the extremely good prospect that following fairly closely upon that initial investment was another investment of £40,000,000 on a fully-integrated steel industry in the north of Western Australia.

One does not require very much imagination fully to appreciate what such an investment would have meant to this State; and when one contrasts the way in which the Government fell over itself to encourage the Australian paper manufacturers to come here and the cost to the State of getting that company to accelerate its programme, one is completely mystified about the Government's attitude in connection with Rio Tinto's proposal, the circumstances of which the Premier denied.

Do not let us lose sight of that fact; namely, that to the properly-elected representatives of the people in this House the Premier stood up in his place and

unequivocally denied that a proposal for the development of the north had been submitted by Rio Tinto when, in fact—although I was not aware of it at the time—Mr. Blake Pelly, the Chairman of Rio Tinto (Aust.), had already informed his shareholders that a proposal had been submitted to the State Government.

No wonder the Premier conjured up the reason that the papers and discussions were confidential and semi-confidential! Apparently it was to enable him to avoid tabling a copy of the letter which Mr. Duncan, the world chief of Rio Tinto, had submitted to the Premier. Also, to characterise the situation as being one purely of negotiation followed by letters, was, I think, to misrepresent the true position which existed at the time and for which there can be no possible excuse or justification.

If a Government which carries on in that way has not forfeited the right to govern, I have yet to see a situation arising where one would. And a Government which is getting full publicity for its efforts to establish industry in Western Australia; making the most of every proposal that is put forward, but clouding this one in secrecy; refusing to make public any of the proposals or anything about them and, going even further by denying their very existence! I cannot imagine a worse situation for a responsible Government to be placed in, when it has to deny in Parliament something which had transpired, and about which members of the Government must have known and which eventually will become known to others. So one is obliged to look far afield to discover what might be a reasonable explanation for such reprehensible conduct.

Mr. Graham: For electioneering funds from the B.H.P.

Mr. TONKIN: The only possible explanation which I can deduce is that the Government does not want another fully-integrated steel industry in Western Australia, for the simple reason that such an industry would be in competition with the friend of this Government—the B.H.P.—which has received such magnificent treatment from it and from the McLarty-Watts Liberal-Country Party Government which preceded it. The initial handout of tremendous and valuable iron ore deposits to Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. was followed by further substantial handouts of iron ore deposits, without any proposals—such as those submitted by Rio Tinto in this case—being submitted; yet Rio Tinto, apparently, is turned down, and the Government refuses to tell the truth about the situation.

I think this is a dreadful position for the Government to be in. Its action is completely inexcusable, and it is a situation which must react most unfavourably to the State of Western Australia. How

can the Government claim to be governing in the interests of the people, particularly those in the north, when it turns down the proposition I have enumerated? The action of the Government is not understandable, unless there is some very strong reason in the background—and surely it has to be very strong.

Mr. Graham: The reason is party funds.

Mr. TONKIN: It has to be a very strong reason to cause the Cabinet to make a decision in that manner; that is, if all members of the Cabinet were aware of the situation.

Mr. Graham: For party funds.

Mr. Brand: Don't judge our party by what your party does!

Mr. Graham: Helping B.H.P. and people like Sir Halford Reddish.

Mr. TONKIN: Although I am not in a position to say anything definite, I wonder whether the Country Party members in Cabinet were aware of this situation, and whether the rank-and-file members were aware of it. It seems to me to be most remarkable that a stand of this kind, which inevitably deprives the north of a golden opportunity, should be taken in the way it was taken.

I refer to an article which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 18th July last in relation to this matter. It states as follows:—

Mr. Court said four main private enterprise groups were testing the Pilbara deposits.

They were the Rio Tinto-Consolidated Zinc-Kaiser Corporation syndicate, the Consolidated Gold Fields-Utah-Cyprus Mines syndicate, Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. and the Howe Sound Corporation of America, which is working with Garrick Agnew Pty. Ltd. of W.A.

All were anxious to hasten their proving programmes. It would take about 18 months for each to decide whether its deposit was of a size and quality to warrant immense capital outlay for exploitation.

Many millions of tons had already been proved.

Much of this had been proved by the Rio Tinto company. The article continues—

The Mt. Goldsworthy deposit, for which the Consolidated Gold Fields-Utah-Cyprus group had entered into an agreement with the State, called for capital expenditure of £12,500,000 when economic quantities had been proved.

This included £4,500,000 for a deep-water port to take 40,000-ton vessels and 120 miles of standard-gauge railway.

The ultimate result could be at least two new mining towns with new port developments.

There was not a word about the proposal submitted by Rio Tinto—a £25,000,000 proposal initially. If the Government could give details of the proposal of the Consolidated Gold Fields-Utah-Cyprus Group, why did it not give details of the proposal submitted by Rio Tinto? In fact, we were told there was no proposal from Rio Tinto.

Mr. Court: The one published was the agreement which resulted from the calling of public tenders.

Mr. TONKIN: We were told that there was no proposal from Rio Tinto, when in fact there was.

Mr. Hawke: The Minister for Railways wants to do the twist.

Mr. Court: I am setting out the facts.

Mr. TONKIN: This is what we are complaining about: We consider the situation calls for the immediate tabling of the actual proposal so that the people of Western Australia will be able to know the facts.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [5.50 p.m.]: In my mind there exists considerable doubt as to whether or not the Rio Tinto group of companies has, in fact, been given the co-operation it should have been given, in respect of its efforts in the north. It may be that the work of this group of companies has been overshadowed, somewhat, by the anxiety of the Government to set up the Mt. Goldsworthy development. From people with whom I have discussed this matter, I am aware that the Rio Tinto group has been given second place by this Government.

The Rio Tinto group is undertaking a considerable amount of testing work in the prospecting areas it holds in Duck Creek. To the best of my knowledge most of the testing undertaken up to date has proved to be reasonably satisfactory. I know, and I do not think the Government will deny the fact, that the Rio Tinto group has approached the Government with propositions from time to time. Why the Premier took the stand that a firm proposition had not been placed before the Government, I am unable to say. Why he takes the stand now—the same as the stand he took earlier—that the papers relating to the negotiations should not be tabled, I am at a loss to know.

If this Government is out to assist the Rio Tinto group it should be prepared to let the members of this Parliament know what stage the negotiations reached, and what are the possibilities of Western Australia having this company establish itself here, especially as we have been told by the spokesman of the group that it is prepared to establish a steel works in the

north-west after a certain amount of investigation has been undertaken, or at least to carry out investigations into the possibility of establishing in the north some form of integrated steel works.

The group of companies has made no secret of this matter, and the newspaper statements have been along the same lines. If the Government is convinced that what it is saying is not correct, there would be nothing wrong in its making a statement to that effect in this House. There is no point in the group proceeding with its testing unless the Government intends, at some time or another, to negotiate with it in accordance with the proposition which the Rio Tinto group was supposed to have placed before the Government.

Perhaps the Minister for the North-West can tell us—even if it is only by way of interjection—whether or not the Rio Tinto group interviewed him on this matter. Present at that interview, as far as I know, were the Premier and the Minister for Mines; and the spokesman for the Rio Tinto group requested some security of tenure in respect of the areas it was testing. At present the group holds only prospecting areas. I was given to understand that the group wanted some form of lease or agreement over those areas.

In effect, the Minister for the North-West was more or less instrumental in telling the representatives of the group very briefly to go to pot, and said he would do nothing about that matter. If my information is correct, then the Minister for the North-West should inform members during this debate about the position, or at least give us some information relating to the matter raised by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Court: I am sure the Rio Tinto people will not tell you that I told them to go to pot. They will tell you that they received the utmost courtesy from all Ministers of this Government.

Mr. BICKERTON: The term was not exactly "go to pot".

Mr. Court: They had the utmost consideration.

Mr. BICKERTON: When it was pointed out to me that the group required leases in order to give it some form of security, I understood the remark made by the Minister for the North-West was, "That is too bad".

Mr. Court: Who was telling you this?

Mr. BICKERTON: I shall not bother telling the Minister who it was.

Mr. Court: The executive of the Rio Tinto group will not confirm what you said.

Mr. BICKERTON: Perhaps the Minister can give us some idea what did take place as far as the Duck Creek iron ore deposits



are concerned. I know the group is carrying out a considerable amount of investigation, in addition to prospecting, into the establishment of port facilities and so on.

In respect of iron ore deposits and similar matters, members of this House have had to wait the maximum time before being given any information by the Government about what was going on. The same remark applies to the Mt. Goldsworthy agreement; and it was long after the tenders had been dealt with and the successful tender had been accepted that the Bill to ratify the agreement was brought before this House. When it was finally introduced, from a reading of the agreement and the debate which occurred I could not see why it took the Government such a long time to bring the matter before the House, and why the information relating to it, which was sought by way of questions, could not have been given.

A similar instance occurred only recently in respect of shipping to the north-west. Although that is a different matter, there again we know a report has been made by a person who has undertaken an investigation into State ships. To every question asked in this House concerning the tabling of the report, the Government said it would study the report and collate information; yet when the report was tabled in this House it was revealed that there was nothing to prevent it from being tabled much earlier in the session.

In regard to the iron ore deposits of this State there is considerable doubt whether the Government is doing the right thing by the Rio Tinto group of companies. If members cannot get information by way of questions from the Premier, to find out what is going on—such as the questions asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—surely some member of the Government should let us know what stage the negotiations have reached and what proposals were put forward by the Rio Tinto group; and further, whether they have been rejected; and, if so, the reasons why they were rejected. The people of Western Australia and the members of this House are entitled to that information.

If the Minister for the North-West or the Premier has that information, he should acquaint members with the reasons for the rejection of the proposals of the Rio Tinto group, and indicate to the House what steps are being taken to reopen negotiations with the object of ensuring that whatever benefits the company might bring to the northern portion of the State in working the iron ore leases will not be lost to Western Australia for all time.

If the Government does favour Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. in this matter—and that company holds a considerable number of leases in the vicinity of the prospecting areas held by the Rio Tinto group—I would not like to think that its purpose

is to protect the B.H.P., and to get rid of the Rio Tinto group because that group would be a company competing with the B.H.P. as far as the manufacture of steel in Western Australia is concerned.

The Government has listed the industries it has brought to this State; and we have seen how it is bending forward, and in some cases bending backwards, to establish industry here. In particular we have learnt about the conditions which the Government offered to the paper mill and to the Hawker Siddeley group to become established in Western Australia.

If such conditions can be handed out by the Government, surely every possible step should be taken and no stone should be left unturned to induce the Rio Tinto group to establish a permanent working organisation in the north-west for the betterment of that area, with the hope and desire to set up a steel works there, because we must, to get population, have secondary manufacturing industries. That is the only answer to the population problem in the north. It is very doubtful whether it is going to come from the Mt. Goldsworthy deposits. If it can be obtained by Rio Tinto, by all means we should obtain that industry in order to get the population into the area and to encourage further industry to associate itself with the iron ore deposits in the north-west.

Once again I request that the Premier, or the Minister for the North-West, be good enough at this particular stage to give us some information to let us know what stage these negotiations have reached; why the Government rejected Rio Tinto's proposal; and whether it is prepared to reopen negotiations with the object of obtaining the services of this company.

**MR. WILD** (Dale—Minister for Works) [6.1 p.m.]: The Leader of the Opposition has, without a doubt, endeavoured to scare the people in regard to what happened at Northam, not only by the questions he asked in this House but by a newspaper article attributed to him which was sent to me from Northam a few days ago. To the best of our ability we have given what we understand to be the facts. It is rather unfortunate that as I did not know this was coming on today I have not with me the file given to me yesterday in order that I might reply to this criticism. I replied to the criticism in the Northam paper a few days ago.

There is not a shadow of doubt that the incident was just an act of God—one of those things which happen. This type of thing occurs all over the place. As a matter of fact I was sitting here just now thinking of my own particular experience. Three or four years ago I had two sheds 100 ft. x 40 ft. on the same property within a matter of 50 yards of each other. They were built from the same plans by

the same builder, A high wind came and took the roof completely off one but did not touch the other.

I was not at Northam at the time of the occurrence to which the Leader of the Opposition referred; nor was he. However, I have no doubt that these disturbances do take place. Willy-willies—or call them what you like—do occur. High pressure winds sweep in and out; and if they get under a particular section of a roof, away it goes. Who is to say what caused it? I can only be advised by departmental officers, who made inquiries not only by talking to the local residents but by talking also to the headmaster who happened to be in the school at the time. I understand he was in his office. He says he heard a loud bang when the roof was lifted.

Subsequently, when officers from the electrical section of the Architectural Division went to have a look, they found a great, big, long, burnt wire which indicated to them that it had been struck by lightning. That was their considered opinion. These things just happen and there is nothing we can do about it.

The Leader of the Opposition asked why officers of the Public Works Department are not up there inspecting all the time. The policy of this Government is to endeavour to allocate as much of the work as it can to private architects and builders. When a contract is given we say, "I want you to build such and such a school or hospital"; and the person to whom the contract is let has to send to the department the plan he intends to put into operation.

It is not up to our officers, during the course of erection, to be on the spot acting as spies all the time. When the job is completed the architect says, "I now want a certificate in order that final payments may be made to the builder." At that stage officers of the division go out; and if they are satisfied that the building conforms to the original plan, the man is paid.

Mr. Jamieson: Is it not usual for inspections to be made periodically?

Mr. WILD: Not when the contracts are handed to architects and builders. We do not say to a man that we will pay him so much to do a job, and then inspect it all the time. If we get a man who falls down on the job he will not receive any future contracts.

Mr. Tonkin: How do you know when he is falling down on the job if you do not inspect the work?

Mr. WILD: The work is inspected when the job is completed. If anything goes wrong with the job the obvious thing to do is to tell him that his work is not up to standard and that he will not get another job. That is the same principle as is

adopted in commercial practice, and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows that.

The Leader of the Opposition was looking for a scapegoat because one of the questions he asked was—

What were the proportions of gravel, cement, sand, and so on in each block? and we gave the following answer:—

Standard mix of 4 : 2 : 1 was used. This means: 4 parts of metal, 2 parts of sand, 1 part of cement. There was no gravel used.

Mr. Tonkin: How do you know?

Mr. Jamieson: Did the architect certify that?

Mr. WILD: Does not the honourable member think that the architect would know?

Mr. Jamieson: He would know all right; but how do you know he told you?

Mr. WILD: When these contracts were let when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was Minister for Works—

Mr. Tonkin: Were they?

Mr. WILD: There were a lot of them—quite a lot.

Mr. Tonkin: Were there?

Mr. WILD: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition's Government did not have all the work done by day labour.

Mr. Tonkin: Most of it.

Mr. WILD: Not all of it; and I am saying that the Labor Government followed exactly the same principle as we are following today.

Mr. Tonkin: We didn't!

Mr. WILD: That is standard practice.

Mr. Tonkin: Oh no we didn't!

Mr. WILD: Does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition mean to say that if he took his motorcar to Winterbottoms for an overhaul he would stand there and watch the fellow doing the overhaul? Of course he wouldn't! He would say to the mechanic, "I want you to do a certain job."

Mr. Tonkin: We never left it to the architects.

Mr. WILD: When the job was completed he would pick it up and pay for it. If he was not satisfied with the job he would not take it back to the same firm on any future occasion.

Mr. Tonkin: We had inspections made during the progress of the work.

Mr. WILD: That was the practice of the Labor Government. It is not standard practice. It is not being done at present.

Mr. Tonkin: We know that.

Mr. WILD: If when a job is completed it is proved to be unsatisfactory, the person responsible does not get another contract. That is all there is to it.

I am not going to go through all the questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition, but without a doubt he was looking for a scapegoat. If an architect is educated at our University, he comes out fully trained. We then give him a job and he is responsible for drawing up the plans. These fellows are not fools. By the same token, he then lets the work out to a builder. I repeat: They are registered builders; and they are not fools either or they would not be working for the department.

It is completely unnecessary to look for a scapegoat like this. As I said at the beginning, I wish I had the final report today in order that I might reply to the Leader of the Opposition. However, the position is summed up in these few words: It was just an act of God—one of those things that happen. It would not have mattered whether the work had been done by day labour or private contract, no-one could have done anything about it. It was purely an act of God.

**MR. FLETCHER** (Fremantle) [6.9 p.m.]: On this subject I am not satisfied with the Minister's explanation. He says it was an act of God. If there is inferior workmanship—

**Mr. Wild:** And who is to say there is?

**Mr. FLETCHER:**—then I submit that—

**Mr. Wild:** I say: Who is to say there is bad workmanship?

**Mr. Jamieson:** That is what I want to know: Who is to say there is?

**The CHAIRMAN** (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order!

**Mr. Jamieson:** Evidently you are not prepared to accept the responsibility.

**The CHAIRMAN** (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order!

**Mr. Wild:** I am prepared to accept as much responsibility as you are.

**Mr. Jamieson:** You are the most irresponsible Minister—

**The CHAIRMAN** (Mr. I. W. Manning): I would ask members to keep order.

**Mr. FLETCHER:** I submit that if there is inferior workmanship being performed by private enterprise, then it is aiding and abetting, making easier an act of God.

**Mr. Court:** We might be good but not that good.

Several members interjected.

**Mr. Court:** I do not think God will thank you for that one!

**The CHAIRMAN** (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order! The member for Fremantle may continue.

**Mr. FLETCHER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman! To illustrate the point I was attempting to make—I wish the Minister would stop coughing.

**Mr. Rowberry:** That is an act of God, too.

**Mr. FLETCHER:** What I am attempting to say is that if the quality of the concrete in which a support was anchored was not up to standard, then a strong wind could conceivably lift that support out of its foundations. Why blame God for something for which—

Several members interjected.

**Mr. FLETCHER:** I wish the interjectors would stop! Why blame God for something for which private enterprise was responsible?

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

**Mr. FLETCHER:** To further illustrate my point I wish to state that I have worked on big projects, for the construction of which private enterprise was responsible. With regard to the concrete, samples were sent weekly to the University for testing. A sample was supposed to have been taken from each day's mixings. In actual fact the samples were poured to correct mixture at the end of the week. I myself knew those samples were from the one day and not from each day of the week.

**Mr. O'Connor:** Did you report it?

**Mr. FLETCHER:** That was not my responsibility. We were the victims then of a Government similar to that which we have today. I am referring to the power house at Fremantle, and the Government was the McLarty-Watts Government. The work was given to private enterprise on a cost-plus basis. A portion of the work had been done by day labour. The Minister was right when he stated that not all the work done during the regime of the Labor Party was done by day labour. Some of it was done by private enterprise.

However, the work performed by day labour was faultless, particularly the work on the concrete entrances of the water intake. That was splendid workmanship, performed by our architects from the department. The engineering and architectural work done by our department on that project was splendid. On the other hand I witnessed the incident which I have just related.

It is quite reasonable to assume that a private contractor on any other work would adopt methods similar to those adopted by the private firm in the construction of the power house. If faulty material is used, that would make an act of God more likely.

The State Housing Commission has inspectors to go around inspecting the work on all buildings. I have seen that being done. It has been claimed by the contractors that the State Housing Commission, in effect, persecutes them. I think that is a desirable state of affairs. These inspections should be made regularly.

But that is not so if work is being done by private enterprise, such as was the case with the school at Northam. Why should not the private architects and

builders be subjected to the same supervision as the builders attached to the department? The work of our own builders is supervised and so should the work performed by private enterprise be supervised.

Mr. Wild: The Public Works Department supervises the work because it is done by its own architects.

Mr. FLETCHER: The point is that this Government has more confidence in private enterprise than we have. It is anxious to make donations to private architects instead of giving the work to the department's architects who can do the work quite competently.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. FLETCHER: I had one other point to make when we suspended for tea in support of my contention that the damage to the West Northam School was not an act of God but inferior workmanship or, alternatively, inferior design on the part of the architects responsible for the building of the school. In support of his contention, the Minister said that a burnt length of electric wire was found amongst the wreckage. It is quite convenient to put on it the construction that the damage was presumably caused by lightning. It could quite as easily have been that this electric wire was alive after the wind had removed the roof and a short circuit could have occurred in the length of wire and burnt the insulation prior to the fuse blowing.

The case I have put forward is just as reasonable as the one put forward by the Minister. He said that officers of his department assumed, as a consequence of this burnt wire, that it was an electrical storm or a bolt of lightning that removed the roof of the building. I submit that my explanation is just as reasonable. The Minister finds it convenient to believe his story for the purpose of trying to imply that it was not poor workmanship which caused the damage.

To illustrate my point, I mentioned earlier that inferior concrete was used in portion of the South Fremantle power station. Samples that were supposed to have been taken during the week were all poured on the one day at the one pouring and they were supposed to represent up-to-standard pourings of every day of the week at various parts of the establishment.

Mr. Brand: Did you have any evidence that inferior concrete was being poured at the time?

Mr. FLETCHER: No. As I said earlier, if supports were mounted in inferior concrete it would be quite possible for foundation bolts to be lifted out of the inferior mounting. Or, alternatively, if the roof, through poor design, was insecurely bolted on to columns that had not been supervised by building inspectors, then a strong wind could remove the roof from the supports.

For the reasons I have outlined, I believe that our leader's criticism is quite justified in the circumstances and I do not accept the Minister's contention in regard to the reason why that roof was blown off.

MR. ROWBERRY (Warren) [7.35 p.m.]: I would also like to comment on the attitude of the Minister towards this catastrophe which happened at Northam. I reject absolutely his approach that it was an act of God. Purely, this is blasphemy, to think that God would act in such a way as to take away the roof of a school at Northam and let every other building in Northam escape scot-free. The Minister's contention that the Leader of the Opposition is looking for a scapegoat is also a very poor one. I should imagine that what the Leader of the Opposition had in mind would be to have a full inquiry into all the circumstances so that such a tragedy would not happen again, and not merely have it put down to an act of God. That is just too easy a way out of it.

We know what the phrase "act of God" means in certain Statutes and certain insurance policies. Briefly, it means a circumstance, or a set of circumstances, over which human beings have no control and which their knowledge, ingenuity, or efficiency have been unable to prevent; and that is why we are discussing this question. Did this happening occur because there were circumstances over which human beings had no control, or could it have been because of faulty workmanship?

The Minister makes it difficult when he says that to appoint an architect to make periodic inspections of the work in progress is tantamount to spying or pimping, or something low. I reject that contention too, because there is only one way of finding out how a building is being constructed and whether it is being constructed according to plans and specifications. The architect is responsible not only for the plans but for the specifications as well, which not only cover the materials used, but also include the workmanship that is employed in the use of these materials. Unless we have periodic inspections, how can we possibly hope to discover these things?

The Minister's analogy about putting a motorcar in a garage for a total overhaul and not standing over the workman all the time he was working on the motorcar, was a pretty inept simile too. In this case it was not the repair of a building; it was the construction of one. In the construction of a motorcar every part is inspected minutely before being assembled. So there again his contention falls down.

I have been employed in bridge building in the timber industry, and I can remember carrying out major repairs to a certain bridge which carried trains bringing logs into a mill. The bridge had been

built by a contractor. In its construction, the piles had been placed in position, and over the top of these were pieces of timber about five feet long called corporals, and on top of the corporals were butted the main joists of the bridge.

We found the main joists of the bridge were not bolted to the main structure at all. Instead of putting 4 ft. or 5 ft. bolts right through the whole structure, the contractor—to save time and gain more profit—had bored a hole from the top about 12 inches into the timber and driven a broken bolt into the hole and had bored a hole about nine inches into the bottom of the structure and driven another bolt in from the bottom and made it appear that the bolt went from the top to the bottom. The whole of that bridge was held by the force of gravity and trains were running over it three or four times a day carrying logs to the mill. It was an act of God in that case that a major accident did not happen.

So I contend that the Minister will have to alter his attitude towards contract work when he says it is not necessary for an architect to make periodic inspections of all works under construction, because it is absolutely necessary in my opinion. I would like to finish on this note: If we have the safety of these children, and the safety of the teachers and all who use school buildings—or any other public buildings—at heart then we will agree with the Leader of the Opposition that something ought to be done about this matter of the West Northam School.

**MR. NORTON (Gascoyne) [7.41 p.m.]**: Like the previous speaker, I think the explanation given by the Minister for Works regarding the school at Northam is a very poor one. If a building is properly supervised and properly constructed, there is no danger of the roof blowing off. We have had experience at Carnarvon, where we probably have far stronger winds than are ever experienced at Northam. Our school and hospital were built under Public Works Department architectural supervision, and they suffered very little from the cyclone we had two years ago.

To give members some idea of the force of the wind, I would point out that there is a concrete tank about 25 ft. across standing very close to the school and containing a sunken roof. This roof was built of karri girders which crossed the whole of the tank. With the roof girders, it was estimated that the weight of the roof was approximately  $3\frac{1}{2}$  tons. The cyclone was so strong that it lifted the roof completely out of the tank and landed it alongside the school. So it can be seen that the force of the wind, when it lifted this weight out of the tank, would have been the same at the school.

The school is a cement brick building, well constructed under Public Works Department architectural supervision by a

private contractor, and the only damage to the school was a few loose tiles. The reason the tiles were loose was that the normal practice of tying every second or third tile was followed. Had every tile been tied, I do not think any would have been out of position.

The same thing happened with respect to the Carnarvon Hospital which is a building erected under similar conditions. No damage was done in spite of the terrific winds that occurred there. Yet many other buildings in the same area lost their roofs. Others were blown down, and damaged generally; but the workmanship that was put into the school and the hospital under the supervision of the Public Works Department architects was a credit to them.

I think that if the same supervision had been carried out with respect to the West Northam School, the roof would still be intact. I would strongly discount any theory which would involve an explosion capable of blowing the roof off the school in the manner shown by pictures in the paper. The cyclonic winds that have a terrific updraft have more chance of shifting a roof in that manner than any other type of storm experienced throughout the State.

During the past 12 months two reports have been submitted to us with respect to the north-west. One has had quite a lot of publicity, and that is the State Shipping Service report by Captain Williams. I think it is quite a good report. But it is astounding to me to think that any man who was paid to do a job—and paid well to do it—should not have visited and taken evidence at every port with which the State Shipping Service is concerned.

Whilst I do not know what time Captain Williams spent in other ports, I do know he omitted to visit Carnarvon, Onslow, and Roebourne. I am not in a position to speak regarding Onslow and Roebourne, but I am in respect of Carnarvon, and I know that the people there were waiting to see Captain Williams and were willing to give quite an amount of information concerning the State Shipping Service.

It has been said that the State Shipping Service has been losing a considerable tonnage of cargo for Carnarvon over the past few years, and since the bitumen road was constructed. But is it the good road which has caused such a drop in shipping tonnage from Fremantle to Carnarvon? That has something to do with it; but people are not going to pay the higher road freights if they can have their goods transported by sea at a cheaper rate. So there must be some other reason why the amount of goods shipped to and from Carnarvon has dropped off; and if Captain Williams had taken evidence at Carnarvon, as had been expected, he would have found the answer.

Actually there are several reasons for it. One of the main reasons is that the State ships are scheduled to call at various

ports and Carnarvon is included; but invariably a day or two before a ship is scheduled to sail the master is directed to deviate from Carnarvon, and thus no cargoes are picked up. This means that any person who has goods scheduled to travel by the State ships is forced to have those goods removed from the Fremantle wharf and transferred to Bassendean to be sent by road.

Also a good many perishable commodities are required by the people of Carnarvon. They would prefer to have them transported by ship at less than half the freight rate, but they are forced to have them sent by road because of the uncertainty of the State ships scheduled for Carnarvon. I understand it costs approximately 2d. per lb. extra to send perishables by road instead of by ship.

If Captain Williams had called at Carnarvon and taken evidence he would have found that the pastoralists in the district had quite a lot to say regarding the State Shipping Service. They would have pointed out that the export of sheep was one point which should be looked at, and also the export of wool to London markets. This wool used to go via Singapore. He would have found that the grocers in the district had quite a lot to say, and also the planters and market gardeners on the river. They all could have put up a very good case in regard to continuing the State Shipping Service schedules to Carnarvon, and the need for a better service generally.

Nobody wants to pay higher freights, and that is why the people wish to send as much as they can by ship. However, as the shipping service is not regular or reliable, the people there are forced to have their commodities carried by road transport.

Another matter that has come to my notice since Captain Williams's report was submitted is this: Two officers from the Transport Board visited Carnarvon; and one would have thought that when two such officers were going through the north-west making an inquiry in regard to transport they would go to the people most concerned. But, strange as it may seem, the only person they called to see in Carnarvon was the wharfinger, and they spent only a short time with him.

They called to see him to find out about shipping; and why the Transport Board officers wanted to find out something about shipping, I do not know. Also, I do not know why they went to see the wharfinger in this regard when the State Shipping Service has an official agent in the town. That agent is on the staff of the State Shipping Service—he is not a commission agent but a direct agent.

However, despite that fact, these two officers from the Transport Board did not call on him. Also, they did not call on the council, the road board, the pastoralists' association, or any other associations

interested in transport. They merely called on the wharfinger to get a little bit of information about shipping. One would have thought that at least they would have gone to see the local authorities to let them know what they were doing, and so that arrangements could be made for the fullest information possible to be tendered by the various interested bodies—and believe me, there would have been quite a few!

Higher shipping freights and fares will not affect Carnarvon as much as the other ports further north, and I will leave it to other members from the north-west to discuss that aspect. Even with higher freights and fares the rates will still be cheaper than road transport; and if the State Shipping Service were to give a regular service, which could be relied upon, I know the tonnage of cargo carried would soon increase and return to what it used to be a few years ago.

There was one point I noticed in the report—although it is only a minor point—which showed how little information Captain Williams got about Carnarvon. He mentioned that the cattle shipments from Carnarvon had fallen off considerably over the past few years, and all cattle were now being transported by road to Perth. The extraordinary thing is that in the area around Carnarvon there are only approximately 400 head of cattle in the whole district. For many years cattle in large numbers have not been shipped from Carnarvon; there might have been an odd beast or two—perhaps half a dozen at a time—but there has never been sufficient cattle in the district around Carnarvon to supply the local butcher.

I can only think that Captain Williams was referring to stock being shipped from the Pilbara, because quite a lot of cattle have been sent by road from Pilbara to Perth over the past year or two, since the Onslow Jetty was blown away. These beasts might have been coming down by road before; but I have not noticed it, although over the past 12 months or so many have been transported by road from Pilbara through Carnarvon to Geraldton and Perth for sale.

If Captain Williams had looked at everything connected with the State Shipping Service in the north-west, as he should have done, a full and comprehensive report could have been obtained in regard to each port, and probably the report would have been more helpful to the people in the north-west. According to his recommendations those towns in the north-west which are now served by a good road should be gradually removed from the State Shipping Service list so that eventually road transport can take over. I am wondering whether his intention is that the Government should throw open roads generally to road transport so that all goods will have to be sent by rail

to Geraldton, and then transferred to trucks to be carted on to the various towns; or whether it is the intention that vehicles are to be pickabacked to Geraldton and then driven on from there.

I do not know what he has in mind in this regard, but it is evident from one of his recommendations that Carnarvon should eventually be closed as a port, and apparently Onslow is to share the same fate. However, if Captain Williams had made an inspection of the district, and investigated the fishing and other industries there, he would have found reasons why Carnarvon should remain on the State Shipping Service list, and why it should be developed as a port.

I hope that, in the near future, these industries will be looked at because it will be seen that it is essential to encourage the development of this port, and at least a regular service, even if it is only a fortnightly one, should be guaranteed. If the State Shipping Service could guarantee that, there is no doubt it would be able to increase the tonnage of cargo carried to and from Carnarvon.

The other report which interested me was the one by Mr. G. K. Baron Hay on the administration of the north-west region of Western Australia. I must congratulate him on his report, because I think it is one which the Minister would have written himself; in fact, I would say that the Minister himself could have not done a better job, because Mr. Baron Hay set out exactly what the Minister has been saying over the years since he has been the Minister for the North-West. From what I can see of the report, and from the way I read it, it has been written simply to please the Minister.

The first 15 pages are devoted to the history of the north-west, setting out the names of the men who have been Ministers for the North-West, and statistical information regarding the population and the disabilities being suffered because of the long distances involved. There are only 23 pages in the whole report, and yet 15 of them are used in that way. On the 16th page he has his major recommendation, and that is set out in graph form. He visualises that the north-west will be administered by an administrator; that there will be a Minister for the North-West with a liaison officer; and from there the department will branch out into two sections, one of which will be the headquarters section in Perth—which will be the North-West Planning Authority—the other having its headquarters in Broome. However, I understand that has now been altered to one of the other towns and the administrator will be in charge of that section.

He will have a senior assistant, who will be secretary of the council. The idea is to form three councils—one for the Kimberleys, one for the north-west, and the other

for the Pilbara area. That appears to be quite a good idea. But let us have a look at the constitution of the council for the north-west, which is the area embracing Carnarvon.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn) [7.58 p.m.]: I rise to make a few brief remarks on this Bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): We are dealing with a motion.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Firstly, I would like to know from the Premier whether any discussions have taken place with employers of this State regarding an amendment to the Industrial Arbitration Act to alter the basis of the State basic wage to make it conform to the Federal basic wage.

It is well known that the State basic wage at present is higher than the Federal basic wage, and some reference has been made by the Grants Commission, I understand, with respect to a penalty being imposed on Western Australia. As far as I know, this is the first time this matter has been raised by the Grants Commission, although it has been in operation for over 20 years.

Mr. Brand: The wage has not always been higher.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: No; the wage may not always have been higher. But at present it is higher; and I am sounding a note of warning to the trade unions of this country to be on the alert and to resist any attempt by this Government, either directly or in collaboration with the Commonwealth Government, to bring the State basic wage down to the Federal basic wage. It would be incumbent, as I see it, on the Government to introduce a requisite amendment; because under the State Industrial Arbitration Act it is specifically set out that the basic wage shall be determined annually, or when the court decides to have an exhaustive inquiry, and to effect quarterly adjustments at its discretion and in accordance with the changes of the cost-of-living index figures. I would like to know whether the Government has any intention at this stage of doing anything in the direction I have indicated. At the same time I sound a note of warning to the industrial movement of Western Australia to be on its guard.

I would now like again to urge the Government to complete the job it has set out to do in connection with the natives of this community. Recently we had before us two Bills which removed certain barriers from the natives of Western Australia. But as the member for Balcatta indicated the other night, other barriers still exist. For instance, they do not enjoy, and will not enjoy if the position remains as it is, full citizenship rights. I think

the time has arrived—indeed I think it is overdue—when any existing barriers set out in the Statutes of this State, should be removed. If this were done the section of the community to which I refer would enjoy full citizenship rights.

I am leading up to the point that representation should be made to the Commonwealth on this question. The other evening I asked the Premier to make strong and continued representations to the Commonwealth Government, with a view to a referendum being held in Australia to repeal section 127 which, at present, excludes natives from the counting in the Commonwealth census—particularly as these figures determine the representation that each State has in the Commonwealth Parliament. Had that been done earlier there is no doubt in my mind that Western Australia would not be faced with the position of having its representation in the Commonwealth Parliament reduced from nine members to eight.

Since discussions took place during this session in regard to water rates—about which most members have heard something—I have been inundated with telephone calls and requests from members of my electorate—which is a metropolitan electorate—concerning this very important matter. They have expressed grave concern; and I have been repeatedly asked if anything can be done. All I have been able to tell the ratepayers of my electorate is that they can appeal to the appeal authority. Of course, I have some idea of what would follow; but that is the only redress they have. They have asked me to raise this question again in Parliament before the session concludes. They have pointed out that there have been severe increases in rates.

I believe—and this statement has not yet been contradicted; and I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition made the statement—that as a result of the basis on which the rates are assessed, ratepayers in the metropolitan area are subjected to an arbitrary increase of 25 per cent. In addition, where revaluations have been effected, the annual rental value in many cases has risen very steeply; and, consequently, the majority of the ratepayers in my electorate have been faced with two increases. Their position, of course, is in common with that of ratepayers in other parts of the metropolitan area.

There has been a tremendous increase in rates, and this has been made more pronounced—if that is at all possible—by the fact that some few months ago the ratepayers received an assessment from their council—and most of my electorate is in the Perth City Council and Perth Shire Council areas—for a period of eight months; and then recently in the change-over of the financial year, they received other rate notices.

I can quote cases of people who have been obliged to pay £16 on the first rate notice, and who were then faced with an assessment notice of £24 and £25 later in the year. These are working people for the most part, and naturally they find it very difficult to meet these commitments. Quite apart from the rate notices which they received from the Perth City Council, they also received rate notices from the Water Supply Department, almost concurrently; and every case I have investigated has shown a steep increase in these water rates.

So I again make my protest on behalf of the electors I have the honour to represent; and I do so in spite of the fact that the Premier said—and he was backed by his Minister—that it was not the Government's intention to use the Act relative to water supply as a taxing measure. I make this protest because the people of the metropolitan area have a different idea; since it is evident that the attitude of the Government has been one of altering the purpose of the Water Supply Department and the relevant Act which governs it, and of using it as a taxing machine rather than a means to balance the budget.

I hope that even at this late stage the Government will do something to relieve the ratepayers of this added burden, which they can ill afford to carry. On the 16th October I asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government the following question:—

- (1) Is it proposed to amend the Local Government Act to provide for payment of rates in two instalments?
- (2) If not, will he give an assurance that no local authority will take legal action against any ratepayer who elects to pay rates in two instalments as was permitted previously?

I received the following reply:—

- (1) No.
- (2) No. It is the concern of each individual council, which can make by-laws permitting payment by instalments if it so desires. In any case, it is unlikely that a council would take action against a person paying by instalments if the person concerned had approached the council on the subject first . . .

I would like the Minister to convey to the Minister for Local Government the suggestion that a very definite statement be made; because many of the ratepayers—and I have been in contact with quite a number during the last few weeks—are most concerned, as they feel it is necessary for them to pay local authority rates in one instalment.



A number of these people are on the basic wage—in some cases they receive a small margin. But they are rearing their families, and they are faced with these obligatory charges which it is not financially possible for them to meet. A statement by the Minister might clarify the position, and give them some peace of mind.

In conclusion, I hope the Government will do something with regard to native citizenship, with a view to removing the barriers that still exist. I also hope the Government will make strong recommendations to the Commonwealth Government to hold a referendum at the earliest possible moment in order that the obnoxious section 127 of the Commonwealth Constitution might be repealed.

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough—Treasurer) [8.10 p.m.]: It looks as if we are going to be here until rather late; so perhaps I had better add my word to what has already been said. The Minister for Works has replied to the Leader of the Opposition in the matter of the West Northam School.

**Mr. H. May:** He tried to.

**Mr. BRAND:** The Minister did explain the position; and his opinion, and knowledge, and information were just as well founded and as authentic as what was supplied from the other side. It seems that some people feel—and I am glad to say it is only some people who feel—that whatever information is given from this side should be looked upon with suspicion and doubt. I presume the Minister for Works has given his explanation to the House, based on reports he received from his department, and as a result of the observations of those people who have looked at the problem since.

I have no doubt that action will be taken to strengthen the weaknesses, if any were found in such a structure. I also hope that the private architects themselves will do all they can—if any weakness has been discovered in any of their planning—to see that such a thing does not occur again.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that the committee was going to refuse supply because a proposal which had been put to the Government by Rio Tinto had been turned down; when, in fact, it was a very attractive proposition involving—I think he said—£25,000,000 in the first place, and £40,000,000 subsequently; and including such works as railways, harbours, development of townsites; and indeed, generally, work along the lines of the agreement made between the Government and the trio of companies involved in the Mt. Goldsworthy agreement.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked me a question without notice, as to whether a firm proposal had been received from Rio Tinto. The question involved quite a number of points; and I suppose I was unwise in endeavouring to

answer the question, of which I had no notice at all. I should have asked for the question to be put on the notice paper. As I explained, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was quite free to do that.

**Mr. Tonkin:** Are you seriously suggesting you required notice of a question as to whether you received a proposal or not?

**Mr. BRAND:** Yes; I should have given this matter further consideration. In my opinion the company referred to did not reach the point of putting a firm proposal to the Government on a basis that could be considered; because at that time the iron ore development was such that it was attracting the attention of people overseas, and also in Australia. It appeared at the time that it would be a very lucrative business; and indeed, from the angle of trading with Japan, a business that would develop very quickly.

However, owing to certain economic problems in Japan, the situation at present is not as clear as it was then. Japan has dampened down her economy, and her people are not buying the ore, or committing themselves to buy the ore, at the rate we might have anticipated at that time.

**Mr. Bickerton:** That seems to have been Sir Arthur Fadden's idea two or three years ago. He said the Japanese were not interested.

**Mr. BRAND:** I do not know about that. All I know is that the Government had a huge area which was believed at that time to be quite rich in iron ore of varying grades. In calling tenders for those areas the Government had laid down certain conditions.

The company, Rio Tinto, discussed with us in the first place proposals which were such that the Government could not accept them, for the simple reason that the area involved, which it was pleased to term a "pentagon"—an area with five sides—was so large that it seemed to us we were handing over the major portion of the Pilbara area to one company.

**Mr. Moir:** Like Yampi!

**Mr. BRAND:** The company suggested it would do certain things in return, but the Government never did reach a point where it seriously considered what could have been a firm proposal. As a matter of fact, the Government was anxious to avoid placing in the hands of one company this huge area when there were others—

**Mr. Moir:** That is something new!

**Mr. BRAND:** —who were interested. An American company known as Howe Sound which is represented here by a firm which I think is known as Basic Materials Co. Pty. Ltd. put proposals forward—proposals which involved processing; and similar ideas to those which have been put forward from time to time by other companies interested in iron ore, including Rio

Tinto. So it was that the Government decided it would allocate certain areas, all of which were known to be very rich and which, I might remind the Committee, had proved to be carrying a greater quantity of iron ore than was ever anticipated.

The late Mr. Price, who came here representing his company—Kaiser Steel in America—said he did not imagine that so much iron ore could exist in one area; and he went on to explain to us that the area which had been granted by the Government to Rio Tinto as temporary reserves with sole right to prospect could provide the future iron ore requirements to Europe for many years to come. I might add that Mr. Price did say he could not see the development of a steel industry in the immediate future.

Mr. Davies: Why not?

Mr. BRAND: I cannot say. He simply stated that the establishment of a further integrated iron and steel industry in Australia at the present time was not an economic proposition; and he referred to the processing which could be carried on in order to develop the iron ore and purify it and so avoid the costly business of transporting the crude iron ore as it came out of the ground.

As a matter of fact, no final decision has been made by the Government on any proposal as yet. The conditions of these leases involve each company in putting forward propositions. They have two years in which to test the area and prove it and then to put up firm proposals as to what they would like to do in return for those leases.

Mr. Davies: Does Rio Tinto want any testing time?

Mr. BRAND: I could not say. That company has the two years, as has each of the other lessees. I can assure members there is nothing mysterious about this; and certainly there was no decision on the part of the Government to protect B.H.P. or any other company—none whatsoever, as will be proved in the future because there is sufficient iron ore of quality and quantity in areas approximately 150 miles away from the coast, and some deposits are very much closer.

Mr. Toms: Have these all been developed in the last four years?

Mr. BRAND: They were discovered in the last two years.

Mr. Hawke: Not according to Senator Spooner.

Mr. BRAND: As a matter of fact, they are discovering more and more iron ore every day; and whilst Senator Spooner made a statement that there were approximately 2,000,000,000 tons of iron ore, the latest report of the Mines Department would indicate that there are over

2,000,000,000 tons. In fact, the department stated it is difficult to assess the tonnage of iron ore to be found in the area.

Mr. Rowberry: Was not Senator Spooner reported to have said this deposit has been known to exist for the past 10 years?

Mr. BRAND: This deposit, but not the quantity of iron ore in it. Deposits have been known to exist for many years—deposits such as those at Mt. Jackson and many other places.

Mr. Fletcher: They will disappear when we take office.

Mr. BRAND: These deposits have never been tested and checked. However, hundreds of thousands of pounds are being spent at the present time in proving the amount of iron ore and the quality of the iron ore in those areas. At the end of the two years, or before, the companies which already have these leases will no doubt come forward with propositions which we can decide upon, not forgetting that the majority opinion is that to establish another iron and steel industry in Western Australia at this stage would be an uneconomic proposition.

Mr. Bickerton: They do not hold leases, do they?

Mr. BRAND: We can expect development in the form of processing such as palletisation and the process of sponge iron. It is all very well for the Leader of the Opposition to moan or groan, but these are the processes which will follow before we finally get another industry which could be described as a fully integrated iron and steel industry.

The Government has left no stone unturned in order to speed up the development of the iron ore field in Pilbara; and I come back to the supposed proposition of Rio Tinto itself by saying that the proposals and suggestions discussed around the office table—and these could be found in part in the number of letters passed to and fro—were not a firm proposition from the Government's point of view. The proposals which the company put forward involved taking over such a large area from the wealthy Pilbara section of the State that we could never have justified the action of the Government in accepting any proposition.

Sufficient iron ore has been leased by the Government to these companies to enable them to develop an iron and steel industry in Western Australia by stages as the economy will allow.

Mr. Bickerton: I understand they have not got leases—they have a prospecting area.

Mr. BRAND: They have prospecting leases under which they will prospect, test, and prove the areas; and at the end of two years, or earlier, they can come to the

Government with certain proposals stating what areas they actually wish to mine and then carry on.

Mr. Bickerton: Do they automatically get these areas if after two years they are satisfied with them?

Mr. BRAND: No; of course they do not. In this way the Government has enabled the prospecting and proving of a huge area of the Pilbara which would not have been done and could not have been done by Government departments. I believe that the very fact that we took this action and allowed private companies to go out and prospect and prove the area of iron ore will turn out to be one of the finest decisions made in respect of prospecting for minerals in Western Australia.

I want to say to the member for Mt. Hawthorn there is no intention whatever to reduce the State basic wage to the level of that of the Commonwealth. There have been no discussions of any kind. However, it is a fact, as I mentioned in the Budget speech, that the average basic wage of New South Wales and Victoria—the two States taken as a standard—is slightly smaller than that of Western Australia. I think it is a matter of 4s. 9d.

Mr. Jamieson: What about the average earnings in those States?

Mr. BRAND: I cannot talk about the average earnings in either of those States; I can only go on the conditions; and the honourable member would see that the Grants Commission has taken the average of the two standard States, and Western Australia has suffered an adverse adjustment in respect of its disability grant which is made this year. I want to assure members there is no intention whatsoever of the State Government reducing the State basic wage to the level of the Commonwealth. Nor has there been any discussion in respect of this matter.

On the question of natives, as was pointed out by the Minister the other night, we are making real progress in respect of the problem of educating, training, and improving the standard of living of natives. It would seem to me that the time is not far off when serious consideration can be given to going a stage further in respect of this matter.

Mr. Hawke: Not long!

Mr. BRAND: Having granted voting rights to natives, it would seem that a very close examination should be made of the situation so that ultimately we can give them full citizenship rights.

MR. HALL (Albany) [8.28 p.m.]: We have heard the Treasurer speaking of the Pilbara area. I would like to ask him why something has not been done in the south as regards ilmenite sand. We have heard a lot about what has happened in the south-west corner of the State; and during the course of the debate we have come

across this company of Hancock, Moore & Jackson, which is also in the north-west. I think it has carried out extensive surveys and tests, but it has done very little about them, and it is strongly suspected that the company does not intend to do anything until it can find a lucrative market. That means that the south corner at Albany has been totally neglected.

I previously asked questions on this matter, as I think these things should be brought forcefully to the notice of the Treasurer. The Government says it is pressing on with a decentralised programme and that small industries will be established in decentralised areas. If it is successful in its attempt, it will have made gigantic strides. I believe this company took over the interests of Griffin Colliers controlled by Fernie.

I have made some research through the geological branch of the Mines Department. I find that the reserves are there. The ilmenite deposits are secure. However, nothing has been done about them; and I do not think anything will be done unless we light a bomb under the Government.

A new company has been formed with a capital of £700,000, and this company is to be established in the south-west corner of the State. We have the spectacle of an industry which is soundly established going into the manufacture of titanium from ilmenite. That company is La Porte Titanium. However, that is industry, and that is progress.

Why have not these sands been used in the South? They show a lucrative return to the State, and I can prove that. Although extensive examinations of ilmenite deposits have been carried out at Cheyne Beach, nothing further has been done. Messrs. Hancock Prospecting Pty. Ltd., Frank Albert Moore, and Phillip Robert Jackson hold the dredging claims in this area, and I believe that Mr. Jackson has other claims in the Torbay area.

The Minister said that in 1958, 89,926 tons were exported from this State at an estimated f.o.b. value of £448,218. Other years' figures were: 1959, 73,628 tons at an estimated f.o.b. value of £353,076; in 1960, 114,662 tons, f.o.b. value £485,562; in 1961, 123,538 tons, f.o.b. value £557,889; in 1962, —to the 30th June—69,868 tons, f.o.b. value £303,196.

Those figures must prove conclusively to the Government that the industry could be built up in the south-west and would show a lucrative return. I do not see why every effort should not be made to develop the industry in another area. We were led to believe it was not sufficiently lucrative, but it has been proved that the mineral sands have a place in the world's markets. Although these sands are being developed in one corner of the State, I see

no reason why they should not be developed in another. Figures prove that it would be a sound economic proposition.

I now wish to direct a point to the Minister for the North-West. I missed this matter when the item on tourists was discussed in the debate on the Estimates. I give the Minister credit for getting down to detail on this particular matter. I asked him whether the Government had given consideration to providing a coastal passenger-cargo service between Fremantle, Bunbury, Albany and Esperance. The Minister replied that there was insufficient traffic to warrant re-establishing a south coastal service to ports which enjoy regular rail services.

Whilst I might agree with the Minister to a certain extent, I must say I think he missed the real point of what I intended to impart to his knowledgeable brain. I would point out that there has been a falling off in Eastern States tourist and cargo ships, and we are endeavouring to build up the tourist trade in this State. I see no reason why we could not have inter-port tourists and cargo ships, by means of which passengers could be disembarked at Esperance, and there link up with the tourist buses which would take the passengers to the south-west and the agricultural areas. It would provide tourists with relaxation, and would be of great benefit to the tourist industry. Small amounts of cargo could be carried into the various ports and the passenger-cargo service would stimulate tourist activity. I am sure it would be of great advantage to this State.

There are many people who wish to go to the Eastern States by ship, but who cannot afford time off from their work, or meet the heavy costs involved. I think that such a passenger-cargo service would meet the needs of those people, and the small cargoes would ease the costs of the journey. I think it would be worth while to have an experimental period—one boat operating in the slack period when the north-west boats are not busy. However, I do not know when that would be.

Mr. Court: Don't let the north-west members hear you say that!

Mr. HALL: There was a vessel built recently for the State, which was designed for tourists as well as cargo. Queensland receives something like £38,000,000 each year from its tourist trade. I think we should get down to practical thinking on this matter and develop different lines from the ordinary conventional methods of tourism. If we did that, we would not be the loser.

There is another matter, which is for the consideration of the Minister for Works. A works programme has been listed for Albany, including the erection of the new gaol. After much pressure, we were given to understand that the new police station would be built. I asked the Minister

whether he would implement a works programme to ease unemployment in Albany and nearby districts. There is a heavy migration of employees from nearby districts into Albany, and Albany carries the brunt of any unemployment.

Owing to seasonal conditions, there has been an influx of unemployed persons. The figure this year has been above the average of any previous year. We have to realise that there has been a complete closure of the public works programme. I believe that in a decentralised area, where people have to look after their homes and the education of their children, there should be some implementation of works which would bind the area together.

I could speak for hours on what is being spent in Bunbury and in the north. Albany is being allocated £18,000 for sewerage, as against £29,000 for Narrogin and £55,000 for Bunbury. There is no doubt that Bunbury is on the Christmas tree. If these works were implemented soon, it would ease the unemployment situation; and Albany would be receiving something in return for its support of the north. We do not mind pulling our weight so long as we get something back for what we are putting in.

There is another matter which I direct to the Minister for Works. I feel sorry for the Leader of the Opposition when he tries to put over his point about the West Northam School. When the previous Minister for Education was in office the P.W.D. work force was transferred from Albany to resurrect the Gnowangerup School, and, I think, the Katanning Hospital. The work had not been undertaken correctly and the fault was discovered and had to be rectified by the Public Works Department. I would refer the Minister to the regional hospital at Albany, which will still be there when other buildings have fallen down. The Minister for Works allocated only £6,000 for the Albany Harbour scheme.

I asked the Minister what was the estimated cost of the septic system for the new technical annexe at Albany. The Minister replied that it was £1,800. I then asked whether it was true that the septic system, as installed, was ordered to be pulled out so that the sewerage system could be installed. The Minister replied that the septic system was discarded and its tank would be filled in. I then asked what would be the additional cost of sewerage connection, and the Minister replied that the figure was £1,065. I also asked on whose authority the septic system, as installed, was ordered to be pulled out; and what was the date when such order was given, and why such a decision was made. The Minister got out of this difficulty by saying as follows:—

The Principal Architect directed that the partially completed septic tank be by-passed to permit direct

connection to the newly-extended sewer. The date of this direction was the 20th August, 1962. The direction was given for reasons of efficiency and economy—

We have already spent £1,000 on this. The Minister's reply continued—

—as it was decided to connect this portion of the town to the sewerage scheme much earlier than anticipated.

That is a nice situation—an interweaving of departments; a perfect example of misunderstanding! We find that the sewerage and Education Departments do not know what they are doing. They are giving £6,000 for the harbour—and the harbour is expanding every week—and we are losing £1,000 on the sewerage.

I would ask the Ministers concerned to give serious consideration to implementing a works programme for Albany; to further developing ilmenite sands; and to providing a coastal passenger-cargo service in connection with the tourist industry.

**MR. H. MAY** (Collie) [8.41 p.m.]: This seems to be a day of grievances. Like other members, I have a grievance which I wish to ventilate. Last month the Minister for Industrial Development was good enough to inform me he was going to Collie. He advised me to that effect by letter. As a result of his visit, he sent an officer of his department to Collie—a Mr. Adams. As a result of Mr. Adams's first visit, he made a report to the Rotary Club in Collie. Mr. Adams expressed confidence in Collie's future. The following appeared in the *Collie Mail* on Thursday, the 27th September:—

Confidence in Collie's future has been expressed by Mr. Clive Adams, an Industrial Development Department officer, who has been engaged on a survey of local industries.

It would not take him very long to conduct a survey of local industries in Collie. The Press report went on—

He told the Rotary Club that in his opinion Collie would recover from the reverses which it has experienced in recent years and develop into a great town.

When I saw that in the local paper—

Mr. Jamieson: Did it remind you of Mr. Fernie?

**MR. H. MAY:** —I asked the Minister a number of questions. They were as follows:—

- (1) Has he received the report compiled by Mr. C. Adams, who was sent to Collie by the department to make a survey of the various industries for the purpose of gauging their prospects for expansion?
- (2) Will he say what industries his department has in mind?
- (3) Will he supply a copy of the report submitted by Mr. Adams?

The Minister replied as follows:—

- (1) and (2) The officer from the Department of Industrial Development who is investigating industrial prospects for Collie has not yet completed his inquiries. He will be visiting Collie again this week after which a report will be submitted.
- (3) Consideration will be given to this when the report is to hand and I am able to study how much is confidential and refers to particular businesses.

I thought I was going to receive a copy of the report subject to the provisions made by the Minister. Last week the following appeared in the local paper at Collie:—

Adams: "Expansion Depends on Coal Processing."

"In the long run industrial development at Collie must depend upon some form of processing coal. Until this is done I do not think that expansion here is going to be very spectacular."

Industrial Development Department officer C. Adams told the Shire Council this on Tuesday night.

He was reporting on an investigation that he made last month into the prospects of industrial and agricultural expansion at Collie.

Mr. Adams made the inquiry as a result of discussions that took place between Industrial Development Minister C. Court and the local Industries Committee.

Big markets were essential before the production of char, coal briquettes and coke could be undertaken on a commercial basis, Mr. Adams said.

#### Markets

The Government was still making every effort to obtain these markets, but so far without success. Some months ago there were bright prospects of obtaining a big market in Japan for char processed from Collie coal. However, an economic recession in Japan caused a breakdown in negotiations.

I am not going to read the whole lot. The point I wish to make is this: I would like the Minister to explain why I was not given a report instead of Mr. Adams being able to make his report direct to the Collie Council and the Collie Rotary Club.

Mr. Toms: You are only the member!

**MR. H. MAY:** A member of Parliament is entitled to some consideration. I realise that the Collie Shire Council, the Rotary Club, the Apex Club, and any other tiddly-winking club are entitled to get information as well as I am; but having specifically asked the Minister for a report and having more or less been given an

assurance that I would get the report, subject to certain provisions that he made—I will admit that—I do not think the officers of the Department of Industrial Development were justified in going along and spilling the beans, as it were, so that the local member was completely ignored.

From my knowledge of the Minister, I do not think he would do such a thing intentionally; and I am not blaming Mr. Adams, because he probably thought he was able to let his head go—and he certainly did. But, after all, I was interested in the matter, and I had asked the Minister certain questions and had received certain replies including an assurance that I would be allowed to have the report or peruse it. But I found the report was made in Collie, and I read it in the local newspaper.

I just wished to bring this matter to the notice of the Minister because I do not think he would do this intentionally. I hope he will be able to give me a reasonable reply; and by the same token I am not blaming Mr. Adams; because as far as I know he could have been told to make the report that he made. But I think the local member is entitled to some respect and consideration, especially when he has asked for the details of a report, and when an officer is sent to investigate the position.

**Mr. COURT** (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [8.47 p.m.]: I would first like to deal with the comments of the member for Collie. An apology is due to him; and I should explain that the officer concerned is a very zealous and capable man.

**Mr. H. May:** I am not blaming him.

**Mr. COURT:** He did a thorough job in Collie.

**Mr. H. May:** I do not know about that; I have not seen the report.

**Mr. COURT:** He found himself, however, in what he thought was a discussion with the council but which became headline news. I was sorry for the officer, because he is conscientious and capable.

What I told the member for Collie in the House still stands; and I have to admit that what I read in the Press was the first I knew of the Collie report, just as it was the first the honourable member knew of it. However, I am not blaming the officer concerned because it was due to a little inexperience, with the result that he found that what he thought was a discussion on his work turned out to be more or less a public forum, because it became headline news.

However, as a result of his work we have agreed to assist one of the honourable member's local industries to an extent, and if the experiment is successful we will expand the assistance still further. I

think the particular industry will be successful. We have tried to explain to the people there that that type of development is the logical type for them to pursue; namely, to explore what they have available in their midst and then to make the most of it.

I wish to make some comments regarding the observations of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. He is either relying on some rather mischievous information or he is trying to make a case on the public utterances of Mr. Pelly. If we examine what he said, of course, his case completely falls to the ground. Let me hasten to say this: The relationship between the Government and Rio Tinto, Consolidated Zinc, and the Kaiser Corporation, could not be better. In spite of the idea that is being bandied around the Chamber that the Government has some complex against Rio Tinto, the fact is that the relationship could not be better. Whether it is in respect of the relationship between the Premier and the company, or the Minister for Mines and the company, or myself and the company, or the three of us collectively and the company, it is on a very satisfactory and sound basis.

I want to make that clear, because there was an attempt during the elections to give the impression that I was the big bad wolf in this matter; that I had taken instructions from some outside party and had denied the mighty Rio Tinto some mining leases in the Pilbara area.

It must be laughable to the company concerned—to its top executives—although I imagine they would be a little distressed in some ways to think that these wrong stories get about which can be and in fact are damaging to a company's reputation; and, what is more important to us, they can be damaging to the State.

One would gather from what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that somebody walked into Government office—either the office of the Minister for Mines, the Premier, or myself—and said, "Here is an industry. When can we start? Where do we sign?" Of course one does not negotiate big industry in that atmosphere.

**Mr. Hawke:** You are the only one who has said you do.

**Mr. COURT:** One does not negotiate industry in that atmosphere.

**Mr. Hawke:** You are the only one to suggest it.

**Mr. COURT:** I would be the last to suggest it; because to negotiate an industry of this type calls for months and months of the most deliberate and careful negotiation, because the companies concerned in going into this type of project commit themselves to tremendous amounts of capital.

The fact is that the Mt. Goldsworthy deposit is in an entirely different category from the other deposits in Pilbara. Surely no-one will deny that, because that was the subject of public tenders—tenders which anyone in the world could submit, and which would be properly evaluated and considered; and so the Mt. Goldsworthy tenders were considered and the Government eventually made a decision to sign on with the consortium, and the agreement that has been ratified by Parliament is the result.

In that agreement the consortium commit themselves to a heavy capital expenditure—some £12,000,000 odd—and they undertake all those things the Deputy Leader of the Opposition enumerated, such as a port, railway, roads, towns, police stations, schools, hospitals, and the like. So the Government has not been behind the door in negotiating these things. We have been very active in trying to negotiate them because we realise they represent the only way to get these deposits opened.

It is only a few weeks ago that the member for Pilbara was standing here saying: Why does the Government get these companies to do these things like building railways and ports; why does not the Government build them and then negotiate with the companies? Members cannot deny he said that, because during the Mt. Goldsworthy debate he made this point and kept at it: Why does not the Government develop these ports, railways, and so on, and then sell the deposits to the companies? But we realise the State could never do these things. It would not have enough money to build ports, roads, and towns in our time; and the logical thing to do is to get the people who have the know-how, the desire, and the money to do it.

Mr. H. May: That is what they want to do.

Mr. COURT: If one takes Mr. Pelly's public remarks they do not, of course, distort the position at all. Mr. Pelly made great play on the fact that there was a large amount of work necessary before the industrial value of these deposits could be assessed. If those are not the exact words the honourable member quoted, they are very close to them. It was part of Mr. Pelly's report to his shareholders, or the public, when he made great play on the fact that there is a large amount of work to be done before the industrial value of these deposits can be assessed.

That is not the language of the chairman of a company that wants to rush in and sign on the dotted line and spend £25,000,000 for an industry this day and £40,000,000 the next day. Those are the

words of a conservative man who understands the problem; who understands that a tremendous amount of proving work has to be done.

When, earlier in the session, the Premier answered the questions of the honourable member, he answered them very truthfully and very fully, having regard to the fact that he was answering them without notice; and he was very careful to refer to the fact that there was no firm proposition; and neither there was; and no-one in Rio Tinto would say there was a firm proposition placed before the Government.

There are people coming in and going out of Government offices day in and day out canvassing for access to this or that deposit or this or that mineral, and suggesting that if they are successful in their proving work, this or that industry could result; but it is all conjecture. Preliminaries, negotiations, and exploratory works take place in the course of trying to attract industry to this State; in trying to take advantage of the natural resources that we have. Therefore, to say there was a firm commitment for a steel industry is just a myth; and no-one in his right mind with the experience of this company, in particular, would come along and say, "Here is a steel industry; sign on the dotted line"; because this company would know that it would have to go through the normal phases of proving the deposits, which is a slow and expensive business; and then through the phases of evaluating the economic worth of them; and that is all summarised in the remarks of Mr. Blake Pelly when he said there is a great amount of work necessary before the industrial value of these deposits can be assessed.

I think the point was well made by the Premier that the Government would have been culpable and subject to grave censure had it, without any proper research, investigation, or negotiation, given the whole of this area to one company that just wanted to sign on the dotted line. I am not suggesting the company wanted to sign on the dotted line; it had too much sense and experience for that. But had the Government been prepared to give this huge area to one company and exclude other people we would be sitting here tonight listening to tirades from the other side about having given away our birthright for a pittance. I could almost recite the speeches that would have been made here had we signed up without the normal and proper investigation, negotiation, and consultation that is necessary.

Mr. Kelly: That has happened before.

Mr. COURT: Not with this Government.

Mr. Kelly: Yes.

Mr. COURT: Do not start talking about hasty agreements from that side of the Chamber, or we will bring up one that we had to sort out when we became the Government!

Mr. Kelly: We sorted out hundreds when we took over from the McLarty-Watts Government.

Mr. Brand: What about the 3d. a ton arrangement?

Mr. May: You are getting nasty now.

Mr. COURT: It was interesting to hear the Deputy Leader of the Opposition going on as he did about Rio Tinto, with Hancock and Wright as the champions and heroes of the piece; but tomorrow it could be that Hancock and Wright would be the villains of the piece. He cannot have it both ways.

I want to refer again to the steel industry, because it was my privilege to have a fair bit to do with the late Mr. Tom Price when he was here. Mr. Price was a man of tremendous vision in respect of mineral development, and his advice was of great assistance to the Government.

Mr. Tonkin: Was he associated with Kaiser at any time?

Mr. COURT: Yes.

Mr. Nalder: A vice-president.

Mr. COURT: He came here in connection with the Rio Tinto negotiations over these mining reserves. He inspected the areas and discussed the position of Rio Tinto at great length with the Government. When asked the question: Is there a prospect of a second steel industry in Australia in the foreseeable future? he said emphatically, "No"; but the processing of iron ore into billets, or sponge iron, or some other form of partly processed material, "Yes, maybe in 10 or 15 years; but steel, No."

Mr. Tonkin: But Rio Tinto didn't say "No."

Mr. COURT: He depicted that as something in the future. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is guessing, or else he is using mischievous information which could easily have misled him up an alley; because these people, as evidenced by the statement of their chairman, Mr. Blake Pelly, did not rush into this as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would have us believe.

The member for Pilbara has entered this debate on the question of Rio Tinto giving the impression that the Minister for the North-West told these people to go to pot. That is not so; because there could not be a better relationship between a Minister and a company, or a group of people representing the company, than between this company and myself. Negotiations have to be held from time to time between the company and me as the Minister for Industrial Development, and between the

company and me in my capacity as the Minister for the North-West. The member for Pilbara does not seem to know what is involved in entering into negotiations for the development of an area such as that in the Pilbara district. He criticised the Government for taking so long over negotiations in regard to the Mt. Goldsworthy deposits; yet, in fact, negotiations were carried out in quick time.

Mr. Bickerton: I criticised you for not making available the information at the time.

Mr. COURT: That is where the honourable member falls down, because a public announcement was made by the Premier immediately the agreement was signed, and it was no different from the story that was told in this Chamber. The member for Pilbara asked: Why don't you reopen negotiations? That question is laughable, because negotiations between the Government and Rio Tinto have never stopped. When one is dealing with a big mineral project such as this negotiations never do stop until one reaches the stage when an agreement is completed and then implemented.

Mr. Bickerton: Or until you get to the stage where the company has had you!

Mr. COURT: It is silly for the honourable member to say that. The company has spent hundreds of thousands of pounds on development in this area. Is that the reaction of a company which considers it has not had a fair go from the Government? The men representing this company are hardheaded businessmen who have conducted similar ventures throughout the world, and they are quite happy to go on developing this deposit, confident in the knowledge that the conditions regarding their lease will be imposed fairly and reasonably.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [9.4 p.m.]: I do not think anybody could be impressed by the reply given by the Premier and the Minister for Industrial Development to the charge that a falsehood was told in the Chamber when the question was asked: Was a proposal placed before the Government? The Minister for Industrial Development tried to create the impression that some understrapper wandered into a departmental section of the Government and had a talk about iron ore, when, as a matter of fact, a meeting at which the proposal was made was properly arranged. The Premier was present; the Minister for Industrial Development was present; and Mr. Duncan, world chief of Rio Tinto, attended by appointment and tendered a proposal to the Government in writing.

Mr. Court: But Mr. Duncan was present at several discussions.

Mr. TONKIN: This particular discussion I am talking about was one that was arranged by the Premier. The Minister



for Industrial Development was present, and other persons whom I could name were also present, together with Mr. Duncan, who put forward to the Government a proposal in writing.

The Premier's interjection was all that was needed because he said, during the time I was speaking earlier, "In return for what?" That interjection by the Premier implied that a proposal was submitted; but the Government balked at it because it considered the price too high. However, when it gave Koolyanobbing to Broken Hill Pty. Ltd., in addition to the iron ore deposits at Yampi, the Government did not think the price was too high then.

Mr. Hawke: No; it did not give an opportunity for anyone else to come in either.

Mr. Court: You would rather ship the iron ore to Japan at 3d. a ton, and you would rather it not be processed by Australians.

Mr. TONKIN: Fancy the Premier wanting notice of a question as to whether a proposal had been submitted to him by Mr. Duncan before he could answer yes or no! It is so absurd! How much notice would you need, Mr. Chairman, if you were asked the question: "Did you sit in the Chair today?" It is as simple as that, because the question was: "Did Mr. Duncan give to the Government a proposal for the establishment of an industry to spend £25,000,000 in the north?" and the answer should have been "Yes." It is no good talking about what Mr. Kaiser had to say.

Mr. Court: There was no firm proposal; that is what the Premier suggested.

Mr. TONKIN: There was a firm proposal to spend £25,000,000 immediately.

Mr. Court: There was nothing of the sort!

Mr. TONKIN: Why not produce the letter?

Mr. Court: Because one does not put such business on the Table. You might, but we don't.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister tries to get out of it by saying that Rio Tinto could not have been serious about establishing an integrated steel industry, because Mr. Price said it was uneconomical; but Mr. Duncan did make such a proposal.

Mr. Court: You are the one saying that; but there was no firm proposal. That is correct. It is no use you relying on mischievous information.

Mr. TONKIN: It is not correct at all.

Mr. Court: I say it is.

Mr. TONKIN: It is not correct. What the Minister is saying is wrong.

Mr. Court: You do not know! You were not there!

Mr. TONKIN: Mr. Price is closely connected with Kaiser, and Kaiser is closely connected with B.H.P.

Mr. Court: No they are not!

Mr. TONKIN: Oh yes they are! They are friends! Very close friends!

Mr. Court: I thought I was a friend of yours.

Mr. TONKIN: And Kaiser told my colleague, the Minister for Mines of the day in 1956, that they were not interested in the establishment of an integrated steel works because B.H.P. would look after that question. That is, their friends would look after it. It is no wonder Mr. Price was not encouraging the Government to allow someone else in to do this. I assert quite definitely—and I challenge the Premier or the Minister to deny it—that Rio Tinto did propose the establishment of a fully-integrated steel works subsequent to its being granted an opportunity to export iron ore if it were given a security of lease at Duck Creek.

Mr. Court: I think you are dreaming it up!

Mr. TONKIN: Does the Minister give a straight-out, emphatic denial?

Mr. Court: There was no firm proposal.

Mr. Graham: Say "Yes" or "No".

Mr. TONKIN: If what I am saying is not perfectly true it would be so simple for the Minister to risk his reputation and give a denial. But he does not know what I know. That is his trouble.

Mr. Court: I am not interested in what you know, or your source of information. However, I was present at the discussions.

Mr. Hawke: The Minister would make a fortune doing the twist.

Mr. TONKIN: Each of the four questions, except the last—that is, the question as to whether he would lay upon the Table the papers concerning the proposal—should have been answered in the affirmative by the Premier if he was not telling a falsehood.

Mr. Court: He would not tell a falsehood! You know him better than that!

Mr. TONKIN: I have proved it in regard to a statement in the Press about his paying a subsidy to the racing clubs.

Mr. Court: You proved it your way. Thank God when we get to heaven we don't have to answer to you!

Mr. TONKIN: Yes; I know!

Mr. Court: I would not have half a chance.

Mr. Oldfield: The only one you are kidding is yourself.

Mr. Graham: You would be shovelling Collie coal.

Mr. TONKIN: The fact remains—

The CHAIRMAN: (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order!

*Point of Order*

Mr. GRAYDEN: Mr. Chairman, I refer you to Standing Orders Nos. 131 and 132 which read as follows:—

131. No Member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any Member of the House.

132. No Member shall digress from the subject matter of any Question under discussion; and all imputations of improper motives, and all personal reflections on Members, shall be considered highly disorderly.

In the circumstances, I feel that the member for Melville should be asked to withdraw the statement he made in respect of the Premier and apologise.

*Debate on Motion Resumed*

Mr. TONKIN: What I seek to establish so that there can be no argument about it is that I am asserting most definitely that a proposal in writing was delivered to the Government at a meeting properly arranged when those present should have been able to remember what took place, and that this proposal was submitted by Mr. Duncan, the world chief of Rio Tinto; the proposal being that if the company were granted a permit to export iron ore and given security of tenure of an area at Duck Creek in the Hamersley Ranges, it would immediately—that is, twelve months ago—proceed to spend £25,000,000 in the north of Western Australia.

Mr. Court: You are dreaming!

Mr. TONKIN: I am not dreaming.

Mr. Court: Do you think we would let anyone like that get away out of our clutches?

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister would let them go all right! That does not go down with me!

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [9.13 p.m.]: A few days ago, Mr. Chairman, I drew your attention, under a point of order, to the fact that the Leader of the Opposition had turned his back on members in the cross-benches, and the Leader of the Opposition immediately replied that the member for South Perth had ten faces. Far be it for me to indulge in the extreme language that is used by the Leader of the Opposition; but after listening to some of the speeches made by members of the Opposition—particularly those made before the tea suspension—I think it would be fair for me to say, without question, that, on the subject of iron ore, members of the Opposition are being two-faced. I think we can establish that very easily.

I could go a lot further and say a lot more; but, as I mentioned earlier, I want to be fairly moderate when speaking on this subject. Before the tea suspension the member for Pilbara and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to iron

ore, and they spoke at length. The crux of their comments which could be summed up in the question asked by the member for Pilbara was to this effect: Is the Government doing the right thing by the Rio Tinto Company? The main theme of the speeches made was that the Government was not doing enough for these great monopoly companies that were operating in the north-west.

During the debate on the Estimates the Leader of the Opposition spoke at length on the subject of monopolies. A reference to his remarks shows that pages of *Hansard* were devoted to that subject; yet this evening members of the Opposition told us what a wonderful proposition these monopolies are putting up, and the Government should do a great deal more for them. That is bad enough: to hear such statements coming from members of the Opposition. But when one compares the statements made by members opposite this evening with the statements they made at the last election campaign, one realises how two-faced they are on the subject of monopolies; one realises how much hypocrisy there was in the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition, when he said that the Minister for the North-West would make a fortune doing the twist.

Well, what sort of fortune would the Leader of the Opposition make, when we compare the statements he made on this subject during this debate with the statements he made during the last election? This was the sort of thing he said during the last election.

Mr. Norton: What was the Standing Order he quoted?

Mr. GRAYDEN: The policy speech made by the Leader of the Opposition during the last election is reported in *The West Australian* of the 9th March. It was a very considered speech, and not one made impromptu. The report read—

Liberal Party Governments, he said, had given B.H.P. at least 300,000,000 tons of good quality iron ore worth at least £600,000,000 for a paltry royalty payment of 1s. 6d. a ton, thus depriving the people of Western Australia of at least £550,000,000 for the State-owned assets given away for next to nothing.

This, he said, was unparalleled generosity by the Government to a huge monopoly company.

As the weeks wore on and polling day approached he became more extreme in his statements. He started to talk about this Government giving away huge deposits in the north to great overseas monopolies.

I remind members that the Leader of the Opposition made statements of that kind not only from electioneering platforms, but also on television, when he looked into the eyes of the viewers

in his extraordinarily sincere way—which he can do on occasions such as that—and declared that this Government was giving away huge quantities of iron ore worth hundreds of millions of pounds to overseas monopolies. He spent weeks building up an image in the mind of the people that the Government was trying to give away the assets of the State. He created that image to influence the result of the election.

Once the election was over and the Government was returned to office the Leader of the Opposition changed his tune. On occasions such as the debates on the Address-in-Reply and on the annual Estimates, one would think that members of the Opposition would substantiate what they declared during the election campaign. But they do not do that. On this occasion they do not say that this Government is giving away £600,000,000 worth of iron ore to overseas companies, but they are saying that this Government is not doing enough for those very same overseas monopolies! I would like a ruling, Mr. Chairman, on what can be regarded as about face.

Members of the Opposition have suggested the Minister for the North-West could make a fortune doing the twist. How then can one describe the action of the Leader of the Opposition in building up the picture in the mind of the public to which I have referred, and then criticising the Government on this occasion for not doing enough for the overseas monopolies? Such change of face shakes one's faith in members opposite. Being brought up in a democracy, we on this side take it for granted that when we make public statements we are speaking sincerely.

Mr. Hawke: The member for South Perth was not brought up!

Mr. GRAYDEN: When we notice such a blatant incident as that, our confidence in some of the political parties in Western Australia is shaken. During this debate some statements were made on the price which the Government will receive for the iron ore. I take this opportunity to remind members that it is absolute hypocrisy on the part of the Opposition to criticise the price.

We know—but unfortunately some people in Western Australia do not realise it to the extent that we in this House realise it—that it was the Willcock Labor Government, of which the Leader of the Opposition was a minister, which, in 1938—virtually on the eve of the outbreak of war—tried to sell Yampi Sound iron ore at 3d. per ton, not to an Australian company employing Australians—such as the B.H.P. about which we have heard all sorts of slighting references during this debate—but to sell 1,000,000 tons of this ore each year for 15 years at 3d. per ton to the firm of Brasserts, which represented Japanese interests. This was

on the eve of the outbreak of the war, and the price was to be 3d. per ton. How can the Opposition on this occasion criticise the Government for selling iron ore on the basis of 6s. per ton?

Mr. Brady: Didn't a man belonging to your party try to sell scrap iron to Japan just before the war?

Mr. GRAYDEN: That is the sort of statement we hear from the Opposition. It is a statement usually made by those in the Communist Party, and sometimes by members of the Labor Party: that the Menzies Government sold pig iron to Japan; and they slightly refer to him as "Pig Iron Bob". It was the Menzies Government which tried to stop the Willcock Labor Government from selling iron ore to Japan just on the eve of the outbreak of war.

Let us see what the Willcock Government did when the Menzies Government imposed an embargo on the export of iron ore. On the 30th August, 1938, the Willcock Government moved the following resolution:—

That this Parliament of Western Australia emphatically protests against the embargo placed by the Commonwealth Government on the export of iron ore from Australia, in view of its disastrous effects upon the development of the State. We consider that the information available does not warrant such drastic action, and we urge the Commonwealth Government to remove the embargo.

That was the motion moved by the Labor Government in Western Australia, of which the Leader of the Opposition was a Cabinet Minister.

Mr. Hawke: What happened to that motion?

Mr. GRAYDEN: That was the motion moved as a protest against the action of the Commonwealth Government in imposing an embargo on the iron ore. Yet the member for Swan, even at the present time, refers to the Prime Minister, as a consequence of that act, as "Pig Iron Bob". That is another very good indication of the hypocrisy of some members opposite.

Mr. Hawke: What happened to the motion?

Mr. GRAYDEN: To give another instance of the two-faced attitude adopted by members of the Opposition, I refer to the statements which were made in this House concerning employees retrenched from Government departments, and offered other employment. They were retrenched as a consequence of economies adopted in those departments. During the last session in particular there was a great deal of criticism of the Government by members opposite over the occurrences in the State Building Supplies. The Opposition considered that some employees would be

retrenched subsequently, and virtually everything the Government did in that matter was criticised on the score that if economies were to be effected certain employees would be retrenched.

For that reason I was rather interested to hear the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition during the debates on the Estimates, when he outlined the policy of his party on the question of retrenchments. A reading of his speech will show how insincere is the attitude of Labor members opposite. The Leader of the Opposition, as recorded on page 1588 of the 1962 *Hansard*, said—

Furthermore, it was on the initiative of the previous Government—

He was referring to the Labor Government—

—to this one that a considerable length of railway lines in Western Australia was closed; and those lines were, of course, the most uneconomic, and the costliest to operate in relation to the return of revenue which was received from them. I have no doubt that, too, has played quite an important part in the operation of the railways physically and in the financial return; because clearly that has been one of the important factors in lessening the total number of men required to operate the railway system.

That is an extraordinary statement by the Leader of the Opposition. I repeat the final portion—

That has been one of the important factors in lessening the total number of men required to operate the railway system.

When the occasion suits him, the Leader of the Opposition says it is the policy of the Labor Government to effect economies in Government departments and lessen the number of men required in those departments.

Mr. Toms: That is your interpretation.

Mr. GRAYDEN: How else can one interpret the statement, except that the Leader of the Opposition would reduce the number of men employed in Government departments at the drop of a hat if he felt that such action should be taken to effect economies?

Mr. Toms: I will not try to interpret statements in the way you interpret them.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The final part of the quotation I have read shows that the Leader of the Opposition is practically gloating over the fact that the number of men engaged in the Railways Department has been decreased. Let us consider that attitude, as expressed in the statement I have referred to, with his attitude earlier this session, when he spoke on the question of unemployment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

MR. RHATIGAN (Kimberley) [9.30 p.m.]: I did not anticipate speaking tonight, but after listening to the wearisome resume on some ridiculous things by the member for South Perth and a very weak speech by the Minister for the North-West, I feel compelled to do so.

Mr. Hawke: Hear, hear!

Mr. RHATIGAN: I feel compelled to do so in order that something may be interesting to listen to, even though I may only speak for a matter of two or three minutes. I think I will exclude the member for South Perth because usually at full moon—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order!

Mr. RHATIGAN: —he gets that way.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order!

Mr. RHATIGAN: So for that reason—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order! I think it would be better if the honourable member withdrew that remark. I think it is going a little too far.

Mr. RHATIGAN: I still think that when it gets around to full moon, sometimes the member for South Perth gets that way.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): That is the remark I asked the honourable member to withdraw. I cannot allow him to make a remark like that, and I cannot allow him to persist with it.

Mr. RHATIGAN: I apologise for that. The Swan River is running rather high now, and at times the member for South Perth becomes a little excited. Does that meet with your approval Sir? I was disappointed in the speech made by the Minister for the North-West. I was very much disappointed. His portfolio represents a very important one in this State, and we have several projects in hand in the north at present.

In tonight's *Daily News* there is an article headed "Broome's Protest," portion of which reads as follows:—

Broome, Tues.: About 40 people attended a meeting last night protesting against the Government's decision to provide a lighter to service Broome at neap tides.

The meeting also protested at the Government's failure to allocate funds for a new deep-water jetty.

I have dealt with this matter on a number of occasions in speeches and through questions. All I have asked the Minister to do is to delay any action on the purchase of that barge until such time as the people of Broome are able to submit their views.

With all due respect to the Minister for the North-West, to the people of the north he is becoming somewhat of a dictator. It is not "what you people want," it is "what you shall get." The Minister

may smile cynically, but that is so. At least they should be consulted and given the opportunity to submit their case. I know the Minister has his experts to advise him on these very important matters, but at least the people who have been resident there over a period of years should be entitled to submit their views and then the Minister could decide after that. But he should not say, "Here is what you are going to get. I am Charles Court, Minister for the North-West. This is what you shall have."

Mr. Oldfield: Has he had his cornet up there yet?

Mr. RHATIGAN: Once again I come to my pet hobby which is a very important matter concerning the people of the north-west. I am referring to the question of air freight on perishables. I have given notice of a question to be asked tomorrow so I cannot speak on this until such time as I receive the reply. All I ask of the Minister is that if he says he can grow salads in the north all the year round—by that I mean tomatoes and lettuce—let him prove he can. Let him appoint a committee, resident in the north, from the Agricultural Department, and let them make the suggestions—not the people sitting here in Perth who merely fly up to the north and say, "You can grow this and that."

The Minister for Water Supplies the other day opened the water supply in Broome. Now the people there have good water; but prior to that they were not in the race to grow anything. Take Wyndham, for instance, with its climatical conditions. The Minister for Water Supplies will bear me out when I say it was 106 in Wyndham. The day he left Broome for Derby it was 104.

The Government must be realistic. These people do not ask for the impossible. All I am asking is that a committee be appointed to live in the north-west to decide when the air freight subsidy on perishables should commence or cease. That is all I ask; and I ask it on behalf of the residents of the north in all sincerity.

The people up there are endeavouring to establish gardens but they have to pay exorbitant rates for the water. They cannot do the impossible. Would the Minister for the North-West like to take up a new house in Wyndham and try to grow vegetables? We are not asking anything ridiculous.

Just think of the women and children up there. That is all I ask; and for God's sake forget politics when considering this matter! It is something fantastic.

I would now like to deal briefly with the State Shipping Service. I only know what I have read in the paper in regard to rising freights and in one case it is going to be as much as 30s. a ton. That would probably mean a fraction of a farthing on

a tin of jam; but is the storekeeper going to put on that fraction of a farthing? No, he will put on 3d. or something like that.

The Minister for the North-West is mentioned every day in *The West Australian*, and is featured over the A.B.C. and on television. He is always stating what he is doing for the north; but I would tell him that his attitude is such as to prevent people going to the north.

Mr. Court: No it's not!

Mr. RHATIGAN: It is. I would like the Minister to prove to me otherwise. He is doing his damndest to prevent people from going there. Why is he increasing the freights? They affect the people who live up there. I do not think he has the faintest idea of what goes on up there although he is the Minister for the North-West.

I would like the Minister to tell me, when he replies, what Mr. McGuigan can do about the situation, no matter how capable he might be. My humble opinion is that he will take a bit of the work off the Minister's hands. I would like the Minister to tell me what authority Mr. McGuigan will have apart from reporting to the Minister. He will not have any funds to expend. I do not think the Minister has much anyway. It all comes through the Minister for Works and the Main Roads Department.

I was inclined to agree at first that the Minister was sincere, but now I am very doubtful because he does not take any notice of any advice given him by the member representing the district; nor is he guided by any representations made to him by the various shire councils, country women's associations, and other responsible bodies in the north. He just ignores them. He is becoming a dictator. Charlie Court says this will be done and that is what it will be! That is what applies in the north at present. All he is interested in is publicity from *The West Australian*, the *Daily News*, and other means of publicity.

Mr. Graham: *The Sunday Times*.

Mr. RHATIGAN: Yes, the *Sunday Times*.

Mr. Graham: Channel 7.

Mr. Court: The *Western Sun* gave me a pretty good go, especially when the elections were on.

Mr. RHATIGAN: This appears to be the Minister's main function. So, on behalf of the women and children of the Kimberley electorate, I ask him in all sincerity to reconsider his decision and commence the air-freight subsidy as from the 1st November next, as has been the case since 1953. I would ask that his committee reconsider the decision. I am asking that he do not say, "I am Mr. Charles Court, the Minister for the North-West. My committee tells me that this shall not commence until the 1st December." After all

is said and done, the people in the north are human individuals and they are entitled to live just as much as the people in the metropolitan area. I would ask the Minister to consider the request in all sincerity, forgetting party politics in any shape or form.

**MR. GRAHAM** (Balcatta) [9.43 p.m.]: When discussing the Estimates I sought an opportunity to express myself with regard to what I feel is the inhuman attitude of this Government towards the pensioners in the matter of housing. It will be noted from the details of the Estimates that this year, the first time for eight or nine, and perhaps even 10 years, no allocation is being made for the erection of McNess homes. The Premier owes some explanation to members generally on both sides of the House as to why this decision has been made.

It is not to be suggested for one moment that all of the pensioners and persons in the social service category are at the moment adequately housed; and when the State is dealing in many millions of pounds per annum, surely a token sum of £10,000 or £20,000, as has been the case over the years, could have been made.

I notice, too, that under the Housing Commission in respect of the normal allocations for pensioners' cottage flats, the number being built for our old people has tapered off very drastically. What is the reason for this? Does the Government feel self-satisfied in the matter? Does it feel that the old people are being sufficiently rewarded in their pensions that they can afford to pay the higher rentals that are sought by private landlords and landladies, or what? All I can deduce is that it is a complete lack of feeling and sympathy for underprivileged people and the Government ought to be ashamed of itself for its attitude in connection with this matter.

I was exceedingly interested to read a pamphlet issued by The Hon. H. K. Watson, who was seeking re-election not long ago. Among other things he said—

As I am the endorsed Liberal candidate it may here be timely and convenient to re-state, particularly for the benefit of new electors, some basic Liberal principles, namely,—

and then he outlines them. I was interested in item 2 (d) of the principles, which reads—

protecting the people against exploitation.

We had what was known as the credit squeeze in operation for a period of something in excess of 12 months, imposed by the Commonwealth Liberal Government—

**Mr. Hawke:** Liberal Party Government.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** Yes, Liberal Party Government; and we were led to believe that business suffered severely as a consequence of that credit squeeze. It may have resulted in the restriction of business; but I have

been amazed, over the last couple of months, notwithstanding the period through which we have passed, to read that companies in Western Australia, and the Commonwealth of Australia, with very few exceptions, for the 12 months ended the 30th June last have made all-time record profits.

I bestirred myself, and I had intended to read a fair sample of those profits. But, without exaggeration, it would take me more than half an hour to read the record profits of companies which have been published in *The West Australian* over the past few weeks. As I have pointed out previously, the record profits for the year 1961-62 are over and above the all-time record profits for the year before against the all-time record of the year before that, and so on. So what we have been suggesting for quite a long time—that the economy of Australia, and the public of Australia are a happy hunting ground, or a picnic for business of one sort or another—is quite true.

We have in Australia, unfortunately, and more particularly here in Western Australia, conservative Liberal Party Governments that allow that sort of thing to go on without any protection for the public or for people who are engaged in business in a small way. For instance, I have a cutting here which is portion of an advertisement that appeared in *The West Australian* a few months ago. It is headed, "The Chocolate War!" and reads—

The latest news. Through our consistent price cutting of chocolates, all supplies have been denied to us including locally manufactured products—who it appears have been pulled into line.

It looks as if the public, whether they like it or not, will be compelled to pay the retail price as dictated by "The Combines"—this retail price shows up to 40 per cent. profit on 2s. size blocks, we consider this margin is excessive for present day volume selling which is the trend today.

So we see that the manufacturers themselves combined to—to use a colloquialism—jack up on a retail firm that is prepared to sell chocolates at less than the fixed price.

Of course, this Government does nothing whatever about it. So long as these business concerns are making plenty of money that is all that matters to the Government. The fact that certain retailers are prepared to sell a block of chocolate at 1s. 9d. instead of 2s., and are quite happy to do it, is apparently something to be frowned upon.

That, of course, is not an isolated example; and I turn from that to another matter about which any Government worthy of the name, or the members of it, should hang their heads in shame. I

had a little personal experience in connection with this matter and it pertains to hearing aids. I think that if persons in an age and civilisation such as this are not able to converse with their fellow men and women, and are not able to listen to music or entertainment on the radio or television, they must be suffering a terrific handicap.

My own wife is defective in the hearing of one ear, and she made inquiries about a simple device to assist her. She was informed that it would cost her somewhere between £90 and £110. With that she left the shop, and she has not an aid at present because of the fantastic price she was asked to pay for it. However, there are people whose circumstances are worse than that of the Grahams; and, believe me, I could, if I desired, speak rather feelingly in respect of the position of private members of Parliament who have no income but their parliamentary allowances; but I shall not do that. As I was about to say, there are people who are in receipt of incomes roundabout the basic wage, and some of them suffer this unfortunate malady of being hard of hearing, and are getting progressively worse.

A colleague of mine, Mr. Harry Webb, M.H.R., who is the member for Stirling in the Federal Parliament, asked a series of questions recently—it was on the 21st August, 1962, if anybody cares to check it—as follows:—

Mr. Webb asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health, upon notice—

- (1) What is the cost per unit of hearing aids manufactured at Commonwealth laboratories and provided to ex-service men and women?

The reply was—

- (1) No hearing aids are manufactured at the Commonwealth Acoustic Laboratories. A hearing aid designed in the laboratories, and known as the "Calaid" is issued to deaf school children, ex-service men and women suffering from war-caused deafness and to members of the defence forces. The component parts are purchased by the Commonwealth and assembled under contract by a private firm. The cost of the parts and assembly is about £7.

The next question was—

- (2) What is the price of hearing aids charged to the purchaser by commercial houses?

The reply by the Minister representing the Minister for Health was as follows:—

- (2) There are many different hearing aids sold throughout Australia. Their prices extend

over a wide range and include overhead costs, fitting costs, and some after-sale service. Most aids sold range from £50 to £80 in price. More expensive models can cost up to about £140 while cheaper ones can be bought for as low as £20. A Japanese aid is understood to be available through radio dealers at £10.

Here is the Commonwealth, which has designed a hearing aid, and buys the components manufactured, which are assembled by a private firm, advising that the entire cost of the manufacture and assembly is £7. Yet unfortunates in this country of ours are paying in the vicinity of £100 for the purpose of having a device to assist them to live a reasonably normal civilised life.

I say this is a shocking scandal; and the Government, instead of being so concerned about these airy-fairy Chevron-Hiltons and the rest of it, and even these large industrial concerns, which admittedly have a part in the affairs of a Government, should bestir itself and have some regard for the welfare of the people. I have insisted on many occasions that this object which has no soul and no body, but is just a name, Western Australia, is to me meaningless. Western Australia is the men, women, and children who live in it; and therefore it is the duty of the Government to legislate and administer for the purpose of allowing those who comprise the citizens of Western Australia to live at as high an economic standard as possible, and to enjoy the amenities, cultures, and comforts of life to the extent that the State is able to afford.

But this Government, whilst concentrating on matters pertaining to big business, allows these things to go unheeded. That is why I took advantage of this opportunity to plead with the Government; and, after all, the Minister for Health has just returned from a Federal conference. Surely he, having come from a working-class family, should have a little compassion in respect of this matter of hearing aids and other devices to assist people who are suffering some disability.

Members of this Government, and particularly the private members sitting behind the Government, should have some regard for our pensioners in the matter of housing; or is this Government content to sit back and say, "The previous Labor Government built so many hundreds of these units that we will let the people—the old folk—die off and we will fill the vacancies as they occur," instead of proceeding with a comprehensive programme to ensure that accommodation of a decent standard is provided at a reasonable price?

I say that, very largely on account of the attitude of the Press, with its glamorising and glorifying, and with this excessive propaganda, this Government has become so affected that its feet are no longer on the ground. It has concentrated on these big airy-fairy questions, and machinations of big business, instead of getting down to the simple and elementary job of looking after the people of Western Australia.

After all, why do the people of any community elect the Government if it is not to safeguard their interests and rights; to protect the weaker sections of the community; and to give an opportunity to all sections to make some advance according to their own lights without doing injury to their fellow men? So I hope and trust that not only in regard to the couple of items I have mentioned, but over-all, the Government will come down to earth and give more attention to the welfare of our people whom we collectively represent.

Unfortunately, in my opinion those people have been neglected over the past 3½ years but probably it is not too late for this Government to have a stock-taking and get back to fundamentals in the matter of democratic Government.

**MR. BRADY** (Swan) [9.58 p.m.]: I had hoped that certain remarks I intend to make tonight could have been made when speaking to the railway estimates; but I realise that with the way things are going, and with the session coming to an end, I may not get an opportunity to speak on those estimates, unless I am prepared to speak at 5 or 6 o'clock in the morning. Therefore I intend to take this opportunity of speaking on the Supply Bill and highlighting one particular matter; because, with the time at my disposal, I do not think I will be able to highlight many more.

Last year, on the 9th August, I asked a series of questions in regard to railway employees, and those questions are to be found on page 2610 of *Hansard* 1961. I asked the Minister for Railways—

- (1) Has the Government Railways Department been approached to provide railway employees with three weeks' annual leave?
- (2) Will he state the department's reply to such approach?
- (3) Is he aware most States have holidays in excess of Western Australia?

The Minister replied—

- (1) to (3) I received a deputation from the unions. Later a petition from approximately one-third of the W.A. Government Railways employees was presented to me by the Leader of the Opposition. I undertook to present this petition to Cabinet. This I

did on Monday last. It will be further considered when some additional information being prepared by the W.A. Government Railways is available. In the meantime the pressure tactics of what is understood to be a militant left-wing minority among the Midland Junction Railway Workshop employees is doing little to further the cause of railway employees or, for that matter, the public relations of the railways generally. The Government has no intention of being influenced by these tactics. I should add that the honourable member referred to an application for three weeks' annual leave, but the application to the Government and that in the petition was for an extra week's leave—that is, the two weeks would become three, and the three weeks would become four.

Tonight I asked the following question of the Minister for Railways:—

When were the awards or agreements for the following types of employees registered:—

W.A.A.S. of R.E.;  
Boilermakers;  
Engineers;  
Electricians;  
Carpenters?

The Minister replied—

Employees are covered by Award No. 3, 1961, registered with the Court of Arbitration on the 30th January, 1961.

I asked a further question of the Minister as follows:—

What are the respective periods of annual leave?

The Minister replied—

The award provides for a basic grant of two weeks' annual leave to all workers with additional leave being granted to "shift workers", and workers in isolated areas.

I then asked—

Are negotiations for new awards taking place for three weeks' leave?

The reply I received was—

No. But application for leave to apply to amend the award in this respect has been lodged with the Court of Arbitration by the unions, parties to Award No. 3 of 1961.

I agree with the Minister that what the men in the railways want is an extra week's leave. Because they are desirous of getting that, they are making their presence felt from time to time.

The Minister, and the Committee, will recollect that last year the railway workshops personnel met at Parliament House. Unfortunately, however, they met on the



day that Mr. Perkins passed away; and the House was not sitting. These men came to this House again, with a view to informing members that they were most anxious to have their leave conditions improved by one week. That was only 12 months ago.

On that occasion the Minister referred to these people as left-wingers. If these so-called left-wingers were in Great Britain, or in parts of the Eastern States, they would be called milk-and-water industrialists; because although they were alleged to be left-wingers with a capacity to cause industrial upheaval, in fact they have worked harmoniously for the railways ever since. They have not caused any strife at all.

Because the railways are now having particularly good times, I feel that the Railways Department, and the Government—through the Commissioner of Railways—should be acting in a spirit of conciliation, rather than forcing these men to go to the Arbitration Court to secure a new award. This evening I called for the *Industrial Gazette*. In that gazette, which I have in my hand, I find 14 pages of agreements that have been negotiated between employers and their employees for better wages and conditions. I see no reason why the Commissioner of Railways, or the Government, should not enter into an agreement with the railway employees, having regard to the vastly improved position of the railways. They should negotiate, to enable these men to secure their extra week's leave.

Whilst speaking on the Loan Estimates I mentioned that these railway employees are putting up with a great deal of inconvenience in regard to the nature of the work they are doing. I referred to the fact that they were carrying out a lot of old repair work, and the Minister for Railways interjected that that was not so. He said, "No." If I had the appropriate *Hansard* I could quote the Minister's denial. Since the Minister for Railways denied that railwaymen were doing all this repair work, I thought it might be as well to consult the commissioner's report for the quarter ended the 30th June, which has been laid on the Table of the House.

What I said about the railway men doing a great deal of repair work is borne out by fact. So the Minister for Railways again misled the House when he said "No" to my statement that these men were doing a considerable amount of old repair work; that they were not getting the new work.

I do not want to labour this matter, because I have not the time. But the records of the Railways Department for the period I have just mentioned set out that the schedule repairs of wagons totalled 374; and off-schedule repairs totalled 127. That makes a total of 501

repair jobs. We find that the new stock that was built in the railways comprised 2 EB vans; 11 VF vans; 46 RCB wagons; and one QJG wagon, making a total of approximately 60 new wagons. So we have 501 repair jobs being carried out, and 60 new wagons being built.

I mention that as part of the story as to why the Government should enter into a conciliatory arrangement with the railways employees, instead of forcing them into the position of going to the Arbitration Court at very great expense to the union, particularly at a time when railway men are not receiving high margins or the concessions which similar employees get in the Eastern States. I understand that the leave conditions, the sick pay conditions, the holiday conditions, and the margins on the railways in the Eastern States are very much superior to those allowed to railway men in Western Australia.

That being so, I think it is up to the Government, through the Minister and the Commissioner, to try to meet the request of these men for better consideration from the department. It is worth mentioning that in the Government Railways return dated the 31st July, 1962, and tabled in the House on the 2nd October, for the year ended the 30th June, we find the earnings of the railways for 1960 were £15,038,264, and the operating expenses were £15,408,204. The deficiency for that year was £369,940.

Without going into the matter of earnings and operating expenses, I want to point out that in 1961, instead of there being a deficiency of £369,000, the net earnings of the Railways Department improved to £986,551. In other words, the earnings were £986,551 more than the operating expenses. They improved as against the previous year by more than £1,200,000 for 1961. For 1962 the improvement was £2,040,000.

Since the Railways Department has improved its position at that rate I think the Government could well give consideration to the men who made that result possible. There is no doubt that the people who are making it possible for the railways to show an improvement of approximately £2,000,000 are the railway employees.

As I said before, it might be difficult for me to make a long speech when the railways estimates are being considered at a later stage in this session, so I am taking this opportunity to mention these matters while the Supply Bill is before us. I ask the Government not to force these men to go to the Arbitration Court, to adduce lengthy evidence at a great deal of cost, in order to secure something which they should be given by the Government in a spirit of conciliation, particularly as the Government prides itself on the social justice it metes out to Government employees.

Railway employees have been most reasonable. Apparently the so-called left-wing militant minority has not been able to sway the more seasoned railway employees to drastic action which may be to the detriment of Western Australia. That in itself speaks volumes for the majority of the men in the Railways Department. One way for the Government to avoid any upheaval would be to grant these men the one week's leave for which they ask; and I hope consideration will be given to this matter. I regret my time has expired.

**MR. NORTON (Gascoyne)** [10.12 p.m.]: Earlier this evening I was discussing Mr. Baron Hay's report on the administration of the north-west. I was pointing out that under the administrator there were to be three consultative committees—one for the Kimberleys; one for the north-west; and one for the Pilbara. I am interested in the composition of the committee for the north-west. Its composition is: The administrator as chairman; the Carnarvon Municipal Council, two representatives; the Gascoyne-Minilya Shire Council, two representatives; the Upper Gascoyne Shire Council, two representatives; the Ashburton Shire Council, two; the pastoral industry, two; and the secretary.

No mention is made of the Shark Bay Shire Council, which is run under a commissioner. Surely it is just as much entitled to representation on this committee. If we analyse the appointees suggested we will find that, out of the 10, eight could be pastoralists. I do not mean to be in the least bit personal or derogatory, nor to suggest that they should not all be pastoralists; but if we look at the terms of reference set out in the same report, we find under item 88, on page 21, the following:—

To assist in the preparation of plans for increased population and production within the Division including—

- (a) the examination and recommendation of means by which production may be increased, including the development of vacant land, and increasing the production of occupied land.
- (b) examination and recommendation of means by which secondary and other industries, particularly those associated with primary products of the Division, may be established or extended.

2. Consideration of communications and transport and large-scale public works which may assist in development.

3. Examination of the possibility of the extension of amenities, including the provision of water supplies.

4. Investigation of or advice upon any matters referred to the Committee by the Government.

If the committee is going to be representative of all sections of the community and all interests, I think a more representative committee should be appointed.

I would suggest to the Minister that a committee be set up comprising one representative of the Pastoralists' Association, one representative of the mining industries, one representative of the horticultural industries, a representative of business, one representative of transport, one of fishing, and five representatives from local Government—that is, one from each of the shires. That would give a very comprehensive committee and one which would represent practically all sections of the community and all sections of interest within the district.

Just what the position is with regard to the other consultative committees I do not know. That is a matter for the other members of the north-west districts concerned. Although it is not mentioned anywhere, I would suggest that the electoral representative of the area concerned should be an *ex officio* member of these committees, because each of those members would, by virtue of his job as representative, have a wide experience of the whole of the district and of the various industries in it. He need not necessarily have voting power, but at least he should be eligible to be a member in an *ex officio* position.

Of the industries I have mentioned, the pastoral industry is one that is well and truly developed. It has certainly been in the doldrums at different times, but the hardships which it has come up against are well known. That industry could be represented on this committee by someone who could give advice, and so on; and this would help the administrator a great deal.

As far as the recommendations for the selection of an administrator are concerned, they have not been strictly implemented. It may be that a person with the qualifications suggested in the report was not available. I have known Mr. McGuigan since 1938 and am well aware of his qualifications and what he can do. In speaking of the recommended qualifications for the administrator I am not in any way criticising the appointment of Mr. McGuigan. On page 18 of the report, paragraph 80, it says—

The Chairman should be a man of wide experience and have broad appreciation of North-West conditions, whilst at the same time having some knowledge of public administration and it is suggested should preferably not be a specialist professional officer of the principal executive Government Departments.

In other words, it is desired to have a man who has had experience in the north-west and who is not a Government man.

In Mr. McGuigan I think we will, in the long run, have a man who can and will do a really good job. As I said earlier, this report appears one which has been written particularly for the Minister for the North-West. It sets out his ideas and what he would like; and I would say that the person who drew it up did a wonderful job for the Minister.

Earlier this afternoon the Premier answered a question asked by the member for Kimberley regarding members being barred from ministerial deputations, and so on. I, personally, have not had that experience, but I have had the experience on more than one occasion of Ministers, when in Carnarvon, telling the people present that if they have any troubles, problems, or worries the best people for them to submit them to be passed on to the Minister is the local governing authorities.

That principle seems to have been followed in this report as the recommendations are that the local governing authorities be on the local executive committees. It seems to be the pattern which this Government is following; and I am not the only one who is complaining about it. We had the member for Collie making a similar complaint on this matter. It is only right that the member who people elect and who represents them should be the person to whom they go in order to get the things which they require. It is the prerogative of members to be able to put up to the Ministers and the Government the requirements of their respective districts and other things which are so necessary for the well-being and welfare of the communities they represent.

**MR. D. G. MAY** (Canning) [10.22 p.m.]: I also would like to take this opportunity to speak on the Supply Bill, especially in regard to my electorate of Canning. It is well known that the electorate of Canning is the second largest suburban electorate in Western Australia and that it consists of approximately 45,000 acres. Included in that 45,000 acres are several small towns such as Kenwick, Maddington, Gosnells, Manning, Rossmoyne, Riverton, and a number of others. Since 1943 this electorate has had six different parliamentary representatives in succession, but I hope to change that. I hope to create a record somewhere along the line. Whether I will be successful or not, I do not know.

It seems to me that the constituency of Canning has been neglected for many years. In order to give members an idea of the position, I would like to read out some particulars in regard to the development of housing in that area over the past three years. I asked a question recently of the Minister in regard to the number of houses that have been built by the State Housing Commission for the years 1959 to 1962 in the Manning-Koonawarra, Riverton-Rossmoyne, East Cannington, Kenwick, Maddington, Thornlie,

Gosnells, and Canning Vale districts. The Minister replied that in 1959-60, 11 houses had been built; in 1960-61, the number was 11, and in 1961-62, it was seven.

Another question I asked was as follows:—

From the estimated £901,000 loan expenditure for 1962-63, will he advise the amounts set aside and applicable areas for residential development in the Canning electorate?

The Minister replied as follows:—

As the commission land in the Canning electorate will not be ready for development during 1962-63, no amount has been set aside.

I think it is a pretty bad state of affairs that a large suburban electorate like Canning was deprived of residential development during the past three or four years. I recently mentioned that in the area adjacent to Manning-Koonawarra there was a large area which has essential services at the present time; and the distance from Perth is approximately four miles. I asked when the development of this area would take place, and the Minister said it would commence in approximately 12 months. I was informed that drainage in the Koonawarra area was retarded due to the problems of that area and when these have been satisfactorily fixed, housing development will proceed. I also asked the following question:—

Of the estimated £167,000 loan expenditure listed for drainage purposes, 1962-63, will he advise the amounts set aside and applicable to areas in the Canning electorate?

The reply I received was as follows:—

An amount of £29,400 has been allocated for main drainage works within this electorate, namely:—

- (a) £25,000 for the Riverton area.
- (b) £4,400 for Lacey Street.

There was nothing at all for the Manning-Koonawarra area. I do not know how the housing development can commence in approximately 12 months' time when no money has been set aside for the drainage of the area. I think somebody has his lines mixed up because on the one hand 500 houses are to be commenced in approximately 12 months' time, and on the other hand no money has been set aside for the drainage of the area. I would like the Treasurer to look into this matter because it is quite obvious that this is an area that should be developed as quickly as possible because of the essential services existing there at the present time.

I would now like to refer to the Maddington area. The Minister for Industrial Development should remember quite well the questions I asked with regard to the possibility of industries being established in the Maddington-Gosnells area; and one of the industries concerned a German firm known as Stator Ltd. I asked

him if this firm had been granted a lease of the former Canning Park race-course, which has a spur line from the Maddington Station that would be ideal for this type of industry. Unfortunately, after three months had elapsed, this firm had not submitted any firm proposal to establish operations in the area and the matter seems to have lapsed.

A firm has recently taken over leases for another quarry in the Maddington area. The Gosnells area already has one large quarry which has had a detrimental effect on housing; and the people in that district have to put up with the detonations and the dust emanating from this particular industry. The recently-established quarry is approximately a mile away in the Maddington area. A petition was taken to the Governor of Western Australia to prevent the working of this particular quarry because of the damage which could be caused to adjacent properties.

Many people have moved into this area and established small farms and that sort of thing, and they are now endeavouring to sell up and move away. In the same vicinity there are a number of claypits which have been used for the purpose of excavating clay for bricks; and in some places the Government has also taken over leases for the excavation of clay.

During the winter months the claypits fill with water and it is disappointing that provision has not been made in the Estimates for finance to enable drainage to be undertaken. The position was so bad recently that the Government saw fit to place fences around the large holes which were the result of continued excavations of clay; and private companies in the area have also been told to fence off these claypits.

I feel that the Canning electorate is being denied finance while it is being given to others. Another area in my electorate is Canning Vale. Recently I had occasion to visit various people in this district regarding subdivisions. This is a five-acre subdivisional area and many families are worried because they are unable to subdivide their properties into half-acre or acre blocks and give them to their sons and daughters.

The Minister for Local Government was kind enough to visit the Canning Vale area recently. After inspecting the area he was of the opinion that something should be done; and he led people to believe they had a very good chance of having their properties subdivided. In one instance there was an acre block with a house on either side. The acre block was attached to one of the houses and was owned by a father of two sons. He desired to give portion of the block to one of the sons, and there could not be any development in the area because there was a house on either side of the block. The

Minister intimated that favourable consideration would be given. Yesterday I received a letter saying that although he had given consideration to the matter he was now going to defer consideration until after the 16th November when the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority would look into the matter.

The people in the area concerned are wondering what is going on. They have been inconvenienced by the fact that the controlled access highway will go across the area. This also applies to the proposed railway line. People in the area are not very happy about the situation.

The member for Swan mentioned recently that several railway employees had been retrenched. They were partially incapacitated and they had been retrenched because of their disabilities. I think that some alternative employment should be found for these employees. I would like to point out that in the heart of the city there is railway property owned by the Railways Department and leased out to private enterprise as parking leases. Over the past three weeks I have counted the number of vehicles parked in those areas, excluding evening parking. The amount of revenue derived from both of those properties is approximately £14,000 to £15,000 a year. That is a conservative figure. Full-day parking is a lot cheaper than two half-days, so I counted a number of vehicles on the basis of full-day parking. They do not have an attendant on the parking lot because those lots are part and parcel of a garage which is in the adjacent area.

If these private concerns can make £15,000, then surely at least one of those partially incapacitated men to whom I have referred could be employed at such places. I think the total rent amounts to about £3,000, which still leaves £12,000. These men have given most of their lives to the railways and I think it is bad that when they became incapacitated their employment was terminated immediately. Surely there are other avenues which could be explored to give such men something to do until their term of employment ceases!

I now propose to refer to the question of crosswalks. It was pleasing to read in tonight's *Daily News* that the Commissioner of Police will soon appoint special constables in the metropolitan area to police crosswalks. This is a definite necessity. An amount of £5,000 has been granted for this purpose. I hope that when the allocation of the special constables is made, consideration will be given to the Maddington crosswalk, to which I have often referred in this House. We have been endeavouring to obtain a crosswalk for the Maddington State School. It is the only State school in the suburbs on a main highway without a crosswalk.

Mr. Guthrie: You should have a look at Jolimont!

Mr. D. G. MAY: I have placed the matter before the Minister for Police, who has indicated that special consideration will be given. I trust that when the special constables are appointed, a crosswalk and a constable will be provided for the Mad-dington School.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [10.35 p.m.]: The Minister for Industrial Development said earlier this evening something about long protracted negotiations being necessary in order to bring big companies into the State. Negotiations with the Minister for Industrial Development would need to be improved greatly for these companies to be influenced by him, because the Minister's participation when the Collie crisis was at its peak a couple of years ago clearly indicated to myself and to other members of the State Disputes Committee of the Australian Labor Party that the Minister was not reliable in his word on any occasion.

Mr. Court: That is not so.

Mr. JAMIESON: That is so. He makes a statement one day, and counteracts it the next.

Mr. Court: Tell us one instance where we did not honour our word on the Collie business?

Mr. JAMIESON: There were many instances. The Minister sent the Disputes Committee scurrying around making negotiations with other firms on the pretext that he would honour any agreement made. But before the Disputes Committee could get back with any agreement, the Minister changed his mind and the minds of the other two Ministers who were with him.

Mr. Court: Fair go!

Mr. JAMIESON: In some instances we had almost reached finality on an agreement. The other Ministers would agree, but the Minister for Industrial Development would say, "We will not agree with this. We will have to refer it to Cabinet." The matter was not referred to Cabinet, but there was some strong talk going on behind closed doors. At that time one of the matters which were being negotiated, and concerning which we interviewed Mr. Fernie, was in connection with sponge iron and the production of char. It was our belief that the Government could have negotiated and established the industry to lessen the burden at the time of the changeover. We tried to proceed along those lines. When we interviewed Mr. Fernie he guaranteed that within six months, with Government support, he would be producing sponge iron and char for a ready-made market throughout the world. These products would be exported from Scott River and several other places.

Mr. Hawke: We have not heard of Scott River for months.

Mr. JAMIESON: Rio Tinto gives us an instance where a bird in the hand would be worth two of those birds in the bush about which the Minister for Industrial Development speaks. The Minister has plenty of birds in the bushes. He has an industry behind every bush. Every time he finds another bush he whistles up another agreement.

Mr. Court: You are not suggesting that B.H.P., the alumina project, Laporte, and others, are not realities?

Mr. JAMIESON: The Minister should not delude himself that he is the motivating power behind any of those. B.H.P. is far more powerful than the Minister for Industrial Development can ever hope to be. Its interest in the politics of Australia is well known, not only within Australia but outside Australia.

Mr. Court: Don't you want them here?

Mr. JAMIESON: B.H.P. had a great influence on the question of the railway line. Had it been in its favour to decide on the Port Pirie-Broken Hill line, the line which is now proposed would not have been proceeded with.

Mr. Brand: That is not true.

Mr. JAMIESON: It is true. The Premier forgot all about the railways for the first two years his Government was in office. The files distinctly show that the Premier forgot about any consideration being given to a railway, and the Premier knows that.

Mr. Brand: He knows nothing of the kind. The net result is that we have an agreement on it.

Mr. JAMIESON: Agreement or no agreement, the Premier did not think about it until B.H.P. stirred the matter up and the Government jumped on the band wagon along with others.

Mr. Graham: Quite right!

Mr. JAMIESON: If we are to see any development take place, surely it is better to get it, as I indicated earlier, from a positive source rather than from a probable source. That has been the whole trouble with the administration of this Government. There have been far too many probable sources and not enough sources which we know are reliable and which could come into this State and start up on an immediate basis.

We have had agreements which cover half of the State, and very little activity has taken place. It is high time something was done about it. I feel sure that before long we will see the Government falling badly in its own sponge iron bed which it has created, because it will not be able to produce the product to the extent which the Government feels is available.

Mr. Brand: You are hoping that.

Mr. JAMIESON: The Premier's limit is selling apples, and that is what he ought to be doing.

Mr. Brand: You said that once before.

Mr. JAMIESON: We want positive action in this State, not the negative action which is taking place at the present time.

Mr. Brand: You have positive action.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—Leader of the Opposition) [10.43 p.m.]: I have a few remarks to make in connection with this matter. Perhaps I should not waste time on it, but nevertheless I propose to waste a couple of moments. The member for South Perth read to us a motion which came before the Legislative Assembly in August, 1938. The motion was by way of protest to the Federal Government in connection with an embargo which the Federal Government had at that time—or just before that time—placed upon the export of iron ore from Australia. The express purpose of the member for South Perth in bringing up this matter was to try to create the belief that Mr. Willcock and his colleagues at that time were disloyal to Australia because they brought this motion of protest into Parliament only about a year or so before the outbreak of the second world war.

When, by interjection, I asked the member for South Perth what happened to the motion, he feigned deafness. When I again asked him what happened to the motion, he quickly closed the volume of *Hansard* from which he was quoting, placed it on one side, and started to discuss a matter entirely different from the protest against the Commonwealth embargo on iron ore.

Therefore, I called for a copy of the appropriate *Hansard* in order that I might check for myself what happened to the motion. I read through some of the speeches which were made upon it in this House. I was particularly interested in what the then member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. McLarty) had to say. I quote—

I hope the motion will be carried unanimously.

Mr. McLarty's hope, as expressed at that time, was met because the motion was carried unanimously in this House. There was not a voice raised against it. There was not a division called. So all the Liberal members of the Assembly joined with Mr. Willcock and his colleagues in having the motion carried without a single dissenting voice.

Mr. Grayden: And yet you would have us believe it is a terrible thing to sell iron ore overseas; that is the point.

Mr. HAWKE: Unfortunately, I was out of the Chamber when the Minister for Works replied to what I had to say about the Government's policy in not having Government inspectors carry out inspections on Government buildings during the course of their construction when such buildings had been designed by a private architect and were being erected by private builders and contractors. I understand the

Minister for Works told the members of the Committee that the interests of the Government and the taxpayers were being safeguarded because a Government department representative did make some sort of inspection of those buildings when they were completed.

I would say, based upon what I saw at West Northam, that safeguard is worth exactly nothing, or less. In any event, what safeguard is there if no inspection is carried out on behalf of the taxpayers or on behalf of the Government during the time the buildings are being constructed? Surely, if the interests of the Government and of the taxpayers are properly to be safeguarded, inspections should be carried out regularly during the course of construction! Once a building has been completed, the roof is on, the walls have been plastered, and the paint has been applied, what value could come from an inspection at that stage? I understand the Minister did not tell the members of the Committee who was responsible for making the decision not to have inspections made during the course of the construction of this building.

So I will ask him now: Who was responsible for making that decision? Who was responsible for letting the taxpayers down? Who was responsible for causing the Government to fail in its plain, obvious duty to the taxpayers? According to the information I have had, Government inspectors of the Public Works Department were, in the initial stages of the Government's new policy in this matter, carrying out inspections during the course of construction and they were objected to, presumably by some of the private architects or some of the private builders and contractors, and a decision was made by someone holding sufficient authority, that no such inspections should be carried out in the future where the building was in course of construction, and where such building was designed by private architects and was being constructed by a private builder or contractor. That is a shocking state of affairs!

I have asked the Minister for Works who made the decision. He remains silent and refuses to say who made the decision. He is afraid to say who made it. I would be very surprised if the Government had endorsed such a decision. Presumably, the Minister, under pressure from private interests, made it himself and let his officers know that he had made it and that any action on the part of any of the appropriate officers to carry out these inspections during the course of construction of public buildings would be looked upon very severely by him as Minister of the department.

So I appeal to him and other Ministers of the Government to have a close look at this situation because obviously it is a serious situation. Obviously the Government is not getting full value for the

money it is expending on the construction of these buildings, and what is more serious is the fact that these buildings could be constructed in such a way as not to be as safe as they should be when their construction is complete.

Earlier in the day I was very careful to say, when speaking on this matter, I would be the last one to try to create any scare or panic. However, I do say it is an extremely serious thing for the taxpayers and the people who will occupy these buildings from time to time that some of them might have been built in such a way as to create hazards for the people who do occupy them.

So very seriously and very strongly I appeal to the Premier and his colleagues—apart from the Minister for Works—to discuss this matter at a Cabinet meeting very seriously and very thoroughly. I would be extremely disappointed to think, and I would hate to think, that the members of the Government as a whole had endorsed this action by the Minister for Works and authorised him to make this decision and had forced the decision, because obviously it is a very bad and dangerous one and could create an extremely serious, or even dangerous, situation in the future.

On the matter brought forward by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in relation to the Rio Tinto Co. and the letters which it placed before the Government, I would suggest that the Government could easily disprove what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said and could prove what the Premier said was true and correct by tabling the appropriate papers in this Chamber. That would conclusively clear up the great difference of opinion between the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on the one side and the Premier and the Minister for Industrial Development on the other side. Clearly, the company would have no objection to the correspondence and the papers being tabled—

Mr. Brand: Are you sure?

Mr. HAWKE: —because the chairman of directors of the company made a clear-cut statement on the matter at a meeting of the shareholders of the company in Melbourne, which was open, presumably, to newspaper reporters. I say that because the report of what he said was published in a Melbourne newspaper.

Mr. Court: But he did not say what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said.

Mr. HAWKE: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition read what had been published in the Press in relation to what the chairman of directors had to say to the shareholders. The fact that the chairman of directors of the company made the statement to a gathering at which newspaper reporters must have been present, indicates that he and his fellow directors

would have no objection to the correspondence between the company and the Government being made available to the public of this State.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): Order! The Leader of the Opposition's time has expired.

MR. GRAYDEN (South Perth) [10.54 p.m.]: The only reason I rise to speak is that I have been misrepresented by the Leader of the Opposition. Earlier in the evening I spoke on the subject of iron ore and made reference to the fact that in 1938 the Willcock Government tried to sell 15,000,000 tons of iron ore to Japan at 3d. per ton. I did not go into any great detail. I did not say that the Government of the day was trying to give this iron ore away or anything of that kind; but the speech which the Leader of the Opposition has just made, at the very outset contained the remark that I had alluded to this proposed sale of iron ore to Japan with the object of creating the impression that the Labor Party of the day was being disloyal in going ahead with negotiations of that kind. The Leader of the Opposition made the clear-cut statement that I referred to the sale of 15,000,000 tons of iron ore to make the virtual implication that the Labor Party of the day was disloyal.

That was not my intention and anybody reading my remarks could not read that imputation into what I said. I made that statement because I wanted to point out how two-faced the Opposition had been during the recent election in making the statement that this Government was selling iron ore at a very low price. I take this opportunity to point out exactly what I did say in that respect. I quoted from *The West Australian* which published the Leader of the Opposition's policy speech during the last general elections, and in that speech he said this—

The Liberal Party Government has given B.H.P. at least 300,000,000 tons of good quality iron ore worth at least £600,000,000 for a paltry royalty payment of 1s. 6d. a ton, thus depriving the people of Western Australia of at least £550,000,000 for the State-owned assets given away for next to nothing. This, he said, was unparalleled generosity by the Government to a huge monopoly company.

When I quoted those remarks I did so with the express purpose of pointing out to the Committee that the Leader of the Opposition, in making a statement such as that, notwithstanding he had been a Minister in a Government which had tried to hand over iron ore deposits for sale to Japan at the low price of 3d. a ton in 1938, was being hypocritical to the extreme. Further, the Opposition in adopting its present attitude to this measure—which attitude we know from the speeches made

by the members of the Opposition tonight—and saying that the Government is not doing enough for these overseas companies which propose to export iron ore from the north of Western Australia, is also extremely hypocritical.

So, as I have mentioned, I have reason to emphasise that when I raised this matter earlier it was not with the object of proving that the Labor Party was disloyal in trying to sell that iron ore to Japan, even though it was 1938 and on the eve of World War II. I was merely contrasting its action at that time with the policy speech made by its Leader during the last general election when it tried to create the impression that the present Government was giving away large quantities of iron ore for next to nothing. I reminded the House that the Labor Party tried to sell iron ore on the seaboard at 3d. a ton.

This Government is trying to sell iron ore which is hundreds of miles inland at 6s. a ton. I repeat: When the Labor Party was trying to sell the iron ore deposit at Yampi Sound, the ore in question was right on the seaboard. I do not want to take up the time of the Committee, because the hour is getting late, but on that particular point I was, without question, misrepresented by the Leader of the Opposition and this is one occasion when I have had the opportunity to refute the type of statement he periodically makes.

Mr. Hawke: What happened to the motion?

**MR. BICKERTON** (Pilbara) [10.59 p.m.]: I want to refer to a couple of points that were raised by the Minister for the North-West and the member for South Perth on the question of iron ore, and particularly in relation to the Rio Tinto Co. The member for South Perth endeavoured to create the impression that the policy of the Labor Party was suddenly to support the working of these deposits in the north-west by a monopoly company. I would remind him that that is the very thing we are endeavouring to avoid. We have been told by this Government that there are four companies interested in iron ore deposits in the north-west. It is the sincere desire of the Opposition—it is certainly mine—that each of those companies should get a share of the iron ore; and, if they did, this would create competition and prevent monopolies.

In these days of mergers, the thing I am afraid of most, as I said when speaking to the Bill dealing with the Mt. Goldsworthy deposits, is that the company which is already operating does not merge with the Rio Tinto group which is interested in the Duck Creek deposits, and thus put the whole lot under one company. I would be against that as I would be against giving the concession only to B.H.P.

So it is for the very reason of having competition that the Opposition brings forward this matter of Rio Tinto, which company we understand, has made certain approaches to the Government, for working some of the iron ore leases. I believe, now that the Mt. Goldsworthy scheme looks like being established, the Rio Tinto and Duck Creek deposits would ensure competition; as would the third company that was mentioned. That is that we hope will happen; not that B.H.P., or any other single company, will take over the entire iron ore deposits of the north-west. For that reason I would like to see Rio Tinto interested in this area.

The Minister for the North-West, in his usual style, informs us that no-one on the Opposition side would understand how to enter into any sort of big agreement with a large company. That is the type of egotistical statement we are accustomed to hearing from the Minister quite frequently. It seems to be his method of getting out of any argument that is put forward. He does so by belittling the Opposition to the greatest extent possible, regardless of who comprises the Opposition. I often think that the Minister for the North-West must regret that his initials are "C. C." and not "J. C." I feel he considers he is capable of running the State completely on his own.

I often wonder how much conversation the Minister for the North-West condescends to have with the other members of the Cabinet when these matters are before it. I believe he does discuss these matters with other Ministers to a certain extent. I would not be surprised, however, if when this matter comes forward the Minister for the North-West discusses it with the Minister for Railways. He would then possibly condescend to discuss it further with the Minister for Industrial Development; and then just to prove that the rank and file have been consulted, I should imagine he would have a few words with the member for Nedlands.

That is the sort of thing that we in this Chamber have to put up with. There is no doubt in my mind that certain approaches, and probably good ones, have been made by the Rio Tinto group of companies. I repeat what I said in my first few words; namely, that I would not like to see this company rejected, because I think it will prevent a monopoly being created if we have more than one operator for the iron ore in the north-west.

**MR. DAVIES** (Victoria Park) [11.3 p.m.]: I have waited all night to hear evidence from the Government side of the Chamber that no offer has been made by Rio Tinto. I have not yet heard that evidence. We have heard vague assertions that the offers that were made were not in the form of a firm agreement. But when he was challenged, the Minister for



Industrial Development was very loth to deny straight out that an offer had been made.

Early in the evening I wrote a note to the effect that a certain way of proving to this Chamber that no offer had been made, was to table all the correspondence. But of course there may be some reason why this is impossible. The obvious alternative would be to show the correspondence to either the Leader of the Opposition or the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the privacy of the Minister's office; because surely both the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would keep the matter confidential, and at the same time they would know whether or not what the Minister has been claiming is correct.

In the face of the lack of evidence, I feel we are entitled to put what construction we like on the Government's attitude. The construction that I place on the Government's attitude is that an agreement has been made, and for reasons best known to itself the Government is loth to take any person in this House into its confidence, to prove it is honest.

If the Government can give these dishonest answers to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—answers which were given earlier in the session—it makes one wonder how far this type of answer extends to other questions asked, and to other answers given. For example, it makes one wonder whether the answers given to the Leader of the Opposition on the matter of the roof of the West Northam School were indeed genuine, or whether the Government was foxing around and, feeling it was in a spot, said, "We hope our luck will hold, so we will cook up an answer."

That is the construction I am forced to place on the answers given by the Government in relation to Rio Tinto. It is regrettable, and it has made me do quite a lot of serious thinking. It has made me wonder just how the Government is treating Parliament which, after all, is constituted of duly-elected representatives of the people of this State. It is a great disappointment to me, and will continue to be so, until the Government proves conclusively to any one member on this side of the Chamber that no firm offer has been made by Rio Tinto.

On the question of the iron and steel industry, I have in my possession a paper written by I. M. McLennan—who has several letters after his name—on "The Steel Industry in Australia". It is reprinted from the *Journal of the Institution of Engineers, Australia*, vol. 34, No. 6, June, 1962, pp. 115-124. I have no doubt that every other member also received a copy of this publication. In this there is an address that Mr. McLennan gave to the institute on the 21st March, 1962. It is a very good history of the

steel industry in Australia; and I think it is one of the best papers that has yet been written.

It outlines the basic requirements of the industry; the start of the industry; its development over the years, and the manner in which it hopes to expand. What is perfectly obvious is that Broken Hill Pty. Ltd. has a firm grip on the steel industry in Australia. There is no attempt to deny that. The position is made clear in the figures that are given, and the companies it controls. There is no doubt that so far as Australia is concerned the steel industry has a great future; and this probably accounts for the fact that the post-war capital expenditure by B.H.P. has risen from £5,000,000 in 1949, to £40,000,000 in 1961.

The production over that time of marketable iron steel products has risen from about 1.5 million long tons in 1949-50, to 3.2 million long tons in 1960-61. It indicates of course that there will be continued great expansion. Another very enlightening section of the paper is the subsidiaries and associated companies of B.H.P. There is no aspect of the use of steel within Australia where this company has not a pretty firm grip. Not only that, but the company has its own carriers, and during the year ended 1961 it exported 2,655,132 tons of products to destinations within Australia, and a lot more overseas. This was only about one-third of the carrying capacity of the company.

Of course it is looking for new markets overseas all the time, and will continue to do so. It is a very healthy industry. I only wish I had some money to invest in it. It is being made quite evident that the company has a stranglehold in the production of steel in Australia, and that by hook or by crook no company will be able to lessen that stranglehold.

I agree with some of the statements made by the members for Swan and Canning in reference to the staff position in the railways. There is no doubt about the wonderful publicity job that has been done, but the publicity is going to those on the high administrative level. If those in charge were to have their ears on the ground they would hear nasty rumblings from the staff down the line. This remark applies not only to the bad and uncontrollable element at Midland Junction Workshops!

Mr. J. Hegney: To the wicked boiler-makers!

Mr. DAVIES: That is so. The remark also applies to the staff all over the State, including not only clerks, stationmasters and so forth, but also some of those holding senior positions. They are getting sick of the fact that all the credit for the great leap forward of the railways is going to the Commissioner of Railways (Mr. Wayne). Everyone acknowledges that he is a very capable man, but it must

be recognised that no one man can achieve the desired result alone. He has to obtain the backing of his officers; and without that backing he would be useless.

Mr. Brand: He is the first to recognise that, and has said so.

Mr. DAVIES: If he is the first to recognise that he should make it known to the officers in the department, because the people concerned have made it known to me.

Mr. Brand: He has said that time and time again.

Mr. Court: You are completely out of touch with the railways. Every time Mr. Wayne speaks publicly he acknowledges the valuable work of the men, right down to the most junior.

Mr. Oldfield: You do the speaking for him.

Mr. Court: Obviously you have not heard him speak publicly.

Mr. Oldfield: He says he has a good Minister.

Mr. DAVIES: The men in the department are getting tired of being overlooked completely, while they have to put in long hours and a great deal of effort to rehabilitate the railways.

Mr. Court: When I go to the country centres the men employed by the department have nothing but praise for Mr. Wayne. It does not matter whether the employee be a porter or a stationmaster.

Mr. DAVIES: The Minister is being completely unrealistic. When the honourable member approaches a member of the staff, in his capacity of Minister for Railways, can one expect that staff member to say that the commissioner is a dill? Staff members invariably say he is a good fellow, and that is only good psychology.

Mr. Court: I have heard the men say many nasty things about members in this House, including those on your side.

Mr. DAVIES: The men would be more frank in their expressions to me than to the Minister. I am now reporting to this Chamber the feelings of the men. Sometimes they wonder what is going on in the leap forward of the railways. When the department is chasing business we see the spectacle of automatic signalling devices being installed on the line between Claremont and Fremantle, with the result that officers who are supposed to give service to the public are taken from the stations in between. How can the department attract business when there is no staff to give service? That is an amazing approach by the department!

At Mosman Park and Swanbourne a number of businesses use the services of the railways; yet during the peak hours from 2 p.m. onwards, when most businesses attend to their railrage, there is no officer on either of those stations to deal with

the public. There is a ticket porter, who carries a bag and sells tickets, as is done by similar officers in the bus queues at Perth; but there is no staff service available to the public. There is no officer present to attend to telephone calls, to sell monthly tickets, to label or despatch luggage or passengers, or to attend to similar matters.

At Mosman Park a chemist, a printer, General Motors (Holden), a convent and St. Hilda's College use the railway service. These are only some of the customers. At Swanbourne the customers include a chemist, an electrician, a veterinary surgeon, three garages, and Scotch College staff. Once again these are a fraction of the people who could use that railway station.

The stationing of officers at those two places would cost the department something each year, but how can business be attracted to the railways if the public cannot be given a service? The staff are told continually to wear their best smile, to keep their clothes clean, and to be courteous to the public at all times. I agree with all that; but how can the staff be courteous to the public if no staff is rostered at those two stations to serve the public? For the sake of the expenditure involved in employing a cuple of clerks, who could be used at some other stations in the morning, and at Mosman Park and the Swanbourne stations in the afternoon a service to the public could be provided. The failure to provide some staff service in those two stations is short-sighted economy.

It is time that some mention was made in this House about the application of the five-day week to bakers. In the middle of August last the Arbitration Court granted a five-day week to the baking industry, but before it can be put into effect alterations will have to be made to the existing legislation.

As the position stands, if the five-day week were introduced in the metropolitan area there would be nothing to prevent bakers outside a radius of 25 miles of Perth from baking bread and carting it to the metropolitan area to supply the shops. This will affect the sales of the local bakeries. Plans to do that very thing have been made by one chain store grocer; and until some legislation is passed to prevent this practice, the cartage of bread over long distances—as is done in the Eastern States—is permitted; and there can be no agreement between the employer and employee on the implementation of a five-day week.

Mr. Brand: Do you think we should take legislative action to prevent fresh bread coming into the metropolitan area?

Mr. DAVIES: The alternative is for the Bakers' Union to approach the Arbitration Court for a five-day week to be made applicable to the baking industry in

the whole State. With its current attitude I am sure the court would have no hesitation in granting a five-day week to bakers throughout the State, but that is not entirely desired by either the bakers or the union.

Mr. Brand: Would that stop owners from baking bread?

Mr. DAVIES: It would prevent bakers from baking before a certain time.

Mr. Brand: Not unless legislation were passed.

Mr. DAVIES: If there is a five-day week in the industry, the bakers cannot bake outside the terms of the award.

Mr. Court: Outside of a 25-mile radius they can.

Mr. DAVIES: The Minister has not been listening; otherwise he would have heard what I said. The union could request the Arbitration Court to grant a five-day week to the baking industry for the whole State.

Mr. Court: That would not stop the employer from baking.

Mr. DAVIES: But they cannot bake on the week-end.

Mr. Bovell: Of course they can!

Mr. Brand: The baker-owner can.

Mr. DAVIES: The amount which the baker-owner can turn out is negligible. It can be compared to the amount which a housewife can bake in her oven. This matter affects the whole of the baking industry.

What I want to know is this: Why after all this time has not the Government been able to come to some arrangement whereby the decision of the Arbitration Court can be implemented? The union has to go back to the Arbitration Court on the 1st November; and what is it going to say? The Government has refused to help us. The local bakers are willing to abide by the terms of the Arbitration Court and implement a five-day week.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. I. W. Manning): The honourable member's time has expired.

MR. J. HEGNEY (Belmont) [11.21 p.m.]: There is a small matter to which I wish to refer. I am digressing from the question of iron ore and railway matters and coming to a matter I raised in this Parliament by way of questions. It refers to the brewery interests in the State of Western Australia.

Representations were made to me by a number of small people engaged in the liquor trade around Perth. They wanted to know what the Labor Party or the Government could do about their problem. I told them I did not think it was much good approaching the Government in the matter because it would not tackle the question—it would not do anything to interrupt the activities of the

Swan Brewery in the course it is pursuing. I told them that all I could do would be to submit a question on their behalf; and that I did. I think I should read the questions again because they are of considerable interest. The first question was as follows:—

Is it a fact that the Swan Brewery Co. Ltd. has acquired or is in the process of acquiring all brewery interests in Western Australia, i.e., Kalgoorlie, Merredin, Redcastle and the Globe Breweries?

The answer was as follows:—

The Swan Brewery Co. Ltd. holds a controlling interest in the breweries mentioned.

They own the first three and are in process of owning the Globe. So that company has a controlling interest in all the breweries in the State. The second question was as follows:—

Is it a fact that the Swan Brewery Co. has purchased a substantial interest in a prominent wine and spirit business in Perth, which sells Eastern States stock to the exclusion of Western Australian stock?

The Minister replied:—

It is understood that the Swan Brewery Co. Ltd. has purchased 49 per cent. of the shares in Johnson & Harper Pty. Ltd., wine and spirit merchants.

This firm of wine and spirit merchants retails only Eastern States wine, and I might say that the people who have seen me in connection with this matter are very concerned about the sale of Western Australian wines. The next question was—

Is it not a fact that the Swan Brewery Co. has acquired many hotel properties in W.A. and the trend is for a complete take-over?

The Minister replied:—

The latest information in the possession of the State Licensing Court shows that there are 452 publican's general, wayside house, and hotel licenses in force in Western Australia; and, of these, the Swan Brewery Co. Ltd. owns 64, and the Emu Brewery Ltd. five; and 383 are held by others.

If that does not show that the Swan Brewery is acquiring the lot, I do not know what does.

Mr. Jamieson: The Globe Brewery owns 12.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: The next question was as follows:—

Is it not a fact that many small liquor businesses in the State are seriously affected by this monopoly trend and practice?

The answer was—

In view of the answer to No. (3), this does not appear to be so.

I can tell the Government that it is so; and many of these people who are operating in a small way are apprehensive and concerned about the trend which is shown in the questions I have asked. The last question was—

Will he have this matter thoroughly investigated to see what effective action can be taken to restrict and prevent such monopoly?

The Minister replied:

An investigation does not appear to be necessary.

The member for South Perth referred to the fact that we on this side of the House appear to be concerned with monopoly interests and big business interests. However, those were questions I asked on behalf of a lot of small people in the metropolitan area because they are concerned with the trend of monopoly control being in the hands of the Swan Brewery, as that company is well on its way to an ultimate take-over. It already has 69 hotel properties in which it sells its own product; and the people in whom I am interested are afraid that once the brewery has control it will exclude the Western Australian product and push the sale of South Australian and other products in this State.

The fact remains that in regard to the wine and spirits industry the Swan Brewery has 49 per cent. of the control. If the member for Toodyay were present I could tell him that on behalf of the people who are engaged in the sale of Western Australian wines I, along with the late Mr. W. D. Johnson—the member for Guildford at the time—discussed with the then Attorney-General, the late Mr. Davey, certain matters to see if something could not be done to protect the interests of Western Australian growers because of the tied houses in Perth where Penfolds wines were sold; and whether there was not some law to compel these licensees to put Western Australian wines on an equal footing with the South Australian wines. However, because of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution in regard to interstate free trade the matter could not be dealt with on that basis.

The answer I received to the last question I asked indicated there was no need to have an investigation. We know there is no law at the present time under which this matter could be dealt with even if the Government wanted to do something about it. However, there was one law on the statute book under which problems like this could be tackled; but that Act was repealed. I refer to the fact that between the years 1956 and 1958 there was an

Act known as the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Control Act. That Act was repealed, and replaced by another entitled the Trade Associations Registration Act.

Mr. Brand: Is the situation the same as when you were in office?

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I am pointing out that a law was in existence; and under that law there was power for investigation into monopoly control. It is an important matter; and only recently—last Sunday week—the *Sunday Times* carried a feature article in regard to a new hotel at Cannington. We know the brewery built that hotel and put in its own licensee. That is the trend. Therefore, I am raising this matter to indicate to the Government that it is an important issue in this State.

Of course, the Government is not interested in this sort of question. As a matter of fact, it is analogous to the position that obtains in connection with the sale of petrol. We know the petrol companies decided to change to a one-brand system of petrol sales. They bought up properties *ad lib* around the metropolitan area and there was a petrol station at almost every corner, but there was no power in the law to regulate the position.

Subsequently, the Government of the day did amend the law—the Local Districts Act—to give local authorities power to prevent the mushrooming of petrol stations all around the place. We know that the licensees in these businesses formed themselves into an organisation and made representations to the Government and a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into this matter; and certain recommendations were made.

Arising from that, a Bill was introduced which at least limited the hours during which petrol could be sold, and there is some control although the oil companies are very powerful organisations in the life of the community. The same thing could apply in this connection although, unfortunately, these people do not have the organisation through which they can voice their disabilities.

However, I bring this matter to the notice of Parliament. Many people in the electorate of the member for Toodyay are wine growers, and this is very important to the industry. Therefore, on behalf of the people who have interviewed me, I am at least giving publicity to the matter so that some of the activities which take place are known. I regret that the Government does not consider it necessary to make a thorough investigation of the matter.

In connection with iron ore, I understand I am one of those who supported the late John Willcock when he was Premier of this State in his negotiations when trying to sell iron ore. The price to be paid then was only 3d. a ton. He did not succeed in his efforts because the

Federal Government was opposed to the idea. Years have gone by and for several years the Labor Government was in power, but the Commonwealth Government was adamant in not allowing iron ore to be exported to Japan or anywhere else. When the agreement was made during the regime of the McLarty-Watts Government, what price was provided? It was 6d. a ton. Members must not forget that in the intervening period prices of everything had gone up, including wages.

The member for South Perth is the last one in the world who should talk about hypocrisy in this connection. He was the one who displaced me in this Parliament.

Mr. Hawke: What a tragedy!

Mr. J. HEGNEY: He displaced me on propaganda of that kind. He originally stood as an Independent for Swan but six weeks later was endorsed as the Liberal Party candidate for Middle Swan. A private member of the McLarty-Watts Government spoke to me before my time expired in 1947 and said, "Jim, it would be worth your while to study the country newspapers to see what Grayden has to say about the parties." I remember what he had to say. I used his remarks as propaganda later on. One of the slogans he used was, "I am Grayden. I am the man the parties fear!" Another was, "Grayden. I am your pledge against party intrigues."

Mr. Grayden: Nonsense!

Mr. J. HEGNEY: That is a fact. Those statements were printed. Go back and look!

Mr. Grayden: In those words?

Mr. J. HEGNEY: There are a few others I cannot think of. He was the biggest thorn in the side of the McLarty-Watts Government. What about his contention that his grandfather was entitled to all the credit for the goldfields water supply scheme! He was an Independent member for South Perth and subsequently was endorsed by the Liberal Party. The party expelled Mr. Strickland who opposed Mr. Grayden in the last election, but did not expel Mr. Grayden. It is remarkable how he has got through all these years considering the criticism he has levelled against men in the party, accusing them of being hypocrites. That is why I say that from past history politically he is the biggest hypocrite who ever came into this Parliament.

Mr. Jamieson: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I am reluctant to say these things; but knowing what has gone on, I am expressing my own view. There are many other things on which I could speak at the moment, but for the time being I merely wish to express my views on the liquor situation on behalf of the small men in the business who are apprehensive that the time is not far distant when the Swan Brewery will take over and become a full-sized monopoly.

MR. HALL (Albany) [11.35 p.m.]: I have one further point I wish to bring to the notice of the House and that is with reference to school hostels. I wish to make reference to a meeting called in Albany and reported in the *Albany Advertiser* of the 7th August, 1962. The heading to the report was, "The Old Hospital to be Used as Boys' Hostel". I might tell members that I attended a meeting to deal with this matter but not this particular meeting which was called to decide what the destiny of the old district hospital should be. It was argued by many of the old persons submitting their case that it could be used as an aged centre, as promised by the previous Minister for Health (Mr. Nulsen).

I would like to say now that this hospital is being converted into a hostel for the boys; but I do not know whether it will receive the popular support the Minister thinks it will receive, because the housing conditions in the previous hostel were so bad that most of the boys have now gone out into private homes. I do not know whether they will transfer to the hostel when it is completed; but if they do, I know it will be with some reluctance.

What I want to make clear is that the previous hostel—The Residency—was taken away from the aged people. The ex-Minister, Mr. Nulsen, advocated that it could be given to the aged persons, and only because there was a railway line dividing The Residency from the main part of the town which made it very dangerous for anyone aged to go out, it was decided to waive their claim in favour of the C.W.A. Hostels. It carried on quite creditably for a while and then fell by the wayside. The other hostel operated quite successfully under the management of Mrs. Sloaman. She carried on most admirably, as did those who succeeded her. However, both these establishments are to be closed with the idea that the Education Department will take over the old hospital for the purpose of a boys' hostel. That would not be so bad, but that it will have a detrimental effect on the aged people.

My opinion is that the aged people have had one put over them. I would favour an aged people's centre rather than an aged people's home. We do not know where to put the geriatric cases. Only two days ago I had to place a person in a home. I recently asked questions with regard to "C"-class hospitals, and I was informed that the charges range from £8 to £14. Even taking into account hospital benefits and Commonwealth subsidies, patients still have to find £5 or £6 each week and are left with nothing in their pockets. "C"-class hospitals, therefore, are out of the question.

The picture on the other side is that we have a nice type of hospital where we can put those cases under some type of pressure. Occasionally they have to be moved out, but the Government will take

them on at a great cost to it. It is always complaining about these costs. There was an article in *The West Australian* which showed the increasing number of aged people admitted to Royal Perth Hospital, causing congestion to the department.

It raises the question: What do we do with our aged when the old hospital at Albany is used for a hostel? The last paragraph of this article reads—

Mr. Nash—

He is the headmaster at Albany School—

—said the proposed conversion of the hospital building to a high school boys' hostel would in some respects be an experiment to find out if the demand for this kind of accommodation was sufficient to justify the Country High School Hostels Authority building a new hostel at Albany.

I asked the following question, on Thursday, the 18th October—

- (1) How many new school hostels have been built in this State by the High School Hostels Authority and in what towns are they built?

The Minister for Education replied—

- (1) One at Merredin.

My next question was—

- (2) How many new hostels are to be built in the years 1962-63 by the hostels authority, and at what towns will they be built?

The Minister replied—

- (2) One at Narrogin and one at Geraldton.

My third question was—

- (3) Are any hostels in existence in this State built by the Public Works Department; and, if so, where were they built?

The Minister replied, "No." The comparison I wish to make here is that the old hospital at Albany was good enough to be resurrected and turned into a hostel for boys.

There was a heading in the *Geraldton Guardian* which said, "Hospital as Aged Home?" We find that in the member for Geraldton's territory there is the possibility that the Rosella Hospital could be used to provide accommodation for aged people and that a new hospital is to be established. In Albany the enrolment is on a similar population basis to that of Geraldton, but we find that Albany is at the tail end of the journey; the old hospital will be used for a boys' hostel, which will be outdated before it is renovated.

Mr. Lewis: This is only a temporary measure. You have been promised a hospital in five years.

Mr. HALL: This is a trial period. Why was there not a trial period for five years in Geraldton? The same applies to Bunbury. The situation does not add up to fairness. The aged people in Albany waived

their privilege of a residence which would have provided them with accommodation for married couples and single people. The former Minister for Health (Mr. Nulsen) said that the old Albany district hospital would be taken over. The population in decentralised areas is growing, and it is necessary to provide accommodation for the aged. I do not favour an aged people's "home." There are two schools of thought on this matter. Some of these aged people wander around the streets in their night-dresses. We would like to get them into the hospital, but there is not sufficient finance available. I believe that the aged people in Albany have had the rough end of things.

In view of the increased enrolments which have taken place at Albany, I consider that a modern hostel should have been built. I am in favour of there being two students to a room, where an older student can encourage a younger student to give closer attention to his studies. When there are a number of boys together, or a number of girls together, they are apt to knock a building about; but if the younger boys are under the supervision of older boys, with two boys per room, that might provide an answer. It would also provide more of a home life for the boys.

I asked the Minister for Education what were the enrolments at the Albany Infants' School for the years 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1962, and what was the anticipated enrolment for 1963. I do not wish to weary the House, but I propose to quote the figures which were given in reply. They are as follows:—

	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
Albany Infants .....	414	356	385	388	380	375
Albany Primary .....	547	348	363	376	363	370
Mt. Lockyer .....	620	641	660	695	673	730
Spencer Park (opened in 1959) .....	.....	268	286	310	297	325
St. Joseph's Prim- ary .....	223	221	220	257	240	252
Dutch Reform .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	47	56
C.B.C. ....	86	96	94	97	102	110
Albany High .....	592	710	807	889	985	1,080
St. Joseph's High .....	46	47	47	46	56	62
C.B.C. ....	24	33	41	52	63	62

I do not think the hostels authority need look very far for reasons for the erection of a modern hostel at Albany.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [11.48 p.m.]: I think it is acknowledged what a very serious step it is to oppose the granting of supply, as the Opposition is doing this evening. We are doing it on the grounds that the Government had a proposal before it; had denied having that proposal; and had attempted to clothe it in secrecy; and therefore had misrepresented the position. In so doing—in taking that action—it denied to Western Australia an industry which the State could have had, inasmuch as Rio Tinto did propose to the Government that it would immediately embark upon an obligation which would involve an expenditure of, initially, £25,000,000.

We have had denials from the Government side that any firm proposal had been put up. Why the Government persists in that attitude, I do not know; but it is clear from two interjections by the Premier that the assertions made from this side of the House are correct. For example, when I was stating that the proposal which the company put to the Government—that it would, out of its own funds and without asking the Government for a single penny, expend £25,000,000; that it would build its own port facilities; that it would, without asking the Government for a penny, build its own railway; and it would provide its own housing and hospitalisation—the Premier said, “In return for what?” I replied, “In return for a lease of iron ore deposits at Duck Creek.” The Premier then said, “How big?”

Those two interjections prove, I think, that the statement I was making about this proposal was a factual statement; otherwise the Premier would not have inquired, “In return for what?” That is an admission that there was an offer. Nor would he have said, “How big?” when I stated it was for a lease of iron ore deposits at Duck Creek. His reply obviously would have been, “There was no request for a lease of iron ore at Duck Creek.” But instead he said, “How big?” and he persisted with that question by saying further on, “I am just asking you: How big?”

I suggest that those two interjections show what the position was. Undoubtedly an offer was made in writing by the head of Rio Tinto, and the offer was conditional upon the Government granting a permit to export iron ore, and upon the Government giving a security of tenure by making available an area of land containing substantial iron ore deposits. I think that is crystal clear. Yet the Premier stood up in this Chamber and denied, as has the Minister for Industrial Development this evening, that a proposal—

Mr. Brand: A firm offer.

Mr. TONKIN: A proposal.

Mr. Brand: A firm offer.

Mr. TONKIN: All right; a firm proposal.

Mr. Brand: A firm offer.

Mr. TONKIN: It is the same thing. If the Premier can find any difference between an offer and a proposal I would be glad to hear of it. It would be an addition to my vocabulary.

Mr. Brand: They were the words used.

Mr. TONKIN: There is no difference between a proposal and an offer. What is a proposal of marriage but an offer?

Mr. Craig: You may not be accepted.

Mr. TONKIN: And a rejection amounts to the same thing. So it is only quibbling to suggest that there is any difference between Rio Tinto making a firm proposal and a firm offer. One cannot make an agreement until one makes an offer which

is accepted; and Rio Tinto's offer, or proposal, was that if it were given the right to export iron ore, and were given security of tenure by a lease at Duck Creek, it would immediately embark upon this proposal for spending £25,000,000. Will the Premier deny that?

Mr. Brand: The Premier has said that as far as he was concerned, and as far as the Government was concerned, there was not a firm offer.

Mr. TONKIN: That is right. Rely upon words! Does the Premier deny that Mr. Duncan, in writing, and in the presence of the Premier, the Minister for Industrial Development, and at least one other gentleman—

Mr. Brand: Name them.

Mr. TONKIN: I do not want to do that. I am asking the Premier whether he denies that in the presence of himself, the Minister for Industrial Development, and at least one other gentleman, Mr. Duncan, the world chief of Rio Tinto, gave him a proposal in writing in which his company undertook to spend £25,000,000 initially if the Premier would agree to give him a permit to export iron ore and a lease or a mining tenement, or control of an area, at Duck Creek? Does the Premier deny that?

Mr. Brand: There are a number of letters that have been received.

Mr. TONKIN: There we are! There is no need to go any further. That is the situation which we asserted at the commencement of this debate. It is the position which the Premier denied when he was asked the question some months ago by saying that there was no proposal. I will read the question so that there can be no argument about this and no quibbling with words. The question was—

Was a firm proposal in writing submitted to the Government last year by Mr. Duncan, world chief of Rio Tinto, under which he offered to proceed immediately to invest many millions in iron ore development in the vicinity of Duck Creek near the Hamersley Range?

Truthfully, the answer to that should have been “Yes”, but the answer was “No”. That is the reason why the Opposition believes the Government has forfeited its right to remain in control of the Government of Western Australia, and particularly if that is the way it carries on government. It receives a proposal and then denies its very existence—a proposal which, if it had been adopted at the time it was made, would have ensured that already there would have been under way in Western Australia—

Mr. Brand: Nothing of the sort!

Mr. TONKIN: Yes it would, because the proposal was for the immediate investment—

Mr. Brand: Nothing of the sort!

**MR. TONKIN:**—of £25,000,000 along the lines I have already enumerated. So the Government persists in this prevarication when it is perfectly obvious that the situation was as stated, and there was an offer which the Government did not accept but which it denied having received.

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

**Ayes—23**

Mr. Bovell	Dr. Henn
Mr. Brand	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Cornell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Craig	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Dunn	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Wild
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Williams
Mr. Hart	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Hearnan	

**Noes—22**

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Brady	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Curran	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Evans	Mr. Norton
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hall	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Toms
Mr. Heal	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. H. May

(Teller.)

(Teller.)

**Pairs**

<b>Ayes</b>	<b>Noes</b>
Mr. Burt	Mr. W. Hegney
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Rhatigan

**Majority for—1.**

**Question thus passed.**

**Report**

**Resolution reported and the report adopted.**

**In Committee of Ways and Means**

The House resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means, the Chairman of Committees (Mr. I. W. Manning) in the Chair.

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough—Treasurer) [12.2 a.m.]: I move—

That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the services of the year ending the 30th June, 1963, a sum not exceeding £17,000,000 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund; and £5,000,000 from the General Loan Fund.

**Question put and passed.**

**Report**

**Resolution reported and the report adopted.**

**Introduction and First Reading**

In accordance with the foregoing resolutions, Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Brand (Treasurer), and read a first time.

**Second Reading**

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough—Treasurer) [12.3 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**MR. JAMIESON** (Beeloo) [12.4 a.m.]: There are a number of items I missed during the debate on the general Estimates due, I should imagine, to mismanagement on my part. However, I intend to take the opportunity on the second reading debate on this Bill to voice them in the House. Firstly, I would like to deal with the matter of industrial relations between employer and employee. I wonder exactly where we are going in regard to this relationship, which is almost developing into open warfare, and I am also wondering whether the employers are ever going to obey the provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act.

There is much said in this House by the defenders of the Government about employees and their shortcomings; but in recent times, as reported in *The West Australian* of the 18th October, 1962, is an address to the W.A. Employers Federation by its president, Mr. A. McA. Batty. Portion of his remarks, as follows, is well worth recording in *Hansard*:—

The public was entitled therefore to insist on sound leadership on the part of both labour and management, with the full support of the Arbitration Court in disciplining unruly or irresponsible conduct.

Further on in the article, he is reported as having dealt with this aspect—

**LABOUR COSTS**

The council expressed concern at increased labour costs caused by decisions of the State Arbitration Court.

In other words, he wants it dealt out in one instance, but not dealt out in another. In referring to awards he said this—

Awards were being amended to make employers give preference to unionists.

That was a decision by the court. Continuing—

It was a form of compulsory union membership. This made monopolies of the unions and violated inherent individual rights.

What a lot of rubbish! The inherent rights of the individual have long since been revoked: ever since the Employers Federation took control of industry in this State. The individual has not enjoyed such rights for many years and he has continued to be subjected to the punitive conditions in the Act inserted by the McLarty-Watts Government. That has represented a fairly big stick with which to beat the employees in this State. This stick is a rather nasty one, especially in relation to the tradesmen who might come here from overseas. The Minister for Industrial Development might take heed and point out to the Employers



Federation and also to his colleagues that this trend could be the downfall of industrialisation in this State.

Just recently we had a clear case of the bad relationship between employer and employee when action was taken against boilermakers employed by Forwood Down for a breach of the award. This action was taken, under the Justices Act, in the Perth Police Court; and the boilermakers who recently arrived from Great Britain were not charged along with their Australian mates. These migrants were highly indignant that they had been singled out for special treatment because they were completely in accord with the decision arrived at by the men on the job to take the action that they did.

It was a fact that there was an industrial dispute in regard to various forms of penalty rates. There is no doubt about that. The employers' representative said he did not know what it was all about. Of course that was a lot of nonsense. It proved to be one of those instances of where tradesmen are brought here to work and in order to prevent a bad picture of employer and employee relations being sent back to the United Kingdom the British tradesmen were not included among the Australian workers who took action in what constituted a strike and therefore the penal provisions that apply to these men did not apply to the British tradesmen.

Mr. Toms: You had better watch out that they do not write back and tell their friends in England about this.

Mr. JAMIESON: Of course they will do that, and before long Mr. Hill of the United Society of Boilermakers will have in his possession the information about these chaps who have just arrived in Western Australia and he will use such information to warn the members of his union in England not to come to Western Australia. After all, those men have the right to advise their union as to what is in store for future immigrant tradesmen when they arrive in Western Australia.

It is strange that most industrial disputes seem to revolve around money matters. The recent dispute is most peculiar. From the various write-ups in the Press one is given the impression that the walk-off of the plumbers at the new pool at Beatty Park is an industrial dispute. I do not know whether it constitutes an industrial dispute within the meaning of the Arbitration Act; but it is certainly a dispute about the payment of moneys in connection with work that has been done at the pool. No penal provision has been invoked by the Employers Federation. As a matter of fact, the Employers Federation does not know where it is going. It is trying to act as arbitrator, judge, and everything else. As a consequence no particular action

is being taken against either side for not having complied with the terms of the agreement.

For a long time we have wondered where the Minister for Industrial Development and, indeed, the Premier, got this idea of the great leap forward that the State was making; and where they were getting their information as to how best the State could go forward. The people who read *The Sunday Times* horoscopes were rather amazed to find in the issue of that paper dated the 30th September that the Minister for Industrial Development, together with his cohorts—W. W. Mitchell and the others—had entered the field of stargazing. There is a rather startling prediction in this particular horoscope for the week under the heading of "Leo". It is as follows:—

Leo—July 23 to August 23: You must budget for the fact that life may be a little rugged in October. By way of consoling you for that, there is a remarkable line-up of planets in the period October 23 to 28, which could set you down in pleasant and prosperous places for some years (12 to 14 years). Western Australia is ruled by Leo, and you will see remarkable changes in progress there. If born or resident there you share them. October 1st to 6th is propitious.

If we were wondering where the Government was getting its malarkey, we need wonder no longer; because the Government is gazing at the stars. These horoscopes are said to be written by Arthur De Dion. There is also something under Taurus the Bull, but that is not included in Leo.

I would like to suggest to the Minister for Industrial Development that his gallivanting here, there, and everywhere like a bee in a bottle is not getting the State very far. We all know that the Minister has conducted some Cook's tours overseas—and I say that advisedly. He certainly did not get very far in his activities—he could not possibly have got very far; because apart from his visit to the Continent, and certain private functions on the Continent which he had lined up, he had no time at all to do very much. I referred to Cook's tours, and I said I did so advisedly, because when we look at page 1562 of *Hansard* of 1958, we find the following:—

Mr. WILD: I have been overseas at my own expense, and after having looked at the itinerary of this Cook's tour carried out by the Deputy Premier, I feel his hopes are vain ones. We all hope that something will come of his visit, but if anything does eventuate, it will only be by sheer good luck. When we look at the American itinerary we find that after having spent four days in New York, the members of the party skipped through America

and Canada with 24 hours in each place. Nobody can tell me that they had an opportunity to present Western Australia's case during that short space of time.

We were told of the remarkable achievement, or the reputedly remarkable achievement, of the Minister for Industrial Development in his air trip to Great Britain and other places, stopping in each for a few hours, and then racing on again to other parts of the Continent to attend social functions. He then returns to this State with all his stories and malarkey.

It would be far better if, for a change, the Minister got out of his office and did a bit of work instead of sitting down and writing articles in conjunction with Macartney and Mitchell, with a view to brainwashing people and conditioning the mind of the public of Western Australia to the Government's way of thinking. If he did get out of his office and did get on with the job it would be a great help to the State. As it is he is not doing anything for the State at all.

Mr. Brand: Oh yes he is!

Mr. Court: Why can't you get out of the gutter?

Mr. JAMIESON: The Minister spends his time wholly and solely in an effort to brainwash people into believing that the might of the Minister for Industrial Development is right. That is about where it starts and finishes. Industrial development is negligible, and will remain so, until we reach the stage where we have something to offer, not only to the industrialists but to the people who do the job and produce the goods that are required.

The Minister will not get very far while he tries to hoodwink the workers, or while he stands aloof from them, or stands over them with a whip if they ever try to stand up for their rights. If they try to do this then they are the worst people in the world. They are told they are led by communists, and that they are not at all desirable for the progress of Western Australia, and should not be associated with it.

Mr. Court: We will have the second verse now.

Mr. JAMIESON: The tune will be the same, but it will be no more pleasant for the Minister, because he knows that what I am saying is correct.

Mr. Court: Oh no he doesn't!

Mr. JAMIESON: If the Minister got out and did something constructive for the State we would have some regard for him. I would now like to turn to another matter. Before the last general election campaign we had the misfortune, or good fortune, to secure a list of donors to the Liberal Party over a period of four

years. This list fell into our hands, and a copy of the documents was taken and compiled.

Mr. Court: It was stolen.

Mr. JAMIESON: It was given to us by someone who had become disgruntled with the Liberal Party and who finally left the cause. The documents in question showed some remarkable features of finance in the Liberal Party. The Western Australian division of the Liberal Party over a three-year period accumulated from donations some £130,000. That is big money in anybody's language. Among the donors listed was one that kept recurring with big donations. Most of the donors had code names, and this recurring donor was called Iron Heart. As I have said, great and consistent donations were recorded against it.

Another one of great interest is an Eastern States firm of accountants, which is not well known in this State. After tracking it in Melbourne and finding out about its business, it was revealed that this was the business organisation of the associated banks, and considerable donations came from it.

Having had experience of running organisations, I realise they cannot be run on "chicken feed." Whilst £130,000 is a very great sum, I know it can be spent quite easily in running organisations with half a dozen organisers employed in the field, and in providing them with cars and other necessities. The interesting feature is the repetition of the code names, and the vast donations which came from them. These details indicate that the bankers and "Iron Heart" are solidly behind the Liberal Party, together with many firms in this State which donated small amounts, in comparison with those received from the Eastern States.

Mr. J. Hegney: What about Reddish?

Mr. JAMIESON: He is cunning enough to be covered by a few code names. He is no fool in the commercial world, and he possesses ability a little above that of the Minister for Industrial Development.

One matter I have brought up in this House concerns the lack of opportunity available to members of this Parliament to attend to the affairs of their electorates. This position becomes more glaring when it is realised that Federal members of Parliament in the Eastern States, such as the member for East Sydney, or the member for Gippsland, are able to visit Kununurra at no expense to themselves, for the purpose of finding out what development has taken place there; yet members of this Parliament, with the exception of one or two, have little, if any, chance to see what is going on in that part of the State.

It is high time that the Government made provision to enable members of Parliament to visit, or to have access to current worthwhile projects being carried on in this

State. Much has been said about the development occurring at Kununurra, but only two members of this House have access to that centre. Members can only imagine what is going on and what development is taking place. This Government should give some thought to enabling members of Parliament to visit or inspect development projects in this State, so that they can determine whether they are desirable.

It appears there is a considerable number of undesirable features at Kununurra because, firstly, the labour conditions do not attract worth-while tradesmen even with the lucrative wages being offered; and, secondly, the Government seems to be sponsoring a degree of snobbishness by establishing a club for the use of engineering officers, Public Works officers, officers of the contractors, and their wives, to the exclusion of the people carrying out the building and doing the hard toil. If the Government is to be associated with that sort of practice it can expect considerable industrial trouble for a number of years on such projects.

It is interesting to note that the Minister for Industrial Development recently appointed a Commissioner for the North-West. He is also making arrangements to place the State Shipping Service under a board, and already he has a Commissioner of Railways running that department. No doubt, he will now be able to look after the affairs of Hendry, Rae & Court, because nearly all the departments coming under his portfolios will be administered by commissioners or boards and all he need to do will be to cull their reports. He will have to find a way around the portfolio of industrial development, but that should not be hard for the Minister, in view of his ego and his ability to appoint commissioners to look after departmental affairs.

Another matter I touch on concerns the part which Parliament should play in amending the Criminal Code so that directions can be given to the judiciary hearing cases tried before juries. In a recent case, to which much publicity was given, after the jury had reached its verdict the judge commented that the decision was a perverse one. What would be the feelings of the members of such a jury who, after listening to the facts of the case, bring in a verdict, only to be slated in that manner by the judge? I wonder whether such action is not a contravention of the provisions of the Criminal Code, in that it amounts to a coercion of the jury.

Whilst the judge might not have coerced that particular jury, he would be coercing future juries empanelled in cases held before him. They would not only be worried as to bringing in their verdict on the facts presented, but also on what the judge would say on their verdict. In these times provision is made to

challenge the standing and ability of members of a jury, so they should be intelligent enough to bring in a fair verdict. The judge should be there to guide on questions of law. The Criminal Code should be amended so that after a jury has given its verdict counsel appearing in the case should not address the jury on the sentence to be imposed, because we find that sentences vary according to cases.

As members of Parliament some of us have been prevailed upon to take action to have sentences against first offenders reduced, particularly indeterminate sentences where offenders are detained at the pleasure of the Governor or Her Majesty. When a misdemeanour is committed, not against a person, but against property, it is woeful for a judge to pass an indeterminate sentence. However, I wholeheartedly support the sentences which judges impose against offenders in assault cases, for the protection of the community. I have every sympathy with judges who hand out stiff sentences in such cases.

Some consideration should be given to the First Offenders' Act and associated matters, when action is being taken in the courts. For a judge to refer to a decision of a jury as being a perverse decision might be all right in law, but it certainly is not right morally. The judge is there to chair the proceedings until such time as the jury delivers its verdict, after which he passes sentence. He should not be entitled to slate a jury unless that jury is entitled to have a say in the Press as did the judge.

Another matter that has concerned me for a considerable time is a case, in which I was one of the litigants, where five members of the Opposition last year found it necessary to take the Cabinet to task for its disobeying of the law in respect of the Electoral Districts Act. After the cheering and shouting and the redistribution proceedings, the only thing left to prove the law had to be upheld was the debit borne by the litigants of £1,092 14s. 9d. The total costs were £2,044 11s. 9d. to the five members who were involved in the case. This cost might seem to be fairly high, but on a constitutional matter there are very few people versed in the law and it is necessary to get Eastern States legal advice. It was, to some degree, through this that the costs were so high.

Irrespective of that, it was also noted that in one case an amount of £703 9s. 6d. was paid by the Government for the Q.C. who handled its case in New South Wales; and he received this for about two minutes' work. At least we had a legitimate excuse in sending the Q.C. from this State, and certainly the cost should have been met when the Government lost the case. When I asked questions earlier in the year the Premier could not tell me the estimated total cost to the Crown Law Department,

but he was able to give the break-up of the amount paid to the Q.C. in New South Wales.

Further, it would be reasonable to assume that the expense to the Crown Law Department in having searched, conducted, and examined this case would have been just as costly as it was for the counsel of the litigants who were concerned. So there is very little let-out there. My question No. (3) was as follows:—

Is he aware that an amount of £851 17s. only of the litigants' costs was paid by the Government leaving them to pay the balance of £1,192 14s. 9d.?

The Premier replied—

The amount of £851 17s. was agreed by the parties as the proper costs to be paid by the Government to the plaintiffs and was paid accordingly.

That is not correct. The only reason it was agreed to was that we had to get something out of the sinking ship. The Premier had already written to the Leader of the Opposition telling him the Government was not prepared to meet the costs of the case. So it was only natural we had to refer to the court in order to obtain court fees from the Government; and the court agreed that £851 17s. must be paid by the Government—and it only paid the amount it had to in connection with the case. The final portion of the answer was—

The amount was in accordance with the scale prescribed by rules of court.

Question No. (4) was as follows:—

As the courts on each occasion of hearing found in the litigants' favour, has not the Government a moral, even if not a legal, right to meet all reasonable costs associated with the retention of legal service?

The answer was as follows:—

The Government has no right to pay costs in excess of those prescribed by law, and if it should make an *ex gratia* payment from public funds it would be treating the plaintiffs more favourably than other successful plaintiffs.

What a ridiculous answer! There has not been a parallel case to this one in the history of the State. So how could special treatment be meted out in this case? It was a different matter altogether. It was a constitutional case; and it is interesting to note in distinct contrast the attitude adopted by the Commonwealth in regard to legal costs. One person of the name of Kane, a D.L.P. candidate, lost the Senate election in New South Wales. Subsequently he took action against the Federal Government and was offered £500 towards his expenses. That is the difference in attitude. This man took a constitutional case on an electoral matter,

lost the case, and the Commonwealth was in a position to pay at least part of his costs to the tune of £500.

Mr. Graham: The D.L.P. are allies.

Mr. JAMIESON: How different was that from the attitude of this Government! I will tell the Premier now that if I ever have any say in the matter a Bill will be introduced to Parliament to provide for the payment of these legitimate costs; and if ever the present Government members are in a position to take a Labor Government to the courts to obtain a decision to uphold the law, I would like to go on record as saying I would favour all their costs being paid.

It is a desirable feature of democracy that when people are proved right in law they should not lose out by the action they have to take. The legal history by Windeyer regarding "the King can do no wrong" requires that all the servants of the Crown shall be personally liable for their actions. They cannot justify any wrongdoing by alleging they were acting in the execution of the orders of a superior.

There is no way of forcing the matter at law again unless one goes through the whole process of getting constitutional lawyers here; and members of the Cabinet would have to pay out of their own pockets the expenses of the Government's case if they knowingly broke the law and continued to do so. Therefore they can consider themselves lucky that the other four litigants and myself are not in a position to fund the additional case before the courts to force them to pay their justifiable dues for the costs of the Crown Law Department and the Q.C. necessary in connection with this case.

Mr. Crommelin: Who actually paid the cost? Did you five individuals pay it?

Mr. JAMIESON: We were responsible for the payment of that money, and it was paid accordingly.

Mr. Crommelin: By you five individuals?

Mr. JAMIESON: We were responsible for the payment of it and we had to see it was paid.

Mr. Crommelin: Did you yourselves have to pay it?

Mr. JAMIESON: I am telling the honourable member that we were responsible for the payment of it and saw it was paid.

Mr. Crommelin: But you did not pay it yourselves?

Mr. JAMIESON: We all put in. What does the honourable member think we have funds for? We do not leave our mates in the lurch.

Mr. Crommelin: That is what I asked you; did you pay it yourselves?

Mr. JAMIESON: What does it matter? In law we were responsible for it. In law Cabinet was responsible for its costs, but it did not pay a brass farthing.

Mr. Graham: We paid that.

Mr. J. Hegney: The taxpayers paid it.

Mr. Graham: I am one of those.

Mr. JAMIESON: Recently I asked a question of the Premier in respect of those who were invited to the last Royal dinner. Incidentally, while on that subject, I would like to be a little critical of that dinner, at the risk of upsetting a few members of the Cabinet. It was not up to the standard of dinners tendered on previous occasions.

Mr. Hawke: Hear, hear!

Mr. JAMIESON: I think I am voicing the opinion of many, including supporters of the Government, when I make that remark. The Government has to decide in future either not to hold such a function or, if it holds one of that nature, it must be prepared to spread itself a bit more. Even the wines that were served on that occasion, possibly with the exception of one or two, were not up to standard at all—and other members will support me in that contention.

I do not know whether the caterers were making an excessive amount out of the function. I should imagine that the menu should have been culled by someone and the wine list should have been inspected to ensure it was of a high standard—much higher than it was.

I well remember the State dinner held for Sir William Slim some years ago in the Government House ballroom. It was of the highest quality and could not be faulted. I think the same caterers were engaged on that occasion. I would not like to place the blame on them. The Cabinet must accept the responsibility of course. If there is to be a future similar function, a decent menu should be provided with something else instead of cog o vin which some country members said smelt alarmingly like rabbit; and they were not too keen on the thought of being mixed up with myxomatosis. However, that is by the way. I would like to say that from the point of view of the prestige of the State, if another function like that is held—and it looks likely there will be another one shortly—the highest quality should be provided.

Much comment was made by TV viewers on the fact that a number of boxes of chocolates were provided; and although I did not suffer in this way, many of the guests were hungry by the time the chocolates came around to them and the TV camera was focussed on many hands going into a box of chocolates. This does not look nice, and we will have to be sure that it does not occur again.

Mr. Toms: Were they Plaistowe's?

Mr. JAMIESON: I do not think so. I raise this subject in connection with the presence of Mr. Mitchell. I asked questions on this matter and I received my answer that he was present because he was Public Relations Officer for the State of Western Australia. I thought he was Public Relations Officer for the Government. There is a bit of change! However, Mr. Mitchell seems to be a highly-prized person. He always gave the impression, right up until the member for Murchison actually won his seat, that he was more than a lukewarm Labor supporter. But suddenly he was bought over and we see the way he responded to the 30 pieces of silver. He is receiving considerably favoured treatment. I would hate to see in future that Mr. W. W. Mitchell was placed in front of the Mayor of Subiaco, the Mayor of South Perth, the Mayor of Claremont, the Mayor of Nedlands, and representatives of quite a few of the bigger provincial areas. I think these people should take their rightful position.

There is always the necessity for the attendance at these dinners of a few who are closely associated with the matters of State, like the Under-Secretary of the Premier's Department, although every time I think about it I doubt the wisdom of the existence of such a department. I do not think it should exist. It is one of those departments that has grown up in this State but has not grown up in other States.

Mr. Brand: Is that so?

Mr. JAMIESON: It is not handled the same way in other States. Here it has now become the considered senior under-secretary's department; and to my mind it should be a very much lesser department associated, for instance, with the Chief Secretary's department, handling all those little things of State which are necessary for the proper functioning of the Government.

Mr. Bovell: You have a lot to learn.

Mr. JAMIESON: And so has the Minister; only he will not learn it, and I will.

Mr. Bovell: I have learned it already.

Mr. Brand: The member for Beeloo is taking a long time to learn.

Mr. JAMIESON: We will now turn to the Minister for Education, who is slumbering. This might wake him up a bit.

Mr. Lewis: Wake me up if you say anything worth listening to.

Mr. JAMIESON: This is probably not altogether his fault but is possibly departmental policy. But then again the Minister has to take the responsibility for these things. For some time the Victoria Park branch of the Carpenters' Union has had the use of the East Victoria Park School for its monthly meetings. The branch has a card printed listing the place of each meeting, and this is issued to members.

After this card had been printed, including the date of the first meeting, the 3rd July, and the meeting place was stated as the East Victoria Park School, the branch was informed that it could no longer have the use of the school. Therefore, as it was a matter of great urgency, I raced up here one day and wrote a letter to the Minister in order that he would have plenty of time before the 3rd July to reply. I wrote to him on the 15th June, and on the 19th October I received the following reply:—

Dear Mr. Jamieson,

With reference to your letter of the 15th June requesting that the Victoria Park branch of the Carpenters' Union be permitted to use the East Victoria Park school for meeting purposes until the 31st December next, I am now able to advise that further consideration has been given to the use of school buildings generally and any organisation which is of a non-school character, such as the Carpenters' Union, which has been using a school prior to the end of December, 1961, may continue to use it. However, in order more adequately to reimburse the department for caretaking, etc., of these buildings, it will be necessary to charge 10s. a meeting and £1 10s. for socials where a charge is made for admission, either directly or indirectly.

You may therefore advise the Union that permission has been granted for the continued use of the school at the increased fee.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) E. H. LEWIS,  
Minister for Education.

Why there could not be a decision of an interim nature—in between that time—I do not know.

Mr. Lewis: We could have given a decision earlier which would not have been as favourable as that one.

Mr. JAMIESON: When the union officials did not receive a notification by the beginning of July they had to make other arrangements. They had to advise their members by letter that the meeting would in future be at the band hall in Victoria Park. They had to shift the venue of their meetings. Had they had advice that the matter was under consideration, they would have been able to continue until a final decision had been made. As it was, there was a delay between the 15th of June and the 19th of October.

Mr. Lewis: Had you received earlier advice, the answer may have been "none."

Mr. JAMIESON: That would not have made much difference. They were entitled to advice.

The Government has given some indication that it is going to meddle with the third party insurance Act and will possibly

increase the amount from £2,000 to a higher figure. At least, I hope that is the Government's intention.

Mr. Justice Negus drew attention to the doubtful value of a policy clause in insurance policies in connection with third party risks. There was a case which involved a person who, because of his age, was not entitled to comprehensive insurance coverage. Apparently he had not been given direct permission to operate a vehicle, and the insurance company refused to pay. The company knew that because the person was a paraplegic it would be up for £15,000 or more for damages. The company chose the cruel way out and used a particular clause in the policy.

The clause was to the effect that the company would cover people whom it would normally insure. The company to which I am referring does not advertise comprehensive insurance coverage—it is the Norwich Union—and it decided that a young person of 18 years of age would not be a good risk and would not be a person it would normally insure. The person involved in the case happened to be riding on the back of a utility and became a paraplegic. He received a total amount of £2,000 which was all he had to make use of for the rest of his life. However, his employer was sympathetic towards him and made arrangements so that he could, by using a wheel chair, return to work as a clerk.

To give members some idea of how inadequate that figure of £2,000 is, I propose to refer to three accounts from the Royal Perth Hospital. One of the accounts, covering the outpatients department, was for £162 5s. 5d.; one concerning third party patient account—this one is loaded higher than the other charges—was for £440; and another one in connection with third party patient account, was for £1,138 10s. That is a total of £1,740 10s. out of a figure of £2,000.

It is with some degree of satisfaction that I say that the Perth Hospital authorities, due to the circumstances of the case, have reduced these bills to a figure which is more reasonable. However, the total figure still represents a terrific amount out of £2,000—the total amount which the paraplegic had been left with which to provide for himself the necessities he will need for the rest of his life.

I draw the Premier's attention to this fact and hope there will be a substantial rise in this particular amount.

I am disturbed with what is occurring in connection with homes for the aged. This particular topic appears to be a habit with some members. I do not wish to make a habit of it, but I do think that some aged people are being taken in by certain schemes. I have already mentioned the Swan Cottage Homes scheme which has

been progressing for some time. The Premier was recently associated with the opening of new blocks.

Recently the Commonwealth changed its attitude towards people being able to retain an equity when they gave a donation to an organisation. As a result, those in charge of the Swan cottage homes hastily went ahead to get an alteration to the agreement it had made with many people. I know of a woman who paid £800 on the consideration that she would retain the equity. She received a letter from this organisation signed by a Richard Cleaver, the chairman, notifying that persons who had attended a meeting had indicated their willingness to abide by the following clause in the agreement:—

(4) In the event of the donor having abided by the aforesaid rules and regulations and of his/her own free will having ceased permanently to reside at the said homes, the Board shall refund to the donor the sum of £800 an amount equal to the sum of £3 per week for each week which the donor has been in residence in a flat of the said association.

Letters were sent to all those who were not present at the meeting explaining that it had been unanimously decided that the Swan Cottage Homes Inc. had been relieved of that condition. That matter then developed into a bit of a fight with those people who wanted to retain an equity.

Many people are wrongly drawn to this organisation under the pretext that they will receive more than they will actually receive. Many of those people do not know whether they can live on their own. In many instances different organisations are indulging in cruel propositions. They virtually do nothing to look after the welfare of aged people other than to provide accommodation. I could not find any fault with the Methodist Mission Home. I think that is an excellent set-up, which provides aged people with amenities and has the facilities to look after these people.

These people, due to their age and failing health, need additional attention. Sometimes they need their food cooked; others need a trained nurse. There are, however, cottage homes going up higgledy-piggledy, and they provide no attention at all. When the inmates of those homes become sick, they are unable to leave their equity and go to "C"-class hospitals. I am speaking in this manner as a warning to relatives of aged people who are likely to indulge in the luxury of one of these cottage homes, and who may find at a later stage that such a home is not to their advantage. That is about all I want to say at this late hour. I shall speak on other matters affecting various sections of the Estimates as they are dealt with.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

*Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Brand (Treasurer), and transmitted to the Council.

## PLANT DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

*Second Reading*

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [1.6 a.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Although ample power exists in the parent Act for the inspecting of conveyances for the carriage of prohibited plants, fruit, or pests such as a fruitfly, there is no authority actually to stop such conveyances. The purpose of this Bill is to provide the necessary authority to stop and detain any vehicle for the purpose of inspection. At present, due to this lack of authority, it is necessary to obtain the assistance of members of the Police Force who have the necessary power to stop conveyances on public roads.

Mr. J. Hegney: It is getting more like the U.S.S.R. every day. We won't be able to move around the country soon.

Mr. NALDER: However, this means taking such officers from their normal duties, and some disruption therefore results which, in turn, has led to complaints.

With increasing road traffic, particularly in respect of interstate traffic during the period of the Commonwealth Games, it is becoming increasingly necessary to inspect conveyances which may be carrying prohibited noxious weed seeds, plants, or stock diseases. I would point out that, if the power to stop a vehicle is contained in one Act, an inspector under the other Acts would have power to search it for the purposes of that particular Act, as both the Noxious Weeds Act and the Stock Diseases Act contain powers of search relating to conveyances but not to stopping them.

The consequences of allowing unwanted pests, diseases, or weeds to enter this State need no amplification. Codling moth, and introduced noxious weeds, have been traced to overland traffic, and members will recall very vividly the extremely costly outbreak of codling moth in our southern fruit-growing areas which took so much time and money to eradicate.

The present powers of the parent Act enable an inspector at any time to enter upon any orchard, land, or premises; or enter any house or structure used for the storage of fruit, or conveyance; or may board any vessel and may thoroughly search and inspect the same, and every part thereof, and anything thereon or

therein, for the purpose of ascertaining whether the same is infected and may, for the purpose aforesaid, examine plants, fruit coverings, and goods and other things, and dig up plants, open packages and do all such other things as he may deem necessary or expedient.

The Act does not, however, provide the power to stop a conveyance, and this will seriously limit the effectiveness of the department in preventing the introduction of diseases, pests, and noxious weeds, and the task of eradicating or limiting the spread of these factors within the State will also be far more difficult.

The Bill therefore seeks to repeal section 13 and re-enact it with amendments which give inspectors power to stop conveyances, and provide a penalty for persons who do not comply with such requirements. To enable the functions of road inspection of vehicles to be better defined, as regards inspection points and procedure to be adopted by inspectors, it is proposed that an additional section should be added to the parent Act to enable the Governor by regulation to prescribe these functions.

As well as providing the additional power, the opportunity has been taken to bring the parent Act up to date by including further amendments in the Bill which involve section 10, 12 (a), 12 (c), 15, and 38, the nature of the amendments being to substitute "Director of Agriculture" for "Under Secretary;" and to alter references to districts so as to conform with the Local Government Act, 1960.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr. Hall.

*House adjourned at 1.10 a.m.  
(Wednesday).*

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 24th October, 1962

### CONTENTS

	Page
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>	
Agricultural Land : Availability in Southern Cross-Karalee Area .....	1957
Metropolitan Transport Trust : Use of Bus Passes by Student Children .....	1957
<b>MOTIONS—</b>	
Workers' Compensation Act and Mine Workers' Relief Act—	
Inquiry by Select Committee—	
Motion, as Amended .....	1961
Motion, as Amended : Amendment .....	1961

### CONTENTS—continued

	Page
<b>BILLS—</b>	
Constitution Acts Amendment Bill (No. 2)—	
2r. ....	1960
Com. ; Report .....	1961
Electoral Act Amendment Bill—	
2r. ....	1959
Com. ; Report .....	1960
Housing Loan Guarantee Act Amendment Bill—	
Intro. ; 1r. ....	1958
Licensing Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) :	
3r. ....	1958
Licensing Act Amendment Bill (No. 3)—	
Intro. ; 1r. ....	1958
Mount Goldsworthy-Ord Ranges-Depueh Island Railway Bill—	
2r. ....	1958
Com. ; Report .....	1959
Supply Bill (No. 2), £22,000,000—	
Receipt ; 1r. ....	1959
<b>ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE :</b>	
<b>SPECIAL</b> .....	1968

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

#### METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT TRUST

*Use of Bus Passes by Student Children*

1. The Hon. R. THOMPSON asked the Minister for Mines:

Would the Minister consider allowing student children over the age of 14 years, whose parent or parents are either aged, widow, or invalid pensioners, and who are in receipt of a M.T.T. bus pass, to use such passes outside of school hours, at weekends, and on public holidays?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:  
No.

#### AGRICULTURAL LAND

*Availability in Southern Cross-Karalee Area*

2. The Hon. G. BENNETTS asked the Minister for Mines:

As, during the last general election campaign, the Southern Cross Industrial Development Committee approached both the Minister for Lands and the Minister for Agriculture for 150,000 acres of land situated between Southern Cross and Karalee to be made available for agricultural purposes in the form of 30 blocks of 5,000 acres each, will the Minister advise if any decision has been made in regard to the proposal?