

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 22nd August, 1963

CONTENTS

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY : EIGHTH DAY—

Speakers on Amendment to Motion—

Mr. Court	529
Mr. Hall	541
Mr. Jamieson	545
Mr. Kelly	542
Mr. Tonkin	533
Mr. Wild	538

Speakers on Motion—

Mr. H. May	548
Mr. O'Connor	546

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—

Beef Export—Quantity and Value	524
--------------------------------	-----

Bridge Over Greenough River—Erection at Eradu Crossing	521
--	-----

Copper Sulphate—

Sources of Supply	522
Use of Imported Product in Fertiliser Manufacture	522

Drainage of Wattle Grove and Forrestfield—Priority of Other Areas	521
---	-----

Education—

Esperance Junior High School—

Additional Classrooms	522
Gazetted as Five-year High School	522
Provision of Hostel	522

Montessori Method of Education : Attitude of Education Department	526
---	-----

Princess May School : Closure and Future Use	520
--	-----

Rawlinna School—

Pupils and Teachers	522
Requirements of Tender for Improvements	522

Youth of Western Australia : Recommendations of Committee	519
---	-----

Electricity Supplies—S.E.C. Power Schemes : Financial Results of Operations	525
---	-----

Fish, Canned—Exports, Home Consumption, and Imports	524
---	-----

Harbour at Geraldton—Report of American Expert	521
--	-----

Hospital at Onslow—Details	521
----------------------------	-----

Midland Abattoir—Tradesmen and Apprentices	518
--	-----

Murders and Hangings—Dates of Crimes and Executions	520
---	-----

Native Welfare—

Housing for Natives—

Allawah Grove Natives	520
Beechboro Land	520
Eden Hill Homes	519

Native Institutions : Location, and Training and Qualifications of Staff	520
--	-----

Natives at Allawah Grove : Improvement in Education	518
---	-----

Police Quarters at Broome and Derby—Improvements	525
--	-----

Public Service Vacancies—Outside Appointments : Government Policy and Effect on Officers	526
--	-----

Radio Tracking Station—Establishment at Albany	524
--	-----

Railways—

Bassendean Railway Bridge : Repairing of Flooring	518
---	-----

Railway Line to Mundaring : Re-opening	519
--	-----

Sewerage—Extension to South Guildford Shopping Sites at Nollamara—Number, Location, and Conditions of Sale	521
--	-----

Totalisator Agency Boards—

Check on W.A. Board by Auditor-General	524
--	-----

Credit Betting—

Acceptance of Bets by W. G. Donohoe and Other Agents	526
--	-----

Action by Minister to Enforce Act Bet by Licensed Off-course Book-maker	527
---	-----

Investigations into Improper Practices by Victorian Board	524
---	-----

Prosecution of Former Agent W. G. Donohoe	523
---	-----

Traffic—

Middle Swan School—	
---------------------	--

Installation of Safety Signs	519
------------------------------	-----

Patrol Officer at Pedestrian Crossing	519
---------------------------------------	-----

Offences—

Failure to Stop at Traffic Lights	522
-----------------------------------	-----

Time-lapse in Institution of Proceedings	522
--	-----

Safety Devices—	
-----------------	--

Establishment in Metropolitan Area	518
------------------------------------	-----

Exclusion of Overhead Bridges	518
-------------------------------	-----

Violet Valley Station—Sale or Lease of Property	526
---	-----

Water Supplies—

Dams on Fitzroy and Margaret Rivers : Approach to Commonwealth Government	525
---	-----

Greenmount-Koongamia Area—	
----------------------------	--

Improvement	519
-------------	-----

Septic Tank System	519
--------------------	-----

Water Rates : Concessions or Exemptions	525
---	-----

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—

Midland Railway Company—Agreement for Takeover	528
--	-----

Motor Vehicles—Thefts in 1963	528
-------------------------------	-----

Standard Gauge Railway—Route Changes : Tabling of Plan	528
--	-----

Totalisator Agency Board—Prosecution of Former Agent W. G. Donohoe	527
--	-----

Traffic Offences—Time Lapse in Institution of Proceedings	528
---	-----

Workers' Compensation—Amending Legislation	528
--	-----

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

TRAFFIC SAFETY DEVICES

Establishment in Metropolitan Area

1. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Whose responsibility is it to initiate the setting-up of safety zones, pedestrian crossings, flashing signals, and similar safety devices in the metropolitan area?
- (2) Is any liaison existing between Main Roads, Transport, and Police Traffic Departments to ensure pedestrians have ample protection at busy highways, schools, railway stations, and intersections?

Exclusion of Overhead Bridges

- (3) Have overhead bridges been excluded from such safety devices?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) Initial requests for such devices usually come from local authorities or parent organisations, and are investigated by the traffic engineers of the Main Roads Department.
- (2) Yes. Investigations are co-ordinated when necessary.
- (3) Yes. Such devices are undesirable unless erected in conjunction with fenced highways such as the Freeway, where use of the overway can be enforced. Alternative devices such as controlled school crossings are more suitable for general use.

MIDLAND ABATTOIR

Tradesmen and Apprentices

2. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What number of tradesmen are employed at the Midland abattoir?
- (2) What number of apprentice-tradesmen are employed?
- (3) Are any additional apprentices likely to be employed in the near future?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) 57.
- (2) 3.
- (3) Yes.

NATIVES AT ALLAWAH GROVE

Improvement in Education

3. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) Has the Native Welfare Department taken any action to help natives in Allawah Grove improve their education?

- (2) Has any training for adults or youths been arranged?
- (3) What form of education is proposed by the department?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Yes. A subsidy to assist pre-school education has been approved and an annual allowance, for the purchase of books, etc., is made in respect of each native child attending an approved school.
- (2) Yes. Allawah Grove is administered, with departmental subsidy, by the Allawah Grove Administration (Inc.), which gives some instruction in carpentry and furniture making.
- (3) If this is intended to refer to adults or youths, no specialised training is proposed at this stage.

SEWERAGE

Extension to South Guildford

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

- (1) Is the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department likely to bring the sewerage service into South Guildford area in the near future?
- (2) If not, when can sewerage be expected in South Guildford area?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) No date can be given as this depends upon the availability of funds from year to year, and the amount of work to be carried out.

BASSENDAN RAILWAY BRIDGE

Repairing of Flooring

5. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Has the Railways Department any plans to improve the state of the flooring in the overhead railway bridge at Bassendean?
- (2) Is the department aware that the bitumen flooring is broken and the cause of holding water in the winter and uneven surface in dry weather?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) and (2) The department is aware of the condition of the bridge. Some attention has already been given to temporary surface filling and further bituminous work will be undertaken when weather conditions are suitable.

YOUTH OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Recommendations of Committee

6. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Education:

When can the general public be informed of the Government's intentions regarding recommendations of the committee who for approximately two years considered what could be done to help youth in Western Australia?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

The committee was appointed in April, 1962, and presented its report to me on the 20th June, 1963. The recommendations contained in the report require careful consideration, which is now being given.

It is not possible at this stage to say when the Government's intentions are to be made known.

MIDDLE SWAN SCHOOL

Patrol Officer at Pedestrian Crossing

7. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Is it intended to place a patrol officer at the pedestrian crossing to protect school children coming from and going to the Middle Swan School?

Installation of Safety Signs

- (2) If not, will he see that school signs are placed in the area with other safety signs to warn vehicular traffic of the school's proximity?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) No. No outside representation has been received for such consideration.
(2) All necessary school warning and pedestrian crossing signs, including the "zig-zag" approach warnings, are erected in the vicinity of this school.

WATER SUPPLY IN GREENMOUNT-KOONGAMIA AREA

Improvement

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

- (1) Is it intended to improve the water supply in the Greenmount-Koongamia area in the near future?
(2) Is the department aware that the above area is rapidly being opened up?

Septic Tank System

- (3) Is the department aware that the septic tank system is considered unsatisfactory by residents in the area?
(4) Will reservoir capacity be increased in the near future?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) As the area grows in the next few years and funds become available, it will be necessary, as with other areas of development, to increase the capacity of the system.
(2) Yes.
(3) The department is aware that the operation of the septic tank system in such areas does provide local problems where the soil does not permit of quick absorption, and some residents have complained.
(4) Probably within the next few years when required.

RAILWAY LINE TO MUNDARING

Reopening

9. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Is it intended to open the railway to Mundaring in the near future?
(2) Is it correct to state that some railway property has been removed from this line recently?
(3) What is the distance from Koon-gamia to Darlington?
(4) What is the distance from Koon-gamia to Mundaring?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) No.
(2) Yes.
(3) 2 miles 50 chains.
(4) 8 miles 50 chains.

HOUSING FOR NATIVES

Eden Hill Homes

10. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) Is he aware that a house at 27 Watkins Street, Eden Hill, formerly occupied by natives, has been empty for approximately six months?
(2) Is he aware that many natives have been seeking housing, without success, in the metropolitan area?
(3) Are natives to be excluded from homes built for natives at Eden Hill?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No. The house is the property of the State Housing Commission.
(2) No. Most natives are able to obtain accommodation according to their social and economic standards.

- (3) As these are owned by the State Housing Commission this question should be addressed to the Minister for Housing.

Allawah Grove Natives

11. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) Is he or the Government aware that no provision is made in the proposed metropolitan regional plan now on the Table of the House, for a reserve or housing area for natives at Allawah Grove, South Guildford?
- (2) Has the Government or Native Welfare Department an alternative site for the natives, in lieu of the present site?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Yes. No such provision was anticipated.
- (2) No.

Beechboro Land

12. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) Is it correct that land purchased by the Labor Government for native housing at Beechboro has been sold by the Native Welfare Department?
- (2) What was the price paid for the property in Benara Road?
- (3) What was the sale price by the department?
- (4) Was any alternative land purchased for housing?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) £3,000 was paid for lot 27 in June, 1957.
- (3) See answer to No. (1).
- (4) Lot 17 in Benara Road was purchased as an alternative reserve site in May, 1959.

NATIVE INSTITUTIONS

Location, and Training and Qualifications of Staff

13. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) For how many institutions is the Native Welfare Department required to find staff?
- (2) Where are the institutions situated?
- (3) Is there a training period given to such staff?
- (4) What qualifications are required for appointment as officer in charge or matron to native hostels?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Six.
- (2) Halls Creek, Nullagine, Onslow, Cue, Yalgoo, and Perth.
- (3) Officers in charge are required to have certain qualifications before appointment and no further formal training is given them other than a brief induction period at the departmental head office. Other staff are trained at the institutions by the officers in charge.
- (4) Experience in administering comparable institutions. Ability to give instruction in manual training, if male, and domestic science if female.

MURDERS AND HANGINGS

Dates of Crimes and Executions

14. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) On what dates have murders been committed in Western Australia between the 12th April, 1962, and the present time; and if more than one on any day, the number of persons murdered?
- (2) On what dates did hangings take place during that period?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) The 21st April, 1962—One.
The 23rd June, 1962—One.
(Charge of unlawful killing of native, Warburton Ranges.)
The 27th January, 1963—Two.
The 9th February, 1963—Three.
The 16th February, 1963—One.
The 9th March, 1963—One.
The 23rd March, 1963—One.
The 16th June, 1963—One.
The 10-11th August, 1963—One.
- (2) Nil.

PRINCESS MAY SCHOOL

Closure and Future Use

15. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it proposed to close the Princess May School, Fremantle?
- (2) If so, when?
- (3) What is proposed to be done with the vacated property?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) The Princess May School was closed some years ago but the building is still being used to house some overflow classes from the John Curtin Senior High School.

- (2) When the building is no longer required by the John Curtin Senior High School it will be returned to the Public Works Department.
- (3) No proposals have been considered as yet.

HARBOUR AT GERALDTON

Report of American Expert

16. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) When does he expect to receive the report of the American expert who was recently engaged to inspect and report on the Geraldton Harbour and approaches?
- (2) When the report is received, will he make it public?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) The report has been received and is under consideration.
- (2) A decision in this regard will be made after reports by departmental officers have been considered.

SHOPPING SITES AT NOLLAMARA

Number, Location, and Conditions of Sale

17. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:
 - (1) When is it proposed to offer for sale shopping sites at North Nollamara?
 - (2) How many shopping sites will be available?
 - (3) Where are the sites located?
 - (4) What will be the conditions of sale?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) A public auction, to be held in the near future, is at present being arranged.
- (2) There are five sites in the subdivision.
- (3) On the north-west corner of the intersection of Marloo and Canara Roads, North Nollamara.
- (4) Individual purchasers will be required to pay 10 per cent. of their successful bid, at the conclusion of bidding, and the balance within 28 days.

DRAINAGE OF WATTLE GROVE AND FORRESTFIELD

Priority of Other Areas

18. Mr. DUNN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

Further to my question on the 15th August, 1963, regarding the drainage of the Wattle Grove-Forrestfield areas, and the reply,

could he advise particulars of the other areas involved, their proposed order of priority and if the Wattle Grove-Forrestfield area is dependent on the completion of any of these areas to allow for its drainage?

Mr. WILD replied:

There are many areas requiring drainage and, while the following is not meant to be a completely comprehensive list, it does show the majority of those areas:—

Areas extending from Wanneroo Road in the vicinity of Dog Swamp right through the northern portion of Morley Park to Bassendean.

Large parts of Riverton.

Parts of Cloverdale, Kewdale, Maida Vale, Wattle Grove, Forrestfield, and the various areas between Welshpool up to and including Armadale along the South Western Railway.

Certain parts of Midland Junction extending up to Koongamia.

There is no fixed priority list, but as funds become available the work to be put in hand depends upon an assessment of the conditions at the time.

BRIDGE OVER GREENOUGH RIVER

Erection at Eradu Crossing

19. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Works:

What progress has been made with the proposal to build a bridge over the Greenough River at the Eradu Crossing on the Geraldton-Mullewa Road?

Mr. WILD replied:

Some foundation boring has been carried out and further investigatory work is to be done.

HOSPITAL AT ONSLOW

Details

20. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Health:

What are the latest details concerning hospital facilities at Onslow?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The situation is being reviewed following a visit by the Assistant Principal Medical Officer (Dr. Rowe) earlier this month.

COPPER SULPHATE*Use of Imported Product in Fertiliser Manufacture*

21. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What quantity of copper sulphate produced from sources outside of W.A. was used in the manufacture of fertiliser here for the years—1960; 1961; 1962; 1963?

Sources of Supply

- (2) What are the locations of the sources of supply?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) In order to ensure adequate supplies of high-grade copper to farmers at the most economical cost on the farm, supplies of local copper ore were supplemented by the following quantities of copper sulphate:—

		Tons
1959-1960	Nil
1960-1961	100
1961-1962	2,050
1962-1963	3,300
		<hr/> 5,450

		Tons
(2) Australian sources	3,750
Overseas	1,700
		<hr/> 5,450

RAWLINNA SCHOOL*Requirements of Tender for Improvements*

22. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will he supply full particulars of the requirements of the tender for the building of a new two-room school toilet block and additions to teachers' quarters at a cost of £24,749 at Rawlinna?

Pupils and Teachers

- (2) What number of children attend this school?
(3) How many teachers are employed at the school?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) (a) Two classrooms, two stores, teachers' room, verandahs completely surrounding building. Of construction to alleviate extreme climatic conditions, prefabricated timber and steel frame, concrete footings, and concrete floors with vinyl tile finish, insulated ceiling.

- (b) Toilet block to be erected of three E.C.'s for girls and two E.C.'s for boys.

- (c) Teachers' quarters—existing. New bath and heater to bathroom and wood stove (new). Repair existing fly screens, repaint whole building externally and internally. Connection to electricity and water supply.

- (d) General—school. Raise bitumen paved area and paths, drainage and spall drains, water supply in storage tanks, electrical installation, flagpole, incinerator and new fencing.

(2) 42.

(3) Two.

ESPERANCE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL*Additional Classrooms*

23. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) What consideration has been given to the building of additional classrooms at the Esperance Junior High School this financial year?

Gazetted as Five-year High School

- (2) When can it be expected that this school will become a five-year high school?

Provision of Hostel

- (3) Has the Government any plans to build a school hostel at this centre? If so, approximately when?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) A Briston prefabricated unit of two classrooms is to be removed from Bullfinch to Esperance to provide the additional accommodation required.
(2) When there are approximately 250 post primary pupils.
(3) No.

TRAFFIC OFFENCES*Time-lapse in Institution of Proceedings*

24. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) What approximate period of time elapses before proceedings are instituted in the case of—
(a) serious traffic offences;
(b) lesser traffic offences?

Failure to Stop at Traffic Lights

- (2) Is failure to stop at traffic lights or stop signs regarded as a serious offence, particularly when this action results in a collision with another vehicle?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) (a) Approximately five to six weeks.
- (b) Approximately fourteen days.
- (2) Yes.

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Prosecution of Former Agent W. G. Donohoe

25. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Police:

In respect of the conviction of William Gerard Donohoe in the Court of Petty Sessions on the 6th August, 1963, for a breach of section 37 subsection (b) of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act, 1960:—

- (1) What was the exact wording of the complaint against Donohoe?
- (2) (a) What are the facts upon which the Chairman of the Totalisator Agency Board complained to the Police that there was a deficiency of moneys?
- (b) Why was it not known to the Chairman whether or not the money had been "actually stolen"?
- (c) Was the complaint of the Chairman in writing and if so, what were the contents of such writing?
- (d) If the complaint of the Chairman was not in writing how, when, where, and to whom was it made and what were the exact words in which it was made?
- (e) Were the circumstances surrounding the deficiency as revealed by inquiries by the Criminal Investigation Branch submitted to the Crown Law Department in writing, and if so, what were the contents of such writing?
- (f) If the circumstances surrounding the deficiency as revealed by the inquiries of the Criminal Investigation Branch were not submitted in writing how, when, where, and to whom was the submission made and what were the exact words of such submission?
- (g) Did the Crown Law Department advise that the information submitted did not disclose a *prima facie* case of stealing, and if so, did the Crown Law Department give

the grounds upon which such advice was founded and or the reasons for it?

- (h) If the Crown Law Department gave the grounds or reasons why the information submitted to it did not disclose a *prima facie* case of stealing what were such grounds and reasons respectively?
- (i) Did the Crown Law Department advise that on the information submitted to it there was a *prima facie* case of stealing, and if so, why was a charge of stealing not laid?
- (j) Was there any discussion between Donohoe or his representative and any officer of the Totalisator Agency Board or of the Criminal Investigation Branch or of the Crown Law Department as to or canvassing what charge should be laid against Donohoe, and if so:—
 - (a) When and where was such discussion held?
 - (b) Who were the persons present?
 - (c) Was a promise extracted from or on behalf of Donohoe that if he were not charged with stealing then he would plead guilty to a charge of having committed a breach of section 37 of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act, 1960?
 - (d) If Donohoe or his representative gave an undertaking to plead guilty to a charge of having committed a breach of section 37 of the Totalisator Agency Board Betting Act, 1960, was there any and if so what discussion as to the way in which the complaint against Donohoe would be worded?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) The complaint of Allan Clarence Trigwell of Fremantle, Detective, made the 26th day of July, 1963, at Fremantle that between the 1st day of July, 1962, and the 4th day of July, 1963, William Gerrard Donohoe having the management of a Totalisator Agency, to wit, Agency No. 23 situate at 8 South Terrace, accepted bets on horse

racings from persons, such persons not having previously established a credit account for such bets in accordance with this Act, contrary to section 37 (b) of the Totalisator Agency Board Act, 1960.

- (2) (a) to (j) Investigations in this matter are being currently conducted. In accordance with the well-established practice I am therefore bound not to comment at this stage.

26. and 27. *These questions were postponed.*

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARDS

*Investigations into Improper Practices
by Victorian Board*

28. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) Is he aware that it was reported in a Melbourne newspaper less than a month ago that the Acting Premier of Victoria (Mr. Rylah), after conferences with the Solicitor-General and the Auditor-General had ordered a concentrated probe into the Victorian Totalisator Agency Board and that a leading detective has been commissioned to marshal all evidence of—
 - (a) apparent embezzlement;
 - (b) false telephone accounts; and
 - (c) betting on winning horses after races have been run?
- (2) Is he further aware that it has been reported that the inquiry may also extend in scope to reveal whether punters' dividends have been affected by late and improper betting on winning horses?
- (3) Has the State Manager of the Victorian T.A.B. been dismissed?
- (4) Is it known whether the Auditor-General was mainly responsible for the disclosures which have led up to the current inquiries?

Check on W.A. Board by Auditor-General

- (5) Does he not think that the Auditor-General should be authorised to exercise an overall check on the T.A.B. in Western Australia, instead of being excluded from so doing as is the case at present?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) No.
- (5) No.

29. and 30. *These questions were postponed.*

BEEF EXPORT

Quantity and Value

31. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What quantity in pounds of boneless frozen beef was exported from this State for the years 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961?
- (2) What was the value of such exports?
- (3) Is edible beef offal exported; and, if so, what was the weight in pounds and the value of such exports?

Mr. NALDER replied:

Separate figures for boneless frozen beef are not available, but they are estimated at approximately 75 per cent. of total frozen beef exports the figures for which are as follows:—

- (1) 1957-58—17,528,363 lb.
1958-59—23,184,228 lb.
1959-60—29,977,441 lb.
1960-61—27,365,093 lb.
- (2) 1957-58—£1,204,639.
1958-59—£2,172,645.
1959-60—£3,370,933.
1960-61—£3,070,662.
- (3) Yes.
1957-58—1,160,298 lb. valued at £85,526.
1958-59—1,668,341 lb. valued at £148,887.
1959-60—2,433,786 lb. valued at £217,806.
1960-61—1,975,888 lb. valued at £183,895.

RADIO TRACKING STATION

Establishment at Albany

32. Mr. HALL asked the Premier:

- (1) Has the W.A. Government been approached relative to establishing a radio base, or tracking station, at Albany?
- (2) If so, what was the outcome of such approaches?

Mr. NALDER (for Mr. Brand) replied:

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

CANNED FISH

Exports, Home Consumption, and Imports

33. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) What tonnages of canned fish were exported from this State for the years 1958-59, 1959-60, 1960-61, 1961-62, 1962-63?
- (2) What tonnages of salmon and herring, processed within the State, were sold in this State?

- (3) How many tons of canned fish were imported into this State for the respective years, from all sources, and of the imported fish how many tons were of salmon and herring varieties?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Figures not available.
 (2) Figures not available.
 (3) Information furnished by the Perth Office of the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics shows the following imports of canned fish into Western Australia:—

	Salmon lb.	Herring lb.	Total Canned fish lb.
1961-62	430,203	322,563	1,374,123
*1962-63	1,039,549	222,847	2,156,483

*Subject to final check by bureau.

It should be noted that imported salmon and herring are quite different from local species going under the same names.

(Note: Figures for earlier years could not be furnished in the time available.)

S.E.C. POWER SCHEMES

Financial Results of Operations

34. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Electricity:

What were the operating costs of the State Electricity Commission for the six years ended June, 1963, in each of the metropolitan system, south-west scheme, other country undertakings, and Albany Gas Undertaking under the headings of revenue, expenditure, and profit or loss?

Mr. NALDER replied:

Operating costs are included in the following schedule:—

METROPOLITAN SYSTEM

	Revenue	Expenditure	Profit
1958	6,680,331	6,588,831	91,500
1959	7,029,017	6,824,613	204,404
1960	7,502,488	7,277,683	244,803
1961	8,159,191	7,803,167	356,024
1962	8,319,337	7,866,396	452,941

SOUTH-WEST POWER SCHEME

	Revenue	Expenditure	Loss
1958	745,651	782,242	36,591
1959	737,593	866,599	79,006
1960	838,842	968,957	130,115
1961	861,903	1,130,519	238,616
1962	939,216	1,177,034	237,818

OTHER COUNTRY UNDERTAKINGS

	Revenue	Expenditure	Loss
1958	199,098	224,875	25,177
1959	191,876	219,292	27,416
1960	229,498	252,613	23,115
1961	300,019	305,362	5,343
1962	304,805	298,627	6,178 (Profit)

ALBANY GAS

	Revenue	Expenditure	Loss
1958	9,594	15,086	5,492
1959	9,957	17,519	7,562
1960	10,908	17,473	6,565
1961	11,576	19,828	8,252
1962	11,501	20,024	8,523

The 1963 figures are not available.

WATER RATES

Concessions or Exemptions

35. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What categories, if any, of persons, clubs, institutions, or associations receive concessions or exemptions in regard to levying of water rates?
 (2) Do any of the above receive concessions or exemptions in regard to payment of excess water charges?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) No concessions or exemptions from levying of water rates on ratable properties are granted.

Land which is declared non-ratable by section 72 of the Metropolitan Water Supply Act has annual charges levied against it, when a service is given, in accordance with the by-laws.

- (2) No.

DAMS ON FITZROY AND MARGARET RIVERS

Approach to Commonwealth Government

36. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Premier:

- (1) Is it the intention of the W.A. Government to approach the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance for the construction of dams across the Fitzroy and Margaret Rivers?

- (2) If so, when will this approach be made?

- (3) If not, will he give the reasons why?

Mr. NALDER (for Mr. Brand) replied:

- (1) Yes.

- (2) Not yet decided.

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

POLICE QUARTERS AT BROOME AND DERBY

Improvements

37. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for Police:

What plans has the Government in mind for improvements to police quarters at both Broome and Derby?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

The question refers to police quarters, but I presume the honourable member means police stations. On that assumption the reply is as follows:—

A new police station is to be erected at Broome at a total cost of £40,000, of which £10,000 is to be spent this financial year. It will include accommodation for single men.

New lock-up, exercise yard, single men's and married men's quarters, at a total cost of £25,000, are listed for Derby. However, no funds are available during the current financial year.

MONTESSORI METHOD OF EDUCATION

Attitude of Education Department

38. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Education:

What is the attitude of the Education Department towards the "Montessori" method of education?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

The modern techniques used in infants' classes in this State include the best ideas from as many sources as possible.

"Montessori's method" was developed to cater for large classes of very young children and, as such, has little relevance in our junior classes.

However, some of the principles underlying Montessori's approach have been incorporated with others, in our present teaching practices. The Education Department, while recognising the contribution of Montessori to education, would regard any adoption of the Montessori method as the total teaching method in a classroom to be a backward step.

PUBLIC SERVICE VACANCIES

Outside Appointments: Government Policy and Effect on Officers

39. Mr. H. MAY asked the Premier:

- (1) Further to my question answered yesterday concerning the appointment of Mr. McCarrey as Assistant Under-Treasurer, is it Government policy to appoint outside the State Public Service applicants who have had no association with the service?
- (2) If this is Government policy, does he not think that such policy will kill incentive within the State Public Service, for officers to fit themselves for top positions within

the service, such as the position of Assistant Under-Treasurer, to which a complete outsider so far as the service is concerned has been appointed in the person of Mr. McCarrey?

Mr. NALDER (for Mr. Brand) replied:

- (1) Yes—particularly in the professional and general divisions. Each case is considered on its merits.
- (2) No.

40. *This question was postponed.*

VIOLET VALLEY STATION

Sale or Lease of Property

41. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for Native Welfare:

- (1) As the lease on Violet Valley Station (formerly a native welfare station) expired on the 29th December, 1962, what action has the Government taken regarding a sale or lease of this property?
- (2) Who was the successful applicant, and what are the specific conditions attached to the sale or lease?
- (3) Does the successful applicant hold any adjoining pastoral lease; if so, what is the acreage of these leases?
- (4) How many applications were received for the sale or lease of Violet Valley Station?

Mr. LEWIS replied:

- (1) Negotiations are proceeding to extend the lease of the property.
- (2) East Kimberley (1963) Pty. Ltd. Conditions of the lease are still under negotiation.
- (3) Not known.
- (4) Three inquiries were received between 1958 and 1962.

CREDIT BETTING

Acceptance of Bets by W. G. Donohoe and other Agents

42. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) With reference to the conviction of William Gerard Donohoe in the Fremantle Police Court on the 6th August, on a charge of having, during the period between the 1st July, 1962, and the 4th July, 1963, accepted bets on horse racing from persons who had not previously established a credit account for such bets in accordance with the requirements of section 33 of the Totalisator Agency Betting Act, thus rendering himself liable to the penalties prescribed by section 37 of that Act—
 - (a) how many such bets were made by Donohoe;

- (b) as every such bet was an offence, why was the charge against Donohoe related to a multiplicity of bets;
- (c) were any of the illegal bets winning bets which required the use of the board's funds to pay them;
- (d) if "Yes," what was the total amount of board's funds so used?
- (2) Did the auditors of the board at any time during the 12 months' period involved, draw attention to the unauthorised use of the board's money to pay the prohibited winning bets?
- (3) Who are the board's auditors?
- (4) Is it not a fact that the chairman of the board is aware that Donohoe and other agents have been accepting bets from persons who had not previously established a credit account?
- (5) Is it not also a fact that he is aware that agents of the board have been accepting bets from persons who had not previously established a credit account, and when asked what he proposed to do to ensure that the conduct of the T.A.B. in regard to credit betting conformed to the undertaking given to Parliament by one of his predecessors that "credit betting off-course in totalisator regions will no longer be legal, and bets will be possible only in cash or against cash deposits or winnings held by the T.A.B." he replied that he did not propose to do anything further?

Action by Minister to Enforce Act

- (6) Has he done anything at all to ensure that credit betting, except against a credit account already established and maintained in accordance with the Act is not done by the T.A.B.?
- (7) If "Yes," what has he done and when did he do it?
- (8) Does he recall having told the House on the 6th September, 1962, that "so far as the T.A.B. is concerned all wagering is in cash" and, further, on the same day, that the "Board only deals in cash"?

Bet by Licensed Off-course Bookmaker

- (9) Is he aware that a licensed off-course bookmaker who had not previously established a credit account was allowed to invest £50 direct with the board by telephone to reduce heavy liabilities on a particular horse?

- (10) What explanation has he to make regarding the statements made by him on the 6th September which are referred to in No. (8), and which are so much at variance with the actual facts?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) (a) I have been given to understand that there are no records available to the board that would give this information.
- (b) It is a common practice to proceed against a first offender in this manner. Experience has shown that the total penalty imposed is similar whether one or a number of charges are laid.
- (c) I have been given to understand that there are no records available to the board that would give this information.
- (d) Answered in (c) above.
- (2) No, because apart from other matters, I understand that there is no evidence available to the board to show the unauthorised use of the board's money to pay prohibited winning bets.
- (3) McLaren and Stewart.
- (4) I do not know, but consider it most unlikely that the chairman has the knowledge claimed of him.
- (5) No, but I did use the words "I do not propose to do anything further."
- (6) No, but I feel certain that the board as far as is practicable is taking proper precautions to ensure that sections 33 and 34 of the Act are complied with.
- (7) Answered in No. (6) above.
- (8) Yes, and I believe the board is using its best endeavours to keep it that way.
- (9) No, but if additional information is made available the matter will be further investigated.
- (10) No explanation is tendered because for all practical purposes statements made are in accordance with the facts as I believe them to be.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

TOTALISATOR AGENCY BOARD

Prosecution of Former Agent W. G. Donohoe

- 1. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Police:
 - (1) Will he indicate whether the current inquiries in connection with the agent of Agency No. 23, who was convicted for illegal betting, are likely to be protracted?

- (2) Will he answer the questions which he has deferred today when the inquiries have been completed?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) and (2) I am not sure, but I am led to believe that they will not be protracted; however, as soon as I am in a position to answer along the lines sought by the honourable member I will do so.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Amending Legislation

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

During the course of the last session the Minister indicated that comprehensive amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act would be introduced this session. Can he give the House any indication of when the Bill will be introduced?

Mr. WILD replied:

No, I cannot. I have them before me now, and when I get sufficient time I will have a good look at them and make some recommendation to Cabinet.

Mr. Graham: This session?

TRAFFIC OFFENCES

Time-lapse in Institution of Proceedings

3. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Police:

This afternoon I asked the Minister the approximate time that elapses before proceedings are instituted in the case of—

- (a) serious traffic offences;
- (b) lesser traffic offences.

The Minister's reply was as follows:—

- (a) approximately five to six weeks;
- (b) approximately 14 days.

Would the Minister enlighten me why five or six weeks elapse when dealing with serious traffic offences, while 14 days elapse in the case of lesser traffic offences?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

I can only suggest that serious traffic offences involve considerably more inquiry than would, say, a minor breach of the traffic law. If the honourable member can quote me a specific instance where he considers the period has been excessive, I will make inquiries and inform him.

MIDLAND RAILWAY COMPANY

Agreement for Takeover

4. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Railways:

Further to my question on Tuesday concerning agreements with the Midland Railway Company, can the Minister tell the House whether the Government at any time entered into an interim agreement or a final agreement with the Midland Railway Company before the proposed takeover?

Mr. COURT replied:

No agreement has been entered into at any time by this Government with the Midland Railway Company. As I advised the House earlier, negotiations are proceeding, and we expect finality at an early date. But at this point of time no agreement has been entered into by the Government with the Midland Railway Company.

MOTOR VEHICLES

Thefts in 1963

5. Mr. O'CONNOR asked the Minister for Police:

Will the Minister tell the House the number of motor vehicles that were stolen in Western Australia from the 1st January, 1963, to date?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

I thank the honourable member for having given me prior notice of this question. The number of vehicles stolen is 649.

STANDARD GAUGE RAILWAY

Route Changes: Tabling of Plan

6. Mr. COURT (Minister for Railways): Earlier this week the member for Beeloo asked me a question regarding prospective changes in the route of the standard gauge railway south of the river. At the time, I said I was examining the possibility of making a statement on this issue in the public interest. I have done that; and with your permission, Sir, I would like to table this plan which shows the broad outline of the changes in route in the standard gauge railway.

The plan was tabled.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: EIGHTH DAY

Amendment to Motion.

Debate resumed, from the 21st August, on the following motion by Mr. Mitchell:—

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

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

To which Mr. Heal had moved an amendment:—

That the following words be added to the motion:—

but we consider the Government is deserving of censure for departing from the basic principles upon which public tendering is founded (viz., that contracts should be awarded to the lowest tenderer unless there exist good reasons to doubt the ability of the tenderer to do the work) in order to give contracts to preferred contractors regardless of the cost involved.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [2.43 p.m.]: I rise to oppose this amendment. Frankly I am rather surprised that the honourable member has moved it, because it can be nothing short of embarrassing to his constituent. Members of the House will know that I offered the honourable member the opportunity to have a look at the particular file with his constituent, so that there could be no suggestion that the Government had anything to hide, or that there was nothing but proper practice in the matter.

I understand the honourable member saw the file, but I am not sure whether he took his constituent with him. I understand from the officers of the department, so far as I was able to check this morning, that only the honourable member saw the file. I am sure that had he taken his constituent to see this file, he would have suggested that the matter be allowed to rest where it is; because hashing this up in Parliament does the constituent no good.

The Government has tried to be fair to the person concerned, because it is not implied that the reasons why his tender

was rejected on this occasion, are reasons why his tender would be rejected for other jobs of work for which this particular person, and one other firm, are suited. It so happened that this tender was for a particular type of work, calling for particular skills and experience. After a very careful investigation by the railway officers in, I thought, a spirit of fairness and thoroughness, it was recommended to the commissioner, and from the commissioner to me, that another tender be accepted.

There is nothing new in the acceptance of other than the lowest tender. If there were something new in this, of course, it would be a matter of public interest; but it has been known throughout the ages that tenders, for very good reasons, are called on the basis that no tender is necessarily accepted.

It so happens that some people tender in good faith thinking they have the ability to do a particular job, and their tender is not acceptable—or I should say their particular experience is not acceptable—to the person who has to pay for the job. It is not unusual for people to tender for work who have no financial capacity to undertake a job of a certain magnitude, where in point of fact they would be able to undertake a job of a lesser magnitude.

So it is left to the discretion of the person having the work done, to make up his mind whether the tender should be accepted. The Government, for good reason has, over the last 12 or 18 months, publicised the fact that it will not necessarily accept the lowest tender in future. There has been ample warning given of this, and that was done for good reasons. Some of the reasons were because of the financial failure of people; and others because of technical difficulties.

The common practice throughout the commercial world is that this reservation be inserted. Having publicised this the Government emphasised the fact that it was going to follow the same practice as ordinary business people; that anyone who tenders for Government work—whether it be for the Public Works Department, the Railways Department, or any other Government instrumentality—will know the conditions under which he tenders. In addition, the advertisement does make it very clear that the lowest, or any, tender will not necessarily be accepted.

The honourable member's own motion, as I have it recorded in his transcript here, really gives the answer to the queries raised, because he says—

but we consider the Government is deserving of censure for departing from the basic principles upon which

public tendering is founded (viz. that contracts should be awarded to the lowest tenderer—

and this is the reservation he makes—

unless there exist good reasons to doubt the ability of the tenderer to do the work) in order to give contracts to preferred contractors regardless of the cost involved.

In framing his own amendment the honourable member gave the answer; because he has gone to considerable trouble to put this reservation in brackets—that there are circumstances in which the lowest tender is not accepted.

Mr. Graham: You say then that these are the grounds on which you have rejected the lowest tender?

Mr. COURT: I will give the honourable member all the grounds before I finish; and if I have not given him sufficient grounds he may interject again, and I will give him more grounds.

Mr. Heal: I hope you won't take six weeks to do it.

Mr. COURT: Already the honourable member has made it very clear that there are certain grounds on which the lowest tender should not be accepted. When the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was speaking earlier this session he also said; in the course of criticising the Government's action, that there were circumstances under which the lowest tender is not necessarily accepted. I do not think anyone in this Chamber would hold that the lowest tender on any occasion has to be accepted.

Mr. Graham: Nobody disputes that.

Mr. COURT: Bringing this matter before Parliament, and forcing the Government to make certain disclosures regarding contracts, does not help the contractor. We had hoped that the honourable member, together with his constituent, would examine the papers and be prepared to accept the situation without any highlighting of reasons why this tender could not be accepted in the opinion of the engineer, the commissioner, and myself, when the matter was put to me.

Mr. Heal: Only in the opinion of one engineer.

Mr. COURT: That is not correct.

Mr. Heal: That is so.

Mr. COURT: We are now forced into the position of highlighting the fact that this particular tenderer for certain types of work is not as good as certain other particular people in this community. Had the matter been allowed to rest where it should, the tenderer could have taken the necessary action to remedy any shortcomings in regard to this particular type of work and then might have been a

desirable tenderer for future work. I repeat: There is certain work for which this tenderer is competent and for which he could tender and tender successfully.

Mr. H. May: This is the only way we could tell him.

Mr. COURT: The member for Collie says this is the only way he could be told. That is not correct.

Mr. Heal: You would not tell him.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order!

Mr. COURT: I would tell him. The papers were offered to the constituent so he could see for himself. He would not have to accept my word, the commissioner's word, or the word of the member for Perth. I elected to do that. I even went further and suggested to the honourable member that if after he had seen the papers he was not satisfied he could discuss the matter further with me.

Mr. Heal: That is why I moved this amendment; I am not satisfied.

Mr. COURT: The honourable member has tried to avoid his responsibilities.

Mr. Heal: I do not think so.

Mr. COURT: Instead of telling his constituents the facts, he has tried to force this Government into the position of stating publicly why this man's tender could not be accepted. The position is very simple to explain; and I do not intend to speak for very long. The facts are that there were two tenderers lower than the one accepted. There was the tender of Martinazzo & Son Pty. Ltd. for £52,977, and one from Marchioro & Son, for £54,939. These were passed over and the contract let to H. A. Doust and Son, for £56,530, which was £3,553 in one case, and £1,591 in the other in excess of the lowest and the next tender.

The tenders were examined when they closed by the engineers who have the responsibility of making a recommendation to the commissioner, and whilst it might appear on the file that the actual recommendation was made by the one engineer, the fact remains that many men are involved in this particular department who have the responsibility of examining this type of work. They do not make a recommendation lightly. They make inquiries as to the financial ability of the people, and they agreed that these people have the financial capacity to see the job through, based on the information before them.

Therefore, there was only the question of the technical test involved. When they made inquiries on this score, they were very definitely of the opinion, as the honourable member will know from the papers, that it was not desirable to let this tender to the lowest tenderer, Martinazzo & Son Pty. Ltd. The honourable member will also

realise from these papers that these investigations covered a fairly wide field and actually covered knowledge of work done by these people.

I would emphasise again that these people are very competent in certain types of work; but this was a very important piece of bridge work that called for special skills and experience and the confidential inquiries we made through other sources—I am referring to technical inquiries—indicated that this particular tenderer—that is, Martinazzo & Son Pty. Ltd.—was unreliable and unsatisfactory for bridge work. I emphasise, for bridge work, and not other work. He was satisfactory for floor slabs and mosaic work, which, I understand, is the type of work carried out by this contractor at Perth Airport.

In this case we are dealing with the construction of a bridge which requires vastly different techniques and knowledge. In the circumstances neither the commissioner nor his engineers were prepared to accept the risk of recommending allocation of this work in the face of the technical reports they had received from very reliable quarters and based, of course, on their own knowledge.

I must, of course, deal with the next lowest tenderer, Marchioro & Son. These people were subcontractors to Perron Brothers on the construction of the Kwinana-Jarrahdale line and here was a case where our own officers, based on practical experience, had a chance to make their own assessment; and in the opinion of our own officers the work of Marchioro & Son was poor in quality and finish and they had obviously no appreciation of the quality and dimensional accuracy required in engineering construction, which is the type of work we are dealing with—work of great skill and importance. We must realise that this bridge is one over which very heavy railway tonnage will have to pass and will not only involve heavy traffic because of the freight concerned, but passengers will be concerned as well.

Mr. Tonkin: This bridge is only £50,000, not £50,000,000.

Mr. COURT: It does not matter whether it is £50,000,000, £50,000, or 50 pence: it is purely a question of technical qualifications and experience and not the financial capacity of these firms. For that reason, when the commissioner came to me with the advice of his officers, I had no hesitation in saying that I agreed with their recommendations. It could be said, of course, that under the contract, if the bridge is not up to specifications, we will not have to pay for it. However, imagine the hue and cry there would be if we had to rebuild the bridge, or get somebody else to rebuild it, and so on. We would have to face a motion on this side of the

House on that one. The officers concerned were not prepared to take that risk.

Mr. Heal: This firm had built two previous bridges.

Mr. COURT: I mentioned the fact that our own officers made certain investigations and were satisfied that this particular company should not be entrusted with this bridge; and I have given a good and sufficient reason. There was no necessity for their recommendation to have been submitted to the Minister, but they came to me as a matter of courtesy, and in view of the fact that the officers did not want to accept the lowest tender I was advised by the commissioner—

Mr. Heal: Why did you complain about their previous work?

Mr. COURT: I explained that in connection with one of the tenderers the department was not satisfied, and had to spend a lot of time supervising in order to get a job that was satisfactory. That was a very simple job compared with this bridge; and the firm that has been the successful tenderer for this bridge is not only building this one but another as well that is part of the overall scheme for the Fremantle concept of getting the railway across the river. Throughout Australia this firm is regarded as a leading firm in concrete work, so there is no risk as far as the technical side is concerned.

I repeat: It is most unfortunate this matter has had to be aired like this, because the firm concerned is one that does certain types of work extremely well. The Railways Department is not prepared to accept that firm for the job under question, and it will be interesting to see what the response is to future tenders submitted to other Government departments for this type of work. The railways and most other departments would be quite happy to accept them for certain types of work.

It is not bad to look back on occasions to see what was the attitude of one's predecessor in regard to this type of thing. I understand there are many cases where the previous Government, in its judgment at the time, did not accept the lowest tender for various reasons. I have never challenged this, except on one occasion—and that was for a very good reason. I bring this up because someone said, "Why did you let these people tender if they are not acceptable?"

Of course, that is a very pertinent and sound question, because in big works, such as the Narrows Bridge, and the big standard gauge project, it is customary throughout the world to invite applications only from firms that want to be accredited tenderers. Only those firms are given plans and specification and allowed to tender. That is done to stop people

without the finance and technical background wasting a lot of time and money and also to stop them wasting the time and money of the technical experts who consider the tenders, because if they know beforehand that a job costing £2,000,000 or £3,000,000 is beyond the financial and technical capacity of a person or firm they do not waste their time considering that tender.

Mr. Hawke: But could a Government legally prevent a company from tendering?

Mr. COURT: It is done.

Mr. Hawke: But can it legally be done?

Mr. COURT: I think so. Any person could follow the procedure that is adopted. If I remember rightly this procedure was adopted for the Narrows Bridge, and I think for the Ord scheme. I know it was adopted for some parts of the standard gauge railway.

Mr. Hawke: I was wondering whether it was absolutely legal, though.

Mr. COURT: When applications are called from firms to submit themselves for accreditation, they submit themselves as approved tenderers to save themselves and others an awful lot of wasted effort. If they are rejected and feel unfairly treated they naturally then appeal—in the case of the Government works, to the Minister of the day and tell him that they think they were unfairly left out of the list.

For instance, I know that when approved tenderers were called for the Fremantle railway bridge, one firm thought it had been aggrieved in this way and went to the Minister to have its case re-examined; and that was done. It is logical to assume that when people are allowed to tender under those circumstances, provided their tender is the best it should be accepted. It is not customary, however, for small work to go through this process; but if a firm wants to find out whether it would be acceptable on a technical or financial basis I know of no procedure to stop it going to the Government authority concerned and asking whether it would be acceptable for the particular job. I have no doubt it would be told, and once it had obtained the information that it would be acceptable it would be entitled to assume that it would be considered on its merits; but that does not apply in this case.

However, I go back now to the 26th August, 1958, when some questions were asked in the House regarding a competition home. The then Government wanted a home built by a certain date, and rather than call public tenders it asked selected tenderers to submit tenders. Now, if I had been one of those selected tenderers I would have thought that if I submitted the best price the Government of the day

would have said I was a suitable person and my tender would have been accepted. But that is not quite what happened.

I asked some questions of the then Minister for Housing which are reported on page 373 of *Hansard* of 1958 as follows:—

- (1) With reference to the answer given to my question without notice, on the 21st August, 1958, regarding tenders for the Department of Industrial Development competition home, why were firms included in the nominated tenderers, if there was doubt about their capacity to complete the work in time?
- (2) What efforts were made to seek from the lowest tenderer the necessary assurances and guarantees of completion within the allotted time, and with what result?

The Minister replied:—

- (1) It was considered by both the Chairman and Chief Architect of the State Housing Commission, and accepted by the Department of Industrial Development, that there was a greater certainty of completion by the required date on the part of the selected tenderer.
- (2) Assurances or guarantees, however well intentioned, would not necessarily have ensured completion within the allotted time.

This matter was again pursued as reported on page 376 of the same *Hansard*.

My main objection then was not to the fact that the lowest tenderer had not been accepted, but to the fact that there had been selected tenderers. Therefore, in those circumstances, when the Government went to selected people in the community—I am not sure whether there were four, five, or six of them—and asked them to put in a tender for the house to be done by a certain date, it would be a prerequisite that the Government had decided that whoever submitted the best tender would automatically be given the job.

However, the Minister in this case stated that he wanted a firm that he knew in his own mind could do the job. If that was the then Government's attitude towards a tender of that type it just amazes me that the member for Perth should see fit to make such a song and dance about something which is being done in the ordinary commercial way by the Railways Department.

I completely support the recommendation made by the officers. I repeat: They could have gone on with the job without consulting me; but as a matter of courtesy they referred it to me in view of the fact that there might have been political

criticism. They gave good and sound reasons for their recommendations which I accepted, and I have no cause to detract from the support which I gave to the officers' recommendation.

I think that completely answers the honourable member's submission. I gather from his amendment that he was a little timid about it himself. Unfortunately I was not here, because of illness, but I have read what he said. He did not make out a strong case for his amendment—in fact, he did not make out a case at all; and in the very wording of his amendment gave me the complete answer this House needed.

MR. TONKIN (Melville—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.6 p.m.]: I rise to support the amendment, and before speaking I would like to read a text for the day. I have a booklet issued by the Liberal Party called "We Believe". It is a statement of Liberal Party beliefs, guaranteed to be authentic, with no misrepresentation.

Mr. Bickerton: Was it authorised?

Mr. TONKIN: Now belief No. 11 is the one I am interested in at the moment and it reads as follows:—

We believe that improved living standards depend upon high productivity and efficient service and that these vital elements can be achieved only by free and competitive enterprise.

Mr. Dunn: Hear, hear!

Mr. TONKIN: I take "free and competitive enterprise" to mean that there is no control or favouritism and that each man is entitled to win on his merits. Let us see how far the Liberal Party put this into practice.

First of all I think it is necessary to appreciate the difference between private and public tendering. In public tendering it is the public's money that has to be used to pay for the job done. In private tendering the person who pays for the contract uses his own money and so, whether he chooses the cheapest or the dearest job is his own business, because he pays for it himself.

I can appreciate that very often there could be circumstances under which a private person who has called tenders might be disposed to give the job to the highest tenderer; and if he chooses to pay more money than he need do, that is his own business entirely, because he is the one who has to pay it. He may do that for reasons of friendship. He might find one of his closest friends is a tenderer for the job and he would like his friend to do it; and so, although he could get it done more cheaply elsewhere, he is prepared to give the job to his friend. But the point there is that he pays for it himself. He does not use the public's money.

Now with regard to public tendering there is an obligation on the Government of the day to see that it does not pay more than it is obliged to pay for the job it wants done; and there are only two criteria—the first is value for the money to be expended, and the second is the time factor.

There are times when it is necessary for a Government to take a much more expensive contract because it is essential that the job be done within a certain time; otherwise, in the long run, the State might be involved in far greater expenditure. In such cases the wise thing is to pay more initially in order to save money eventually; but if the time factor does not enter into it, and enter into it properly and fairly, then the only criterion left is that the best value for the money should be obtained.

There is ample evidence that this Government has departed from the basic principles of public tendering in order to give contracts to preferred contractors. It is significant that the contractor who got the job about which the member for Perth complained, to which complaint the Minister replied, and the contractor who got the Victoria Quay job is a substantial contributor to Liberal Party funds.

Mr. Court: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. TONKIN: Yes; he is.

Mr. Court: How do you know the unsuccessful ones are not?

Mr. TONKIN: I am talking now about the successful tenderer, and I am saying it is a fact that he is a substantial contributor to the Liberal Party funds.

Mr. O'Connor: Does he also contribute to the Labor Party funds?

Mr. TONKIN: Not so far as I know. Firstly, why does the Minister for Railways refuse to publish tender figures? Invariably he adopts the attitude that the figures for tenders for his department should not be made public.

Mr. Court: Your Government followed the same practice with railways, and there is good reason for it.

Mr. TONKIN: Did our Government refuse to publish the price of the successful tenderer?

Mr. Court: We published the price of the successful tenderer.

Mr. TONKIN: No you did not.

Mr. Court: It was mentioned in the radio report.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes; and the Minister kicked up a row about it.

Mr. Court: No I didn't.

Mr. TONKIN: I am saying the Minister did.

Mr. Court: Which one did I kick up a row about?

Mr. TONKIN: I am quoting from *The West Australian* with regard to this particular contract—the contract let for a bridge. The newspaper report states that building contractors H. A. Doust & Son won a Government contract at an undisclosed price.

Mr. Kelly: They won the handicap.

Mr. TONKIN: What was the reason for it?

Mr. Court: There is no reason for it.

Mr. TONKIN: The Government refused to indicate to the paper what the price of the successful tenderer was. I submit there was a good reason; namely, that he was not the lowest tenderer. He was not the lowest tenderer for that job, nor for the Victoria Quay job, but he got both jobs.

Where public money is being expended on public works, the people have the right to know the price for the job being done, and I also say they have the right to know the tender prices submitted by other people who sought to do the job.

Mr. Court: Why did not your Government follow this policy if it is such a great one? There was good reason why it was refused to give the amounts of other tenderers; and the Tender Board still follows the same policy.

Mr. TONKIN: When the Minister was dealing with this question a few minutes ago, he endeavoured to show, firstly, that the contractor in whom the member for Perth was interested did not have the technical knowledge and skill to do the job—a mere £50,000 bridge. Could the Minister say the same about the lowest tenderer for the Victoria Quay job—a firm that has done £75,000,000 worth of work in Rhodesia; built Lawson Flats; built the C.M.L. buildings; built the Adelaide Steamship buildings; and is currently engaged in a £3,000,000 contract at Fremantle—a concrete job? Can it be said of that contractor that he did not have the financial stability—that he did not have the technical know-how? How ridiculous it would be for anyone to get up and urge that against this company! It was the lowest tenderer, but it did not get the job.

Mr. Court: Which contract is that?

Mr. TONKIN: I will tell the Minister privately if he wants to know.

Mr. Court: Which contract?

Mr. TONKIN: The Victoria Quay bridge.

Mr. Court: Which one is that?

Mr. TONKIN: The second one that Doust got.

Mr. Court: Who said he was not the lowest tenderer for that?

Mr. TONKIN: I am saying.

Mr. Court: It is different from what my officers have told me.

Mr. H. May interjected.

Mr. Court: Don't you worry; I rely on them implicitly.

Mr. TONKIN: My information is that the company to which I have just referred, in the price it tendered, was the lowest tenderer for that job without any doubt—some £140,000; just under £141,000.

Mr. Court: According to a minute of today's date from the commissioner, H. A. Doust was the lowest and the successful tenderer for the James Street bridge.

Mr. TONKIN: James Street?

Mr. Court: There is the James Street bridge and the John Street bridge that affects the railways.

Mr. TONKIN: What was Doust's figure?

Mr. Court: I have not it here.

Mr. TONKIN: My information is that the figure which was submitted by the contractor to whom I have just referred was just under £141,000 and that it was the lowest tender. As the Minister has not disclosed the figures, I am not in a position to be absolutely certain about what I have just said; I am only going on information conveyed to me, which I have no reason to disbelieve.

Mr. Court: The commissioner this morning wrote me a minute to say that H. A. Doust was the lowest and the successful tenderer for the James Street bridge.

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister can settle that question easily if he states publicly what Doust's tender price was.

Mr. Court: I will get you the information with pleasure, because I cannot imagine the commissioner would give me anything but the right information.

Mr. TONKIN: I should hope not.

Mr. Court: He certainly would not.

Mr. TONKIN: Subject to the correction which the Minister may produce—and I must acknowledge that is a possibility, but it will greatly surprise me if he does produce a correction, because I have not got my information in a roundabout way—as I say, subject to the Minister's correction, I can offer instances of where the Government has not accepted the lowest tender. The Minister made great play, so far as the case mentioned by the member for Perth is concerned, upon the ability of the contractor to do the job. What particular ability did R. J. Davies Pty. Ltd. have to build bridges?

Mr. Court: That firm was guaranteed by Gammond & Company for its technical proficiency.

Mr. TONKIN: What particular ability did Mr. Davies have? What is his trade?

Mr. Court: It was technically guaranteed by one of the most foremost firms in the world.

Mr. TONKIN: It has not done very well, because it is months and months behind with its work. If it is the efficient firm that we are led to believe is always selected by the Government, why is it so many months behind? The original date for the completion of the railway bridge at Fremantle was the 1st March, 1963. This is now August and the bridge is not yet completed. This company is supposed to be subject to a penalty if it does not complete the job by the proper date; but when the Minister's attention is drawn to the matter, all he does is look for excuses.

We are told that this is a firm which was selected on the basis of efficiency and financial stability to do the job, but it was lucky to stave off liquidation. In *The West Australian* of Friday, the 21st June, there appeared a report under this heading—

Western Australian Firm Loses on Ord Irrigation Work.

Then the report goes on to deal with a meeting of creditors which would be held on the 2nd of July to appoint an official manager. This firm could not have had such tremendous financial stability when its position was being examined before it got this job.

I saw a job that this company was supposed to be doing at Kununurra, but I do not know whether it is finished yet. I am told it has a further contract for a bridge over the Bow River. Its performance so far would not engender any great confidence that that is going to be well done and on time. So apparently it is only in certain cases where this rigorous test of financial stability and efficiency is applied.

Let us look at a few more of these tenders. For example, let us look at the tender for dredging the Bunbury Harbour. The lowest tenderer for that job was not successful. Some argument was raised about equipment that was to be used by the lowest tenderer. That is one of the reasons given as to why he did not get the job: his equipment was not satisfactory.

However, the equipment he had was Warman equipment, which is specially designed for that job. I am told that that equipment would be satisfactory to anybody because the firm of Warman is a specialist in the provision of equipment. For this contract the lowest tender was £20,000 below the price submitted by the successful tenderer. In round figures, the two prices were £50,000 submitted by the lowest tenderer, and £70,000 submitted by the successful tenderer.

That is a great deal of extra money to pay for something which is not apparent to me. The firm which got that job succeeded recently in getting a contract worth just under half a million for dredging the Esperance Harbour. Once again it was not the lowest tenderer. I suppose, in order to make the people reasonably happy, an endeavour was made to create the impression that this firm which got the job was a Western Australian firm, and therefore we should all be happy because of that.

The following is an extract from a newspaper report taken from *The West Australian* of the 4th of July of this year—

HARBOUR JOB TO W.A. FIRM

West Australian Dredging has won a £396,666 Government contract, against interstate and overseas competition, for dredging work linked with Esperance harbour development.

I interpolate to make a correction here. A minute ago I said that the contract was worth just under half a million, but it is some thousands of pounds short of that figure. Continuing—

The firm is the W.A. division of Dredging Industries (Aust.) Pty. Ltd. of Sydney. It previously won a big harbour dredging contract at Bunbury.

I made a search to see how much Western Australian this company is and whether there was any justification for presenting it in that way. I find that the Western Australian Dredging Company is registered in Western Australia as a business name only. It was registered on the 30th April, 1963.

Mr. Bickerton: Just in time.

Mr. TONKIN: It is a subsidiary of Dredging Industries (Aust.) Pty. Ltd., which firm was registered in Western Australia on the 29th April, as a foreign company.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): You can relate these remarks to the amendment, I hope.

Mr. TONKIN: This is one of the firms that was a successful tenderer.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): But I do not think there is anything in the amendment as to where the firm comes from.

Mr. TONKIN: But it is important to show that there is preferment in regard to those who got the tenders.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): That is a bit different.

Mr. TONKIN: I am trying to show why there is preferment. This firm which is supposed to have got the tender is put up as a Western Australian firm in order

to justify its getting the tender. I am trying to prove it is not a Western Australian firm. Its directors are—

Kelverton Roosevelt Champion—Honolulu.

Jack Eadley Hambleton—Ashburton, Victoria.

John Henry Teaney—Hawthorn, Victoria.

George Edward Jorgensen—Turrara, New South Wales.

Alfred Raymond Jessop—Tunburra, New South Wales.

I am informed that the Hawaiian Dredging Company owns 25 per cent. of its shares. It would take a big stretch of the imagination to give it that much of a Western Australian flavour, and I am further informed that at the time the Bunbury contract was given—and possibly the Esperance contract, too—the paid up capital of the firm was £115. There is not much stability in that company if that is taken into consideration. I am not saying it has not very substantial assets, but I am told that that was the state of the shareholders in the company at that time.

Mr. Fletcher: They would pay that much for rent.

Mr. TONKIN: The lowest tenderer for the Bunbury job felt that as it was a genuine Western Australian firm a protest to the Premier might bring some result, and so one of the gentlemen connected with this firm wrote to the Premier and complained that his firm had submitted the lowest tender; that it had the financial capacity to do the job; that it had the necessary technical knowledge; and that it had the proper equipment.

However, it did not get the job. The Premier wrote a very nice letter in reply. He told that gentleman that the Government hesitated to give the job to a relatively inexperienced contractor. However, in the future he would be given every encouragement. I would like to know how, because his very next experience was to be knocked back again as the lowest tenderer in favour of somebody else whose price was higher.

That is far away from the text I read before I commenced to speak, and a long way away from the undertaking given by the Premier. He would be given every encouragement! What sort of encouragement is he given if he is not given a job? That is fine encouragement for a local firm!

It is idle to talk about the time factor in connection with the Bunbury job. That was supposed to be one of the reasons which influenced the Government against giving this firm the Bunbury job; firstly, that its equipment was not up to date—and I debunk that because it has modern equipment—and, secondly, the time factor.

Let us consider the time factor. It took the Government three weeks to attend to the tenders; that is, to have them called in. Then it took the Government two months to make up its mind as to who was to get the job. After the tenders were closed it took the Government two months to decide that. The firm was given the job in January, and it commenced the job in May.

Is any member on the Government side going to stand up and say time was a factor in this contract? If one did he would be a laughing stock. What then was the factor in relation to this contract? It could not be the equipment, because of the standing of the firm which provided the equipment. It could not be the time factor; and it could not be the financial aspect. What then was it? Why did not the lowest tenderer get the job?

The Premier said he did not get it because he was relatively inexperienced. So is a new firm not to get a start at all, and are all the plums to go to those who have already been given a fair go? What encouragement is there to a new firm to start? How would a firm gain experience if it is not given a chance to gain experience? Similarly, how many new members of Parliament would we see if the electors, first of all, applied the principle that they have to be experienced? How does one gain experience without being given a trial?

I say that is a very poor reply to a complaint that this firm is continually being passed over in favour of others who are being preferred. Why are they being preferred? That is what the Government has not answered. The reply of the Minister for Railways is not satisfactory in regard to these contracts. The time factor was not a factor; financial stability was not a factor; equipment was not a factor; and technical know-how was not a factor either.

There is widespread dissatisfaction in the community because these contracts are not being allotted in the way they are ordinarily allotted. I will admit quite readily that it is usual to provide that the lowest or any tender need not necessarily be accepted. That is done in order to give the person calling the tenders the right to take into consideration the criteria which have a bearing on the question.

There are some contracts in which the time factor is the most important factor. Suppose we were calling tenders for the supply of electrical equipment, and we needed generators to be installed by a certain time because if that were not done on time it would be impossible for the station to go on load on time. Obviously in such a case it would be worth something to pay an extra amount to ensure that the contract was completed on time.

I can recall during the time I was Minister for Works when the contract for the dredging of the Success and Parmelia Banks was in progress. It became obvious to the company establishing the refinery that its works would be ready to go into operation a considerable time ahead of the scheduled date, but before the channels through the banks would be completed under the contract.

The company sought my help, and asked me to start negotiations with the dredging company to ascertain if it was possible to expedite the work under the contract. The company was prepared to pay a substantial sum of money—which it eventually did pay—to get the dredging company to expedite its work. One cannot complain about a case such as that; and an additional sum, over and above what would ordinarily have been paid under the contract, was agreed on. It paid the company to do that, and it got value for the expenditure; therefore, there can be no argument on that score.

Take this dredging job at Bunbury! What warrant has the Government for spending £70,000 when it could have got the job done for £50,000? That is the question which has to be answered properly. This puts the job in an entirely different category from jobs which are purely private and personal affairs, where a person uses his own money and is prepared to pay for what he gets. A person is not entitled to do that when he uses money belonging to somebody else; that is, when he is a trustee. If a person is a trustee for somebody else there is an obligation on him to ensure that he gets the best possible value for the expenditure being incurred by him, and that he gets the job done as cheaply as possible. That is expressly what the Government has failed to do.

Mr. Court: You are now referring to the Victoria Quay job. Were you referring to a bridge?

Mr. TONKIN: Yes.

Mr. Court: That is known as the John Street bridge?

Mr. TONKIN: No; there are two bridges.

Mr. Court: There is the James Street, and there is the John Street bridge. Concrete Industries was not the lowest in either of them.

Mr. TONKIN: I have not mentioned anything about Concrete Industries.

Mr. Hawke: You did use a concrete argument!

Mr. TONKIN: I was not aware that I mentioned anything about Concrete Industries at all.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): The honourable member cannot carry on an argument by interjection.

Mr. Court: You mentioned a name.

Mr. TONKIN: I want to say definitely I did not mention the name of any contractor to whom I was referring, other than the successful contractor.

Mr. Court: I thought you mentioned something about that in respect of the V.L.F. station.

Mr. TONKIN: I do say that the particular contractor to whom I referred was the one who had done £75,000,000 worth of contracts in Rhodesia, who built Lawson Flats and the offices of the Adelaide Steamship Company, and who currently has a contract for a very big job exceeding £3,000,000 for Co-operative Bulk Handling.

Mr. Court: I am assuming that you are referring to Concrete Industries. It certainly was not the lowest tenderer for either of those bridges. I have had the files checked.

Mr. TONKIN: I am asking whether Doust, the successful tenderer, submitted the lowest tender?

Mr. Court: He was for one, and he was the third lowest for the other, as I have explained to the House.

Mr. TONKIN: My information is that he was not the lowest tenderer for the Victoria Quay job.

Mr. Court: That is the John Street bridge job, under discussion by the member for Perth. If you are referring to another piece of work it has nothing to do with the railways.

Mr. TONKIN: The contractor to whom I refer tendered £140,756 for the job. That is the contractor to whom I am referring.

Mr. Hawke: The one the member for Perth referred to was only £50,000. How could they be the same?

Mr. Court: There are two projects: One at John Street and one at James Street. I am trying to supply the information the honourable member wants.

Mr. TONKIN: I cannot understand how in some instances so much latitude, so much consideration, so much help, is given to one contractor—like R. J. Davies, for example—and yet other contractors, local people with financial backing, technical know-how, and good equipment—even though they are the lowest tenderers—are passed over in favour of somebody else.

I say there is a responsibility upon the Government to explain that away; and on the information given to me, which, I was assured, is factual, I remain completely dissatisfied about what has been happening. In regard to one contract, which is the Esperance contract, there will be more anon because this one is at present the subject of a writ against the Minister for Works, and therefore, of course, I cannot enter into any great explanation about that. But when it is settled, either in court or out of court—whichever way it

is going to be settled—then we will be free to deal with that one. But it is somewhat significant that the firm concerned in that matter is the firm which was the lowest tenderer for Bunbury and the lowest tenderer for at least one other contract which it failed to obtain.

To me it just does not add up on the reasons given by the Minister for Railways, and I support the amendment moved by the member for West Perth.

MR. WILD (Dale—Minister for Works) [3.42 p.m.]: Like my colleague, I find it very difficult to reconcile the views which were expressed by the member for Perth in connection with this amendment; and also the remarks which were expressed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Everybody must realise that the matter of calling tenders is not an easy one. In the Public Works Department, in which there is considerable knowledge of tenders, because a great number have to be approved every week, many factors enter into the discussion before officers make a final recommendation. It is therefore very difficult for me to understand how the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who for six years prior to 1959 occupied the same position which I now hold, could get to his feet and express himself in the way that he did, when he did exactly the same thing that is being done during my regime.

Mr. Tonkin: Oh no I didn't! I did not do exactly the same thing at all—nothing like it.

Mr. WILD: As I remarked earlier, it is a very difficult process; and I would like to say at the outset that had I been in the position he is in, I would probably have done exactly the same thing. I am not criticising him for what he did, but I am criticising him now for condemning the Government for doing exactly the same things that he did.

Mr. Tonkin: You prove your contention.

Mr. WILD: I am going to prove my contention. I hope we shall soon be suspending for tea, after which it will be my intention to tell the House of at least half a dozen occasions—at least half a dozen—when the honourable member did exactly the same thing that is being done by the present Government. I do not want to proceed with the matter until we have suspended because I want to get those occasions listed in sequence. There are quite a lot of them.

When I did a little research and looked back into some of the files it was quite interesting to see some of the remarks made to my predecessor by senior officers, and it is my intention to read one or two of those recommendations—which were made by men such as Mr. Clare—who was then Principal Architect and who had held that position for many years—and

other engineers in the department, indicating why in their view the tenders of certain people other than those of the lowest tenderers should be accepted.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.5 p.m.

Mr. WILD: Just prior to the tea suspension I indicated that I found it difficult to line up the attitude of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition with what he did during his term of office, which was for the six years immediately preceding my term. During that time the honourable member did exactly the same as I have done—when I say "I" I mean that I concurred with the actions of the officers of the department. I also made the comment, and I want to repeat it, that I am not cavilling at that position. Had I been in the honourable member's place I would have done the same thing. However, I do join issue with him when he rises in his seat in this House to support a puerile amendment moved by the member for Perth—which, if I may say so, backfired; because in the amendment he left an escape clause—and criticises the Government for doing exactly what his Government did.

I want to discuss one or two points made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. During the course of his dissertation he talked about electrical machinery. I am very glad he used the words he did because they indicated something that is static. By that I mean if I am referring to a pair of glasses such as I have in my hand they are not subject to tides or anything like that, and the tender would be for a pair of glasses only.

I now want to jog the honourable member's memory in regard to two cases, and the first is dated the 22nd October, 1953. I think he will agree that he was then Minister for Works. Tenders were called for some pumping machinery at Cunderdin and Kellerberrin, and two tenders were received, one from William Adams & Co., £86,486, and the other tender was from a firm named Heine, who tendered £76,271. The honourable member accepted William Adams's tender although the figure was £10,000 in excess of that submitted by the other tenderer.

Mr. Toms: And the reason for it?

Mr. WILD: Later on, towards the end of his regime—

Mr. Tonkin: What was the deciding factor?

Mr. WILD: The final decision was based on the fact that William Adams's tender allowed for mainly Australian and English equipment and Heine's pumps were to come from Germany.

Mr. Hawke: Yes.

Mr. WILD: The other one was on the 2nd October, 1958. There were two tenders for the pumping station at Merredin. One was from Industrial Exporters, for £52,334, and the other was from Hyland, for £62,053.

Mr. Tonkin: What was the deciding factor?

Mr. WILD: In this case he decided to accept Hyland's tender.

Mr. Tonkin: What was the deciding factor?

Mr. WILD: The factor that decided him in this instance was that in the view of the engineers the operating costs would be less with Hyland's equipment as compared with that supplied by Industrial Exporters. Again, we find he is prepared to spend £10,000 of the public's money, which, he told us before the tea suspension, was so vital. I agree with him; and probably we have done exactly the same thing. He read the recommendation of the engineers, which is all we can go by; and we also did just that. Let us have a look at the position in the architectural division; and see what the honourable member did in two or three cases there.

On the 19th December, 1957, he accepted tenders for a new brick maternity ward at the Kojonup Hospital. The two lowest tenderers were a man called E. Rapanaro who tendered £32,129; and a man called W. Palmer who tendered £40,185. I would like to read what the Principal Architect had to say on the file—

The lowest tender is that of E. Rapanaro at £32,129. Rapanaro has not previously worked for this Department . . .

I think that lines up with what the honourable member said in asking where does a man start. He was cavilling at my colleague in connection with a particular tender which I think in that case was for a bridge. The note of the Principal Architect continues—

His tender is £8,000 below the tender now recommended. It is obvious from examination of the tender list that it would be very unwise to accept Rapanaro's tender, as it is quite likely that he will break down during the contract, and the department would be left to finish the work, the final cost of which might well be considerably above the tender now recommended.

I am therefore unable to recommend the acceptance of Rapanaro's tender.

There is a case in point in which the Principal Architect said that the tenderer in question had not done this kind of work before. The second point he raised was that he did not think he could finish

the work on time. He accordingly awarded the tender to W. Palmer whose tender was £8,000 in advance of the lowest tenderer.

On the 3rd March, 1959, tenders were called for the erection of a new courthouse at Port Hedland. The two lowest tenderers were Hobbs & Walters at £25,860; and the Geraldton Building Company whose tender was £27,549. The reason given for awarding the tender to the Geraldton Building Company was that the credit guaranteed by the committee of creditors was not considered sufficient to enable the contract to be completed. Again, I say that was a logical reason. It is one of the reasons the Minister's advisers must put before him, to allow the Minister to arrive at a decision.

In the third case to which I would like to refer, tenders were called for curtain walling for the Rural and Industries Bank. These tenders were called on the 18th December, 1958, and we find that the two lowest tenderers were Prowse Engineering Co. whose tender was £82,300, and Brisbane & Wunderlich who tendered £84,500. There is a note under this tender which states that the R. & I Bank considered that the financial resources of the lowest tenderer were not sufficient to enable them to complete the job.

So it can be seen that the honourable member did no different from what we are doing. All the departmental officers do is to marshall the facts, which are then presented to the Minister who has a look through them before giving a decision. But nine times out of 10—indeed I would say 99 times out of 100—the Minister accepts the recommendation of his senior officers.

Mention has been made about a contract at Bunbury involving a firm which is known to the honourable member, and to other members of this House; and exception was taken to the fact that this firm did not get the contract at Esperance. The firm is suing me as Minister for Works. There is a writ out for failure of performance of contract. Unfortunately this matter is *sub judice*, but if it ever sees the light of day in the court then of course everybody will know about it. If, however, it does not, I would only be too happy to inform the honourable member, from my place in this Chamber, of the facts appertaining to this case.

It is a case similar to the one referred to by my colleague, the Minister for Industrial Development. It is one, however, which would be better left unmentioned in public. Members will appreciate what I mean in that regard. Even though the matter to which I have referred is *sub judice* I think I can refer to it broadly without mentioning any names. The firm in question was a tenderer for works in Bunbury. It was not the successful tenderer, and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition went to some lengths to go down

to the Companies Office to ascertain what the successful tenderer's financial position was, pointing out that it is an Eastern States firm.

I do not go down to the Companies office to find out these things, but my departmental officers do. They certainly did about the other tenderer to whom the honourable member referred. The firm he quoted had £115 paid up capital. The only other firm about which the honourable member was speaking had a paidup capital of £7. There were two shareholders, one with four £1 shares and the other with three £1 shares. Not very long after the tender was let the man who had the three £1 shares sold his shares. The whole case is of course *sub judice*, and I cannot mention names. As to the firm being an Eastern States firm and not having been in Western Australia, I would point out that this particular firm had been dredging in Western Australia for four years.

Before the firm in question got the contract for the Bunbury job it had been working for approximately three years dredging the Swan. So I think it can reasonably be assumed that our engineers, thinking this firm could do the job, were justified in giving it to that firm. The other firm which the honourable member tried to imply was a Western Australian firm was the gentleman who has four £1 shares, and who came from South Australia. He has only been in Western Australia three years. One firm had been here four years, and the other had been here three years. The latter had come from South Australia, formed a company, and had four £1 shares. The other man who sold his had three £1 shares.

In the matter of dredging I would suggest that quite a degree of technical skill is required. It is a highly technical process. It might be as well for members to see how some of these people work. In the case of the firm to which I have referred, it obviously has not a feather to fly with—it has £7 paid up capital with two shareholders owning between them four £1 shares and three £1 shares. It must get someone to back it financially in order that it can buy equipment. Then again it must get somebody with know-how. Having done this it says, "We have the financial backing, and the equipment; and we also have the know-how. We can sit in our office and rake off the 10 per cent.," or whatever the amount is.

Exactly the same thing is happening in Esperance with another contract for £360,000. There is one man who is in Perth. There is a backer who bought the machinery; a financial company who financed the backer to buy the machinery; and yet we find that not one stone has been turned during the past three weeks. It is little wonder, therefore, that the

Government should look into details carefully to see whether firms have the financial backing and the know-how; and whether they can complete the job on time.

We have set up in the department a contract and tender section in which I think I can say is the name of every man who has done a job for the Public Works Department in this State. His name is in a card index system, and when tenders are called the department is able to pull the cards out and see from his record whether he is a good or a bad tenderer.

It has been most essential to have such a system, because we are letting tenders for the Education Department to the value of about £3,000,000; and about the same amount by way of tenders for hospitals. Added to this is the cost of work for my own department. In the course of a year we are calling for tenders to the value of £10,000,000, £12,000,000, or £13,000,000, spread over some hundreds of contractors. It is necessary, therefore, for us to make a close check.

So I find it difficult to appreciate the remarks of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who preceded me for six years as Minister, particularly as he did exactly the same thing as we are doing now. He did nothing different, and I do not cavil at that; but I cannot understand his criticising this Government for doing exactly as he did.

There is no substance whatever in the amendment moved by the member for Perth. We have been carrying on that system for years, even before the Brand-Nalder Government took over. I have no doubt that until some other system is evolved, in the future we will continue in that way.

I want to indicate finally that we as a Government are charged with the responsibility for spending the public's money in a fair and correct manner. The only way that can be done is to have the *bona fides* of tenderers gone into. If the engineers, the architects, or whoever else might be making the recommendations are satisfied that the lowest tenderer is not capable of performing the job because of, firstly, finance; secondly, know-how; and, thirdly, previous record, then they will have no alternative but to recommend to the Minister that the tender be not accepted, and that a higher one be accepted for the job.

I only wish that in the case of five or six contracts which were let to the lowest tenderers in the last few months, better judgment had been exercised to pick a tenderer who had submitted a higher quote than the lowest tenderer. If that had been done we would not be in the position in which we find ourselves. I oppose the amendment.

Personal Explanation

Mr. COURT: Have I your permission, Mr. Speaker, to make a personal explanation?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): The honourable member is permitted to make a personal statement under Standing Order 121 which states—

A member who has spoken to a question may again be heard, to explain himself in regard to some material part of his speech, but shall not introduce any new matter, or interrupt any Member in possession of the Chair.

Mr. COURT: The personal explanation I want to make comes within that heading. During my speech I referred to the fact that the firm of H. A. Doust & Son submitted the lowest tender for what we know as the James Street bridge job. That is the approach on the southern side of the main railway bridge at Fremantle, and I assume that is the one to which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred as the Victoria Quay job. I told the House that Doust & Son submitted the lowest tender, and I have had that information checked as requested by the honourable member.

The facts are as I stated. Doust & Son submitted a tender for £138,964, while Concrete Constructions submitted £140,756 5s. 11d. The order of tenders in connection with what we know as the John Street bridge job—the bridge on the north side—is in accordance with the figures I gave to the House; namely, Martinazzo the lowest, Marchioro the next lowest, and Doust the next.

Mr. Tonkin: Were there any contingencies in the tender of Doust?

Debate (on amendment) Resumed

MR. HALL (Albany) [4.23 p.m.]: The amendment before the House gives me the opportunity to air a few grievances I have in respect of the actions of this Government over public tenders. I refer to five houses in my electorate for which tenders were called. They were to be erected in Spencer Park, Albany. The difference in the price tendered by the local builders and that by the metropolitan contractors was £4 16s. per house, which represents a difference of £24 for the five houses.

Without elaborating on the advantages or disadvantages to Albany of having those houses built by the local contractors, there is a case for suspecting—in view of the fact that the difference between the tenders was so minute—that somebody had access to the figures tendered.

I referred this matter to the Minister for Housing, because of my anxiety to bring about decentralisation of industry, and to have the building industry in

Albany built up. I am referring also to the complementary industries to building, such as tile and brick manufacture, and the production of other materials required for building. In his reply the Minister said that although he was sympathetic he could not lean to my wishes, because that would set a precedent which the Government would have to follow, and would establish some form of priority.

I followed that up by writing to the Minister for Works, and I would like to read part of his reply. In it he used a term of endearment or courtesy, but I assume it was done in a jocular manner. On the 26th April I received an acknowledgment from his secretary stating that in the absence of the Minister the letter was acknowledged, and it would be placed before him when he returned.

I wrote to the Minister pointing out that contracts pertaining to Albany's future development and to the public works programme should be implemented. In his reply dated the 9th May, the Minister stated—

The writer is very mindful of the necessity to do everything possible to assist in regard to decentralisation as it is the policy of the Government, but it must also be appreciated that when tenders are called they are open to any contractor in Western Australia. It would be extremely difficult to give preference to local tenderers and you, my dear Mr. Hall,—

That was where the Minister used the term of endearment I referred to—

—would be one of the first to criticise if the Government did not give such contracts to the lowest tenderer, subject to his being able to satisfactorily perform the work.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out very plainly this afternoon—and the facts have been substantiated—that the lowest tenderer has not been successful in many contracts. The amount involved runs into millions of pounds. Through its narrowmindedness and lack of foresight the Government has brought about a detrimental result to the town of Albany, and industries depending on the building industry there have been affected.

In the case I referred to the difference in the tendered prices was only £24 for five houses. I am led to believe there is a close connection between the big industries and suppliers of materials in the metropolitan area, on the one hand, and the contractors who submit tenders from the metropolitan area on the other. If that tendency is allowed to continue, in future contractors will not be putting in for Government jobs because they know they will be put to one side, as a result of the collusive tendering by four or five firms.

The Government is deserving of censure for its action in awarding the contract for the five houses at Albany, and for its failure to bring about a greater degree of decentralisation, especially as a sum of only £24 was involved.

Another case I bring to the notice of the House concerns the Chief Secretary, and the painting of the Albany fire station. On this occasion recognised tradesmen and master painters submitted tenders, but the successful tenderer did not even visit the site to make an inspection of the job. The project has to be inspected to enable a tenderer to contract successfully, but I wonder how the successful tenderer got the required information?

The privileged contractors are putting in tenders in the right order, as they are advertised in the Press. The local tenderers carry out surveys which take time and money, yet they do not receive any consideration. The Perth contractors are given the right to inspect fire stations in the country areas, and they are considered by the Fire Brigades Board to have greater knowledge and experience in applying prepared paints, than painters operating outside the metropolitan area.

How do the contractors in the metropolitan area obtain the information to enable them to compete against the local master painters, or to find out that they have been beaten for a tender? Is that justice to anyone who carries out surveys, for which they have to use their own time and money? I would say that tenderers in Albany are now very prone not to apply for tenders in those circumstances. I think if any member in this House received that sort of treatment, he would be reluctant to pursue the matter any further.

In regard to our native reserve, the contracts were let to a firm in the metropolitan area. That firm built the houses and the ablution blocks. I am not aware that tenders were advertised in *The West Australian* in regard to this particular project, but it was insinuated in a letter from the Minister that they were. The same contractor gets this work throughout Western Australia. So, again, there is a complete block against the tenderer from outside sources, and in the metropolitan area.

I do not know whether these people are getting preference. I think they are getting through to the department concerned. I feel very strongly that there must be some way in which these people are obtaining access to the quotes received by the respective departments. The building trades in the metropolitan area fully support my remarks by articles which have appeared in *The West Australian* and in *The Albany Advertiser*.

I condemn the action of the Government and its methods in dealing with these tenders when the margin is close; and what is being done is having its effect on decentralisation and the stimulation of the

industries I have mentioned—small industries. Their quotes should be considered in a fair light.

MR. KELLY (Merredin-Yilgarn) [4.32 p.m.]: From what I have heard of the Minister's attempts to belittle this amendment, there must be good ground for him to take that attitude—some ground that is not very acceptable so far as we on this side of the House are concerned. It has been interesting to hear the many references, particularly those made by the Minister for Industrial Development and Railways in connection with the position that no tender is necessarily accepted.

Of course, we have known for over a period of years that circumstances do enter into almost every contract that is called; but in view of some of the methods I desire to discuss, I wonder just how far this particular aspect is regarded in the final analysis of deciding which tenderer is in and which tenderer is out. I do not think there is a great deal of merit in a clause of that kind when in most cases it is simply used as a scapegoat clause to allow a Minister to do one thing or the other, whichever suits him.

I think the member for Albany has put the position most ably. Perhaps the front bench members of the Government will realise that the case put up by the member for Albany applies in many country towns. The "escape clause" is just a handy let-out for the Government if it desires to use it for that purpose. On the other hand, if it suits it to accept either the highest or the lowest tender, then that is the attitude it adopts.

I often wonder just where the recommendations that are made to Ministers really begin and end, and just how much credence is placed on the advice given in many cases where a great deal of query could take place in regard to the manner in which tenders are granted. I think what we have heard recited about the history of tender forms, and those tenders which have been acceptable in some cases and not in others, has little bearing on the actual amendment. The reasons given in some cases are as unconvincing as the Government's hollow claims regarding decentralisation. Here again, the member for Albany hit on this particular point—one that greatly concerns many country centres.

As was the case in Albany, I have one at the moment in connection with tenders for some of the works in Merredin. Exactly the same thing has happened in regard to the acceptance of this particular tender as has happened elsewhere. I would not say there is collusion in the strict sense of the word, excepting to say that it could so happen that inter-related companies tender on the same lines. Nor could I say that anybody had had previous access to any of the submitted figures, because that I would not know. It could have been

taking place, but I would be sorry to think that form of acceptance of tenders or that form of collusion could possibly have taken place. I would be sorry to think that that could enter into the acceptance of tenders by any Government office and by any Government officer.

I wish to bring before the notice of the House a matter that was raised with me in the first place by the Merredin Shire Council, and secondly by several private individuals who have the interests of the town at heart. The Merredin Shire Council drew my attention to the fact that Mr. Denis Murphy, a local building contractor, submitted a contract for work in connection with the Merredin district hospital and sought my assistance to endeavour to have the accepted tender reversed. This, of course, was a very difficult thing at that stage, because the tender had been accepted.

It further stated that this Mr. Murphy had built the public works offices in Merredin, so he was well known to the Minister for Works. It said his work would be well known on that score; and he had just completed the building of the modern library for the council. At present he is carrying out additions to the Merredin High School. Therefore, we can see the related works which have been granted to this man by the Public Works Department—works that apparently were carried out very satisfactorily, or otherwise he would not have been given a second opportunity.

The time arrived when he tendered for extensive hospital alterations that were to be effected; and at a later stage I will advance that side of the statement I am making.

This is the position in many towns where we are endeavouring to foster, establish, and maintain industries in the interests of decentralisation in order that they might increase the population of the areas concerned and ensure prosperity for those who have had enough insight to establish themselves in centres where the volume of work is perhaps somewhat questionable. The shire council's letter continues—

A plaster works and steel fabricating works have been operating in Merredin for some years and it is felt that if the contract is let to the local builder, industries such as the ones mentioned, which this Council have assisted in establishing within the district will benefit by being given the orders for the necessary materials. Mr. Murphy also employs much local labour which is also of much value to the district.

I have received letters from other people who are in a similar position. One letter says—

If Murphy gets it—

He is speaking of course, of the contract—

—it will mean a lot of employment for local men. Even the plaster works will benefit to the extent of about £5,000.

If the other firm receives it—

that is, the Perth firm—

—this will go to Perth.

In other words, the majority of the materials, and also the labour, would come from Perth.

On receipt of that information I contacted the department of the Minister for Works. I tried to contact the Minister but unfortunately he was not available at the time. I pointed out to the officer to whom I was speaking just what the position was and what my quest was. I had learned, of course, through the correspondence that the tender had already been let. I knew that if the figures had been made public, the tender must have been let. This officer advised me that the tender submitted by Mr. Murphy had not been acceptable and that the Public Health Department in any case—not the Public Works Department—had the final say.

He stated that to have done anything other than what was done—and this is the part that really rings very untrue in view of the fact that we have had much prated here today about the various Ministers accepting tenders of varying magnitude in different orders of preference, whether they be a higher figure or a lower figure—would have created a precedent. That is about the most hollow reason given yet—that to accept anything other than the lowest tender would have created a precedent.

This officer told me that that was the Minister's decision, but that if I wanted to see the Minister I could but that he would tell me exactly the same thing. Of course it is just too ridiculous when this Government uses one reason in one case and another reason in a different case.

If it is decided to accept a tender, although a little higher than another, there would be no great squeal about it because very frequently, as has been explained, there are extenuating circumstances to make it necessary to accept one tender as against another. But to be told that a tender was accepted because to have accepted another one would have created a precedent is too silly; and I, for one, do not accept it.

Mr. Wild: Are we not being criticised for not accepting the lowest tenders?

Mr. KELLY: I said earlier that that does not concern me as long as the person most capable of carrying out the work is the

one chosen. But here is a case where a man who has tendered for a specific job is already carrying out work to the satisfaction of the department. Apparently his credentials and workmanship were good but he is overlooked in this particular case.

I say that if the Government were sincere in its prating on decentralisation it would give thought to this very point—the same point as was made by the member for Albany. In other words, when granting tenders in the country, full cognisance should be given to the fact that they are country people obtaining their living in the country areas and they are capable of carrying out the contracts.

As other firms have been mentioned here today, I do not suppose it will do any harm to mention another one. In this particular case I was advised that Jennings Industries had been given the particular tender. I received the following letter, not from the Minister for Works of whom I had made the inquiry, but from the Minister for Health:—

I am pleased to advise that the tender submitted by A. V. Jennings Industries Australia Ltd. has been accepted for alterations and additions to the Merredin Hospital at a cost of £104,962.

Certainly the Minister can say that the lowest tender was accepted, but this did not establish a precedent. The lowest tender was accepted in this particular instance because it suited either the Minister or his officers to do so. The tender submitted by Mr. Murphy—a very reliable man as I have already indicated—was £105,457. The successful tender was £104,962—a miserable difference of £495, not £10,000 as has been the case in some of the tenders quoted this afternoon. A man who was thoroughly and totally capable and who had already carried out a lot of excellent work for the department, thereby indicating just how highly he was rated, was knocked back immediately a bigger figure was involved.

The only assurance I could gain from the Minister's department was that as far as possible materials from Merredin would be used and as much labour as possible would be drawn from that centre. But what do we find? Practically everything was brought from outside.

Mr. Wild: What preference would you give to the local builder? A preference has been mentioned which is given to Western Australian as against Eastern States tenders. You are advancing the theory that we should give preference to local builders in the State. Tell me what preference you would give—what percentage?

Mr. KELLY: I would give him every preference provided his work was on all fours and his reputation and standing were

the same as those of anyone outside Western Australia. In those circumstances I would not give a single contract to an Eastern States contractor as against a Western Australian contractor because I think the local people are the people who should be considered.

Mr. Wild: Would you give 5 per cent. or 10 per cent.?

Mr. KELLY: I would give 100 per cent. Never mind about a miserable 5 per cent! If the Western Australians were on a par with the Eastern States tenderers I would give it to the Western Australians every time. I am speaking now with a view to trying to advise the Minister that people in the country think they are just as important as the people in the city.

Mr. Wild: Quite right; they are.

Mr. KELLY: When it comes to a tenderer from the country having all the qualifications of the man in the city, even though the country man's tender is perhaps a few pounds more—as I have indicated, in this case it was a miserable £495—in the interests of decentralisation which this Government and the Minister for Railways so frequently advocate, he should be given the job.

Mr. Wild: So you do not agree with the amendment, because the mover maintains that the lowest tender should be accepted.

Mr. KELLY: As far as tenders are concerned, the Government has endeavoured to demonstrate that the amendment is wrong because it fails to bring the point to the fore. My interest is in connection with decentralisation. I have not said whether or not I am supporting the honourable member's amendment to the motion, except that I say there was every justification for bringing it forward. But members on the other side of the House cannot get away as easily as that from the position they are in regarding decentralisation.

Mr. Lewis: We are not talking about decentralisation.

Mr. KELLY: I know we are not. But it was mentioned by one member and it was allowed to be discussed. Where a precedent has been established, apparently the matter can continue to be discussed. The point I raise is this: Tenders vary, and consideration should be given to extenuating circumstances before a tender is accepted. In the interests of decentralisation, those concerned in the matter of accepting tenders should give equal consideration to country tenderers whose tenders compare favourably with those submitted by city tenderers.

Mr. Lewis: Irrespective of whether they are the highest or the lowest?

Mr. KELLY: Yes.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [4.52 p.m.]: In the course of his remarks the Minister for Works gave instances of the lowest tender not being accepted when the Labor Government was in office. That would be true. We could probably trace through the files and find that over the years consecutive Governments have, for one good reason or another, at various times not accepted the lowest tender. However, the cases which the Minister instanced did not contain a great disparity in figures, compared with some of those that have been mentioned on this occasion. I believe the highest was around £8,000, which was in connection with the erection of a hospital. The others showed a disparity in the vicinity of £2,000 on fairly big contracts.

I might remind the Government that whether or not there is anything in the matter, there is disquiet among many people who are tendering for jobs; and when they receive an indication that their tenders have not been accepted, although they were the lowest tendered, they complain to members of the Opposition or to those who are associated with the Opposition party, asking that the matter be aired before Parliament. That is their just right.

Sometimes we find that our information is not as correct as it should be; but I am always worried whether, when the Government, without a good explanation, accepts other than the lowest tender, it is not the first sign of some form of corruption. I do not say that anything like that exists at the present time; but it is a good scheme for any administrative body to make doubly sure, before it allocates any tenders other than the lowest one, that it is not lending itself to a decision upon which it could be criticised.

Some years ago the member for Balcatta, who was then the member for East Perth, took the Government to task in connection with railway sleepers. Afterwards one of the gentlemen, whose tender had been a good deal lower than that which was accepted, published a booklet complaining about what had been said to his detriment in the House. No action was taken against him, and I assume that the information contained in his booklet, about what was said in the House, was correct.

Mr. Hawke: The Government later gave him an order for £60,000.

Mr. JAMIESON: Probably that was to quieten him down. He was entitled to some consideration because of the lowness of his tender.

It was indicated today that one person who had tendered had been informed that his tender was not acceptable, because he was unsuitable and he would be unable to carry out the work. However, the jobs which had been undertaken by this tenderer for other organisations

had been of a high standard technically, and were to the tune of many more thousands of pounds than the tender which had been rejected. No wonder the Opposition has a right to take the matter before Parliament and ask the Government where exactly it is going in these matters. This is a correct procedure which must be indulged in by the Opposition from time to time in the interests of the public at large.

If the same thing took place when a Labor Government was in office and the then Opposition did not take the matter up, then it was remiss in not having done so. If there was a good explanation in those days, then it was up to the Government of the day to give that explanation. To my mind the particular instances which have been cited have not been satisfactorily answered. One of them is *sub judice* and needs examining. No doubt it will be aired very fully later on.

The present motion is a condemnation of the Government for its shortcomings in not giving contracts to those who are submitting the lowest tenders. My colleague, the member for Albany, referred to a letter from the Minister for Works stating that the member for Albany would be the first one to complain if the lowest tender were not accepted. We cannot have one thing and mean another.

Many of these people are justified in submitting their tenders. I have known cases about which I have felt doubtful. As a matter of fact, I was doubtful about the company which received the contract for the additions to Parliament House. The tender was the lowest one. The files of the Public Works Department will show that the Government required a guarantee of financial backing. This backing was received, and the contract was allocated to the company. It is true that it has been able to carry out the work.

However, contracts have not always been allocated to people, whether they are local people or people from the Eastern States, from whom the Government required financial guarantees. I should think that whether a person's financial position was beyond doubt should be the concern of those people guaranteeing that person. The penalty clause which exists in contracts should be sufficient safeguard for the Government against any shortcomings on the part of tenderers.

I know of some very glaring instances when the Government has not allocated a contract to the lowest tenderer; and because of that there is grave doubt in the minds of members of the Opposition when these matters are referred to them whether the right thing is being done by the Government.

The Government must be called upon to answer for its actions in this regard. A satisfactory answer has not been given. It is my intention to proceed with my

original line of thought: that the Government should be censured in this regard, and I will be supporting the motion to amend the Address-in-Reply.

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

Ayes—22

Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. D. G. May
Mr. Davies	Mr. Moir
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Norton
Mr. Graham	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Heal	Mr. Sewell
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Toms
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. H. May

(Teller.)

Noes—23

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Lewis
Mr. Cornell	Mr. I. W. Manning
Mr. Court	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Craig	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Dunn	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Gayfer	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Runciman
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hart	Mr. Williams
Dr. Henn	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Hutchinson	

(Teller.)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr. Curran	Mr. Brand
Mr. Evans	Mr. Burt

Majority against—1.

Amendment thus negatived.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

MR. O'CONNOR (Mt. Lawley) [5.5 p.m.]: I wish to speak briefly on a subject which concerns not only me and other members of Parliament but also the public generally. I refer to the increase in the incidence of car thefts and juvenile delinquency generally over the last few years. At the moment it is not safe for any member of the public to leave his car unattended outside a residence, or almost anywhere, irrespective of whether or not the keys have been removed. To support my statements on this matter I wish to quote an article which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 7th January. It is headed "Car Thefts Increasing" and reads as follows:—

With 1,082 thefts, 1962 was the worst car-stealing year on record. Rising to three a day, the rate is becoming intolerable.

Out of every four detected offenders three were juveniles, most of them approaching manhood. But car-stealing is not just a prankish night's entertainment for high-spirited youth. It is a serious crime and is sometimes a prelude to other crime such as breaking and entering.

It is not uncommon to see articles like that in the paper, and there are also references to young people having caused considerable trouble and damage in various parts of the metropolitan area. So far

as cars are concerned, I think the manufacturers could do something about helping to solve the problem by making it more difficult for youths to start cars without keys.

There is one feature about this business with which I do not agree and that is the automatic two-year ban on juveniles when they are convicted of a car-stealing offence. At the moment a number of lads are legally banned from driving motor vehicles until they are 80 or 90 years of age. For a youth of 16 years of age that appears to be completely ridiculous, and if the penalty was adhered to in its entirety, the child's ability to earn a living later on would be impaired, particularly if he wanted to take on the job of a traveller, a salesman, or almost any other sort of work in this modern age. These days a driving license is nearly always required for any type of work. I think that automatic ban is something we could dispense with at this stage because it really achieves nothing.

I have heard of a number of instances of car stealing, and I know of one case where an elector of mine had a car stolen from his house. It was taken down near the river, petrol was poured over it, and it was burnt. There have been many other instances where various articles, such as radios, sun visors, mirrors, and so on have been removed from cars. Like car stealing, this sort of thing is increasing.

In my electorate I have three Child Welfare Department centres and I should like to discuss each one briefly. The first is the Mt. Lawley Reception Home. In the past we have heard criticism about children escaping from this home, but I think that sort of thing must be expected in a home like that.

It happens not because of the inability of those in charge properly to control the home; because I consider Matron McPherson, and her staff, to be very capable. The reception home is not the place where the worst type of delinquents are sent. Frequently children who have run away from home, or who have for some reason been taken away from their parents by the State, are sent to the centre. It is more or less a staging depot to which these children are sent while they are waiting to go to some other institution or detention home.

A number of the children attend the Maylands school daily and it is not uncommon for one of them to take a jaunt on the way home and go to see one of his friends, or to escape from the custody in which he has been placed by the department.

In the electorate there is also a place known as Tudor House, and this is the type of home the establishment of which I think should be encouraged. It is a house run by a married couple. They have 12 boys there, and an effort is made to conduct

the home in a way similar to the manner in which an ordinary everyday family home is conducted. Those lads leave the home for their place of work and return there in the evening. When they receive their weekly pay they hand it over to the woman conducting the home, and each boy is allowed a certain amount of pocket money. The boys are also allowed out on certain nights of the week. The same system is used to conduct Stewart House for girls in Mt. Lawley. This house has only recently been opened.

Because of my concern over juvenile delinquency in this State, I also wrote to other countries for information and paid a visit to Riverbank to see for myself how that home was administered. As we know, Riverbank is a home where only the worst types of boys are sent. However, in my opinion, it is one of the best conducted I have ever seen. The staff is highly trained and the boys are kept in excellent physical condition by being given plenty of exercise and work. They are also encouraged to follow various trades or to study various lines of education in which they show interest. Two or three lads have escaped from this home, but generally speaking the reason for their escape is that a certain amount of leniency is shown to them by the staff, which makes every endeavour to assimilate them and rehabilitate them once again in the community.

It is noticeable that over the past five years the number of boys who have misbehaved has been six times greater than the number of girls who have been charged with misbehaviour. In November, 1960, the number of cases of misbehaviour among boys was nine times that of the girls. Over the years, whilst the cases of misbehaviour of boys and girls have risen, the percentage rate of misbehaviour among girls has increased to a greater degree than it has among boys. We do not have the facilities in this State to handle girls as we do boys. As a result of my inquiries, I received a letter from England, and the following is an extract from it:—

The number of children and young persons found guilty of both offences has risen steeply in recent years. Compared with 1957 the increase in the number of persons aged 8 and under 17 found guilty in 1961 at all courts of such offences was 221 per cent.

So Western Australia is not the only place in the world that is experiencing an increase in the rate of juvenile delinquency. I also have here a letter from the Police Department of the City of New York. This letter indicates that in New York youths who are charged with the theft of motor vehicles are not treated very leniently. The following is a brief extract from that letter:—

If the perpetrator is over the age of 18 he is treated as an offender who has reached his majority and is

charged with grand larceny. In such a case, depending on the value of the vehicle, it would be grand larceny in the first degree if the value exceeds 500 dollars.

That represents about £240 here. Continuing—

The maximum penalty for this is imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years. If the value does not exceed 500 dollars then the charge is grand larceny in the second degree which is punishable by imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years.

In view of the increase in juvenile delinquency in this State, it would appear that either our method of handling these offenders is completely wrong, or the severity of the penalty inflicted is not enough. Therefore, it would seem necessary that action should be taken to increase the existing penalties in this State so that members of the public can be offered greater security. A copy of the New York Larceny Act was also forwarded to me.

The method of handling youthful offenders in England is similar to that used in this State, although I think that remedial measures for children in England are on a wider scale. In that country they have a number of homes for both boys and girls, but the youngsters are allowed to go out at night; they are taken on picnics; and, in general, are treated in the same way as they would be if they were enjoying normal home life.

One of the reasons I have spoken on this subject this evening is that I am of the opinion that there is a real need for a reformatory for girls in this State, administered on the same lines as those in England. I also feel that a centre should be established to which juvenile delinquents could report at regular intervals. This could be based on lines similar to the centre which has been developed by the National Safety Council in Mt. Lawley.

To amplify that a little, I mean that it could be a centre for children who have committed crimes of a minor nature after being told by the court that they must attend the centre for a certain period. For example, it may be required that each offender shall attend one of these homes on 12 occasions for two hours each visit, or have conditions based on similar lines.

If this were done I think it would assist in straightening out some of these children. At the centre, efforts could be made to ascertain what is wrong with them. Also, being deprived of their leisure hours would be something they would not appreciate, and it would deter them from offending again. Further, the instructors at such a centre could teach the youngsters, during the hours they spend there, how to develop their activities along the lines in which they were interested.

I still consider, however, that the greatest aid that can be drawn upon for the rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents is that given by the parents themselves. It is noticeable that although the population of the State is divided almost equally between city and country there is five times more juvenile delinquency in the metropolitan area than there is in the country, and most of the offences committed in the country occur in the larger centres.

I believe that it is the duty of parents to guide their children along proper lines. They should encourage a boy or girl to come home and bring their friends with them, and show them more love and affection than is shown by parents, in many cases, to their children at present. Love and attention are the things that a child misses most.

I feel certain that if the parents of juvenile delinquents showed them a little more love and care, the incidence of delinquency would be less than we have at the moment. I think the words printed on the envelope I received from the Police Department in the City of New York sums up my feelings on this subject perfectly. Those words are—

When family life stops—
Delinquency starts.

MR. H. MAY (Collie) [5.18 p.m.]: Like other members, I desire to make some comment on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. Before dealing with State matters, I take this opportunity of expressing my regret at the loss from this Chamber during the last 12 months of a man we all respected. I refer to the late Sir Ross McLarty.

Mr. Bovell: Hear, hear!

Mr. H. MAY: His death was very untimely, and I feel certain that it was hastened by the work he performed in this Parliament and elsewhere for the constituents he represented. He was a member of Parliament when I was elected. After he became Premier I came in contact with him a great deal, and I found that he was a man of his word; that he was a kindly man, and a man who gave me a great deal of assistance during the early days of my work in this Parliament. I feel sure many other members regret, as I do, his passing; and I take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation for the manner in which he conducted his dealings with me. I am sure he dealt with everybody else in this Chamber in the same pleasant and just fashion.

During the period in which we were absent from Parliament after the last session, two of my particular mates in another place passed away. I refer to Evan Davies and, as we knew him, Bill Hall. They were two very good mates of mine. Mr. Davies made a name for himself in this Parliament, and left his name on the

Statute book of Western Australia. His work with the Fremantle City Council will also not be forgotten. He certainly made an impression there.

As we all know, before Bill Hall entered Parliament he was a member of the Kalgoorlie Road Board, in which capacity he served for a number of years. He also served as Chairman of Committees in another place, where he carried out his duties to the satisfaction of all members in that House.

I must also refer to the passing of Mr. Simpson. Mr. Simpson was Minister for Mines during part of his political career, and while he was the Minister for that department I came in contact with him a good deal in connection with matters of considerable importance to the coalmining industry of this State.

I would like now to pay a tribute to Mr. Simpson for the manner in which he did everything he could to meet representatives of the coalmining industry; to see what their troubles were, and to rectify those troubles before they got out of hand. I appreciate very much his many visits to Collie, and I am grateful for his co-operation with the unions in Collie relative to the coalmining industry, and for what he did as Minister for Mines generally.

I have read the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech and, as usual, I can find nothing that has reference to the electorate I represent. There is no mention of it at all.

Mr. Lewis: How long has it been like that?

Mr. H. MAY: I will let the Minister know very shortly, because his department is one with which I propose to deal.

Mr. Nalder: Have you any agricultural areas in your electorate?

Mr. H. MAY: No; they are all taken up by the Forests Department, which, incidentally does not pay any rates to the shire council.

Mr. Nalder: You have some very good agricultural areas in your electorate.

Mr. H. MAY: If the Minister for Agriculture is referring to the West Arthur Shire Council I will tell him straight away that that area has received more attention since I have represented it than it ever received before; and that goes for both representatives.

Mr. Nalder: It sounds as though you know the song; you are giving yourself a pat on the back.

Mr. H. MAY: That is not the case at all. The record speaks for itself. I will pit my record during the last 12 to 18 months against that of any other member in that district. The Minister can put that in his pipe and smoke it.

Mr. Nalder: I will have to borrow yours.

Mr. H. MAY: If members on the other side of the House wish to get mixed up in an argument, I am quite prepared to be in it.

Mr. Lewis: Have you any for me?

Mr. H. MAY: The Minister need not fear that he will be left out. I now wish to make some reference to what has happened over the last 18 months in relation to what I term the continuous liquidation of Collie. I have made enough noise in this Chamber about what the present Government has done to Collie over the last three or four years, so members should know the position that exists there.

Mr. Oldfield: Done to or done for Collie?

Mr. H. MAY: It would seem to me that this selfsame Government is still adopting a policy under which the town of Collie could be completely liquidated. I think we all know what happened to Collie when the last coal tenders were finalised. This resulted in 400 to 500 men being put out of employment. I would like your permission, Sir, to mention this matter again, because it is something I will never forget. The people there will certainly not forget it; and as long as I am in this Chamber I will see that the Government does not forget it.

I do not know who is paying for all the empty houses in Collie at the moment. These dwellings are going to rack and ruin as a result of the action of this Government. I can only estimate the amount of rent that has been lost by leaving these houses lying empty. The present Government must take full responsibility for this state of affairs. It is difficult to estimate what the people who lived in those houses have lost by way of equity. All they had has gone by the board. Yet we find a persistent attitude among the Ministers of this Government to do all they can to continue the liquidation of the town.

I will now refer to the Minister for Education and his department, and point out what they are doing to help in this liquidation of Collie. During the period of the last war, the Commonwealth Government recognised the urgent necessity to maintain apprentices; and, because there were so many apprentices at the time, that Government had some annexes built for the Collie High School. These annexes were beautiful brick buildings. They were filled with the required equipment for training apprentices, and there were many lads in the town who received their apprenticeship training there.

All of a sudden, however, for no apparent reason and without any notification at all, somebody in the Education Department saw fit to close down these buildings

and to remove the machinery and equipment to Bunbury, where it has been installed in a building that has not even been completed.

Mr. Williams: It has the walls and the roof on.

Mr. H. MAY: I am glad to hear the roof is on; because that is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Lewis: It puts the lid on your argument.

Mr. H. MAY: Can anybody tell me why it is necessary for apprentices from Collie to go to Bunbury to receive their daily training when there are already the equipment and buildings in Collie? They have been there for years and have served a very useful purpose. The boys trained in Collie have received certificates from the Arbitration Court to show that they are tradesmen.

Quite accidentally the Collie Shire Council discovered what the Education Department intended to do. There appears to be no co-operation between that department and local authorities. The department did not even have the courtesy to notify the Collie Shire Council, or myself as the member for the district, what it intended to do. On the 14th February I wrote to the Minister for Education as follows:—

I have received a request from the Collie Shire Council to obtain information through you, the reason why certain aspects of technical school education are being transferred from Collie to Bunbury. In this connection, at this point, I should say, I have received no intimation of any change of policy regarding this particular matter, but it is evident the Shire Council has heard of it through some form or other, but still not aware of the reason for the change or of any details concerning the changed policy, hence its request to me.

Since December, 1960, Collie has suffered a great setback in every direction, as a result of the present Government's coal policy, to such an extent it has been found necessary to include the whole of the West Arthur Shire Council area to make up the electoral quota of electors, due to the number of people having to leave the Collie district to find other employment as a result of the altered coal policy.

Now it would appear that this policy of the liquidation of Collie is to continue by transferring some of the facilities previously enjoyed by the Collie residents.

In this particular instance I feel perfectly justified in making a strong protest against the present

policy of gradually taking away facilities, in this particular instance educational, and I sincerely trust that upon further reflection favourable consideration will be given this matter with a view to allowing the present system to remain, the result of which will allow the people of Collie and their children to receive that standard of education which has been available to them under previous Governments policies.

The following letter was received from the Minister for Education in reply to my letter and is dated the 12th March:—

I refer to your letter of the 14th February requesting information regarding certain aspects of technical education in Collie. A similar enquiry was received recently from the General Secretary of the Coal Miners' Industrial Union of Workers and I am attaching hereto a copy of my reply to the Union and the Press statement referred to therein.

The letter I wrote to the Minister on the 14th February was entirely different from that which the Minister received from the coal miners' union. The department, and to some extent I blame the Minister for having signed the letter, had the audacity to send me a copy of the letter which it had sent to the union, but which had very little relationship to the one I sent the Minister.

Mr. Lewis: It had every relationship.

Mr. H. MAY: The Minister knows what I mean. He knows the points I raised in my letter. Those points were not made by the union. If I had been the Minister I would not have signed a letter like that which showed such discourtesy to the member for the district. The Minister should have instructed his staff to give a proper reply to my letter, and not enclose a copy of one sent to the union.

Mr. Lewis: You did receive a letter subsequent to that.

Mr. H. MAY: I received many letters subsequent to that, and the Minister will hear all about them. When I write to the Minister I expect a proper reply from him, and not to receive a copy of a reply sent to some other party. I would not do that if I were the Minister; I would not do that to an Afghan!

Mr. Lewis: That is colour bar.

Mr. H. MAY: When a member is appointed to be a Minister of the Crown, he should pay due regard to his duties and responsibilities; above all, he should show courtesy to his fellow members in this House.

Mr. Lewis: No discourtesy was intended.

Mr. H. MAY: I know what the Minister would have done if he were in my place. I know all about the time when we were working in the room next to the post office

in this building, and he used to go off the deep end by complaining that a certain Minister was doing this or that.

Mr. Lewis: I agree. That was before the change of Government, before 1959.

Mr. H. MAY: That was before the honourable member became a Minister.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! The honourable member should address the Chair.

Mr. H. MAY: I remember quite well how the Minister went off the deep end and how he complained about the Minister, by saying, "Fancy sending me a letter like that! Fancy the Minister not doing this or that!"

Mr. W. Hegney: Fancy, they will not do anything now!

Mr. H. MAY: The attitude of the honourable member changed completely when he became a Minister. He bowed to the will of his understrappers in the department, and someone in the department wrote the answer to my letter and the Minister calmly signed it. I suppose he said, "This will do the member for Collie." But it certainly did not, and a lot of other letters did not. He will hear all about it.

Mr. Lewis: I cannot hope to satisfy you.

Mr. H. MAY: The Minister has not gone very far to try to satisfy me. I did not have much schooling, but I learned about common decency, and about the treatment which a Minister should give to members of this House who are trying to do the best for their electorates.

Mr. Lewis: No discourtesy was intended.

Mr. H. MAY: I hope the Minister is prepared to put that in writing, so that I can show it to the people of Collie and publish it in the local newspaper.

Mr. Lewis: I shall do that.

Mr. H. MAY: On the 23rd May, the Amalgamated Engineering Union wrote to me in the following terms:—

On instructions from the Collie branch of the above union I have to advise you of the position of apprentices at Collie and the imposition of technical training at the Bunbury technical centre.

I want it to be clearly understood that the member for Bunbury has nothing to do with this matter at all, and I do not know what are his views. The letter continues—

Apprentices have been issued with instructions of when to attend for technical instruction, find own transport and pay own expenses. Leave Collie at 7 a.m. and return around about 6 p.m. Quite a few of the employers say they are not going to pay for the boys' expenses and they are not interested in the supply of transport.

Here we have the opinion of the employers. We could not expect anything else from them. The letter continues—

The branch considers it is not a fair thing or the responsibility of the apprentices to supply their own transport and be out of pocket through having to attend Bunbury Technical School. Further the Government should pay the expenses of the apprentices and supply the transport if they insist that the Bunbury technical centre is to be used. Collie has approximately 30 apprentices—

A further letter will show there are 40 apprentices. The letter goes on—

and we feel that the Collie technical centre should have been left intact instead of shifting the equipment to Bunbury. Raw deal for Collie every time. If it is at all possible we would like you to place this protest to the Government. Should you desire more particulars I will endeavour to supply same.

Yours faithfully,
R. H. True,
Secretary.

Following receipt of that letter, I wrote to the Minister on the 27th May, as follows:—

Technical Training Facilities at Collie

I refer once again to my letter dated 14th February, 1963, and the reply I received in regard thereto, concerning the above-mentioned subject. I feel I am justified in pointing out to you the reply you gave me was not a reply to the letter you received from me, but simply a copy of a letter sent to the General Secretary, Coal Miners' Industrial Union of Workers, to certain representation it made regarding this subject.

However, the Engineering Unions at Collie are not at all happy with the decision that all Collie apprentices are to attend technical instruction at Bunbury, find their own transport and pay their own expenses. They will have to leave Collie for Bunbury at 7 a.m., and return to Collie about 6 p.m. in the evening. The Employers say they are not paying these expenses and they are not interested in supplying transport.

I am given to understand there are about 30 apprentices in Collie and the Collie Unions feel the Collie Technical Centre should have been left intact instead of transferring the equipment to Bunbury. Further, I shall be obliged to be advised of the actual number of Bunbury apprentices who live in Bunbury.

The Amalgamated Engineering Union in Collie has requested me to convey it's very strong protest against

the Government's policy in this matter and I do so with the addition of my own dissatisfied feelings that the action proposed was not necessary and against the best interests of the town of Collie.

I enclose for your information the letter I have received from the Union mentioned in this letter.

Now I will read the Minister's reply, dated the 18th June, which was about three weeks later. It reads as follows:—

Dear Mr. May,—

The only nice thing about his letter is the introduction. Continuing—

I refer to your letter of the 27th May regarding technical training facilities at Collie. The decision to close the Collie annexe was made only after a very full investigation of the position. The problem is simply that Collie does not have sufficient apprentices to support a technical annexe.

If that is not boloney, tell me what is. They have been training apprentices in Collie for years.

Mr. Lewis: They will do it much better at Bunbury.

Mr. H. MAY: I will have something to say in that regard shortly. I will tell the Minister in no uncertain manner the reason it has been transferred to Bunbury. Continuing with the letter—

You refer to 30 apprentices in Collie, but it must be appreciated that these lads are divided into several different trades,—

Who would not understand that! Continuing—

—in each of which they can be spread out from the first to the fifth year. Obviously when the numbers are broken up in this way there are not sufficient numbers in any one year of any one trade to justify effective facilities and instruction.

It has taken 15 years to find that out!

Mr. Lewis: That is why they cannot do as good a job there as in Bunbury, because in Bunbury they have more students.

Mr. H. MAY: I get enough boloney in the Minister's letters without his piling it on here. Continuing—

On the other hand, the number of apprentices in Bunbury in major trades is about 90. With facilities centralised in Bunbury this number can be supplemented not only by the apprentices from Collie but also those from Busselton, Capel, Donnybrook, and Harvey so that the total currently attending for instruction is about 120 and the total in the area, including

those who have yet to be effectively contacted by the school, would amount to over 150.

Bunbury is no further from Collie than Collie is from Bunbury; and no further from Harvey than Collie is from Harvey; and the same applies to Busselton.

Mr. Lewis: Collie would be further.

Mr. H. MAY: Continuing—

Clearly these numbers give much greater scope for dividing apprentices into their appropriate trades and years of apprenticeship justify more adequate equipment and facilities and make possible the employment of a variety of specialised instructors which could not possibly be provided for the numbers in Collie.

The next bit is good—

My department had hoped that the question of transport from Collie to Bunbury would be solved economically on a co-operative basis, as is being done by students from Busselton. I am sure that a number of apprentices have access to cars even if they do not own one, and by the sharing of expenses no substantial cost need fall on any individual.

However, the position in other States is currently being ascertained. Meanwhile, consideration is being given to the problem, both in Perth and in the Bunbury area, and I hope to be able to inform you of my decision shortly on the question of transport.

Boys who are apprenticed obtain a very small wage, and the Minister for Education is suggesting they are in a position to buy motorcars and also pay their own expenses.

Mr. Lewis: How do they get from Busselton to Bunbury?

Mr. H. MAY: Let the member for Busselton answer his own problems. I am dealing with the problems of Collie. Do not go to Busselton; stick to Collie as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Lewis: Why is Collie any different from any other place? It is just as far from a technical school.

Mr. H. MAY: Why should the writer of this letter—the Minister signed it, but probably someone else wrote it—suggest these lads should buy their own cars, arrange their own transport, and arrange to pay their own expenses?

Mr. Lewis: That is done with co-operation in other places.

Mr. H. MAY: I think it is a shocking thing. Surely the Minister does not want to be led by the nose in regard to what is done in other places. Why does he not stand on his own two feet and say, "The State will pay these boys." As things are,

it is an incentive for the boys to steal cars—a position which exists already. We are simply asking them to do it because we are expecting them to do something they cannot afford to do.

Mr. Lewis: They do not steal cars to go to technical schools.

Mr. H. MAY: They certainly do not walk from Collie to Bunbury and back and buy their meals while they are there. There was no need for all of this. I think it is a crying shame that the department was allowed to go into this without even consulting the shire council at Collie. The Minister can put me in the background if he likes because I represent Labor.

Mr. Lewis: It has nothing to do with politics as far as I am concerned.

Mr. H. MAY: Does the Minister agree that the department should have consulted us and said, "This is our programme", instead of upsetting the whole show in Collie and letting us find out in the way we have?

Mr. Lewis: We did not consult shire councils anywhere else.

Mr. H. MAY: I am not worrying about anywhere else. I am worrying about Collie.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! I think the honourable member had better address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. H. MAY: I agree with you, Mr. Speaker, because I do not think the Minister knows much about this. I think he has allowed this situation to arise on the blind. The next letter is from the Amalgamated Engineering Union, and is as follows:—

Many thanks for your attention to apprenticeship position at Collie. My first estimate of 30 apprentices was far short of the mark as I believe there are over 40 counting panel beaters and carpenters and joiners.

That is the build-up of numbers in Bunbury. Bunbury did not have that number, and never did. However, taking in Harvey, Brunswick Junction, Busselton, and Collie, the figure has jumped to 200—a marvellous way to step up the figure. Continuing—

However it appears at the moment we are up against a brick wall although we may break through by our endeavours.

It was reported at our last meeting that the apprentices from here travelling to the Bunbury Technical School were only receiving correspondence lessons and no practical training.

If this is correct there should be some action taken to remedy the position. Perhaps you will be kind enough to ascertain whether this information is correct or not.

Thanking you once again for your assistance.

Now that's a lovely set-up isn't it? Because the buildings in Bunbury are not finished and therefore not ready to take these apprentices they are getting correspondence lessons from Perth. Where is the practical training? There is none at all.

Mr. Lewis: They are going to get that too.

Mr. H. MAY: It just shows what is going on, and I am going to explain to this House what goes on behind our backs. I think this is one of the shabbiest tricks served on me. On the 17th July I retaliated in the same strain by writing to the Minister as follows:—

My dear Minister,

I thank you for your letter dated 18th June, 1963, concerning the question of centralisation of apprentices in the South-West at Bunbury, and the various problems connected therewith. Your letter has been considered by the combined Metal Trades Unions of Collie, and as a result, I have been asked to obtain information on the following points.

Firstly, the information given you regarding the number of apprentices at Collie was incorrect in-as-much as it is 40 and not 30 as previously advised. It is difficult to appreciate your line of reasoning in the second paragraph of your letter under reply, as apprentices in the various trades in Collie have received their training in Collie for years past. The Unions would like to know, why all this sudden policy of centralisation at Bunbury? Has the matter suddenly become one of politics, and as such is a part of your Government's policy to progressively liquidate the town of Collie.

If your policy is that all apprentices in the South-West be concentrated in Bunbury, then we are strongly of the opinion the Department should make the necessary transport arrangements and not adopt a miserly policy of telling these lads to make their own arrangements. It should be borne in mind, these lads only receive apprenticeship rates of pay, which it is well known does not include finance for transport. How is it possible for them to own their own cars whilst existing on apprenticeship rates of pay? Advice regarding your enquiries in other States on this aspect would also be appreciated.

Finally, it has been reported to the Unions in Collie, that the apprentices who travel to Bunbury are only receiving correspondence lessons, with no practical training. If this is so, then the facilities for training appren-

tices at Bunbury falls far short of the arrangements given in your letter of the 18th June, 1963.

We now await your further comments regarding the points raised in this letter.

Mr. Lewis: Yours affectionately, Harry May!

Mr. H. MAY: It is no joke so far as I am concerned, affectionately or not affectionately. What little affection I did have for the Minister has gone. On the 6th August—this is the latest letter—I received the following from the Minister:—

On the 17th July you wrote to me seeking further information concerning the centralisation of training of apprentices in the South West at Bunbury.

It is true, of course, that apprentices have been receiving some training in Collie for years past—

I like that part—some training! How does the Minister think they got their Arbitration Court certificates if they only had "some" training? To continue the letter—

—but as I pointed out in my earlier letter to you the department has always been concerned that such training as has been possible to provide has been quite inadequate since there have not been sufficient numbers to justify specialised instructors, a satisfactory range of equipment, or the provision of separate classes for students at different levels in their trade training. These deficiencies will be rectified by the concentration of training in Bunbury and I can assure you that the provision of adequate training is the sole motive for this action.

Might I interpolate to make a few comments. At this stage when the facilities are already at Collie—there is a beautiful brick building there—was there any justification for establishing a new set-up at Bunbury? Even if the facilities in Collie were not big enough for the number of apprentices in the south-west, additions could have been effected thus saving the department a lot of expenditure. For political reasons they said they were going to build Bunbury up.

Mr. Lewis: There are no political reasons so far as I am concerned. They are purely economic.

Mr. H. MAY: The letter continues—

The report received by the Collie Union that apprentices who travel to Bunbury are receiving only correspondence lessons and no practical training is incorrect. The workshop is still under construction—

That is what the Minister said in his letter—

The workshop is still under construction and it is not possible at the moment to give practical instruction.

Mr. Lewis: That is right. Read on!

Mr. H. MAY: The Minister first of all says that the report received is incorrect and then in the next paragraph he says they cannot be given practical instruction.

Mr. Lewis: They have to have something else besides practical training.

Mr. H. MAY: Of course they do.

Mr. Lewis: Read on; finish the letter.

Mr. H. MAY: Of course they do. Most people have enough commonsense to know that. There is nothing new about that. To continue the letter—

However, the students are receiving class tuition under qualified instructors—

There is nothing to say they could not get that in Collie—nothing at all—

—and in many respects this is proving a valuable transition period since consolidation of their theory work is essential for many apprentices who have been studying under less favourable conditions.

Does that not go on all the time, no matter where it is—Collie or even Timbuktu? To continue—

It is also giving the instructors some opportunity to achieve common standards among the apprentices before they move into the practical work which will be provided as soon as the workshop is completed. The Director of Technical Education—

He is the nigger in the woodpile—the Director of Technical Education.

Mr. Hawke: Sir William Gunn is the nigger in the woodpile.

Mr. H. MAY: The letter continues—

The Director of Technical Education visited Bunbury a week ago and is satisfied that the workshop, which is expected to be ready in from two to three months' time, will provide first class conditions for practical instruction.

Doesn't any fool know that!

Mr. Lewis: You seem to dispute it.

Mr. H. MAY: Brand new set-up! Scrap the one in Collie which is worth thousands of pounds!

Mr. Lewis: There will be enough students in Bunbury to make it worth while.

Mr. H. MAY: You have said that before.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! The honourable member must address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. H. MAY: There is no difference in the mileage from Collie to Bunbury, and from Bunbury to Collie.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): Order! The honourable member must address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. H. MAY: Can you, Mr. Speaker, prevent the Minister from attracting my attention?

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): If I could I would.

Mr. H. MAY: I would agree with you that he is no Miss Australia or anything like that to look at, but he will continue to attract my attention when I should be paying attention to you and to the matter under discussion.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Hearman): I was not aware I had attributed any remarks like that to the Minister, but still! Miss Australia!

Mr. H. MAY: The letter goes on—

I have ascertained that there is no State which makes specific provision for the subsidisation of travel for country apprentices attending day classes, although South Australia does assist all day class apprentices with their travel costs. This provision was apparently not intended for country apprentices and ranges from 6d. for 5 miles up to 3s. for 9 miles and over.

In New South Wales and Queensland the railways grant a concession of a single fare for a return journey where apprentices use this means of travel to day classes. These Governments do not assist in any way when other forms of transport are used.

The point I want to make is: Why should we follow the pattern of other States? Should we not have our own standards? Surely we are capable of creating our own standards! To continue the letter—

It would be difficult for this State to offer facilities not provided elsewhere in the Commonwealth.

That is boloney!

The Government is already doing as much as any other, and more than the majority, in meeting transport costs for country apprentices by paying the fares of those attending intensive courses. Because of the accommodation costs which have to be met by these lads assistance to them appears more important than to those attending day classes.

The State is making its contribution by providing high quality facilities for day training of apprentices in country areas wherever possible. It looks for the co-operation of employers and apprentices in seeing that these facilities are used to the greatest advantage.

That reads funny to me when the building is not finished and will not be finished for another three or four months—

Where there is no public transport, as at Collie, there is no doubt that many apprentices either have cars or have access to them.

That is a lovely thing to put in a letter! The boys are not even earning enough to live on, because they have to be kept by their parents, and yet the Minister wants to know why they have no motorcars. I do not know what they think we are in Collie, if they think we are going to swallow that. To continue—

My department will co-operate wherever possible by trying to so organise the classes attended by apprentices who do not have their own transport to enable them to travel at a time when apprentices from the same area with transport are doing so.

They want to climb on to the band wagon of somebody else, instead of meeting their own obligations, Mr. Speaker. They are dodging their obligations. The letter concludes—

Co-operation between the department, employers and apprentices could probably also assist in achieving considerable economies by the organisation of common transport for groups of boys in this way.

Your faithfully,
Minister for Education.

I think I have said enough to show there is a move on foot within the Education Department to centralise these things wherever possible.

I have already related what the Government did to Collie as a result of the last coal tenders. Anybody with a reasonable amount of gumption would think, "All right, we have done such-and-such a thing to Collie by taking away a certain thing. Now we will build on the buildings already at Collie, and we will set up the system which is to be adopted in Bunbury with regard to apprentices." It is no further for anybody to go from Bunbury to Collie than it is for somebody to go from Collie to Bunbury.

Mr. Lewis: It is not a question of going from Bunbury to Collie, or from Collie to Bunbury. You know that. There is Busselton to be catered for as well. It is further for Busselton people to have to go to Collie than if they had to go to Bunbury.

Mr. H. MAY: Very little. We would not get enough apprentices in Busselton to count on one hand.

Mr. Lewis: How many are there?

Mr. H. MAY: I asked the Minister that question, and he has not answered it.

Mr. Lewis: You answer the question.

Mr. H. MAY: Collie people are being forced to go to Bunbury. Up to date I have not received one word from the Minister in that respect. He is dodging it. I am not altogether blaming him. The only blame I can put on the Minister is that he has not seen through it. I am

going to tell the Minister that I have come to the conclusion there are some people in his department who are developing a tendency towards fascism. If ever I am able to find out who they are, I will not hesitate to tell the Minister and the House.

The Minister should safeguard everybody who comes under his jurisdiction. He should not favour one particular spot. I could go on and say that it is being done for political reasons.

Mr. Lewis: That is not worthy of you.

Mr. H. MAY: I shall have another half-hour speech to make later on in regard to another set-up, where Bunbury is being made the centre. A more inhuman set-up one could not imagine. I wish to move—

That I be given leave to continue my speech at the next sitting of the House.

Motion put and passed.

Debate thus adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.3 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 27th August, 1963

CONTENTS

	Page
ADDRESS-IN-REPLY : NINTH DAY—	
Speakers on Motion—	
The Hon. J. Heltman	573
The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	566
The Hon. R. H. C. Stubbs	574
The Hon. H. K. Watson	578
BILL—	
Marine Stores Act Amendment Bill—	
Com.	561
Report ; 3r.	566
MOTION—	
Town Planning and Development Act—	
Disallowance of Regulations Nos. 4 to 25	557
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Drilling for Minerals—Drills Utilised, Results, and Cost	556
Local Government Act—	
Interpretation of Section 231	556
Position of Main Roads Department	556
Metropolitan Region Scheme—Effect of Adoption on Parliament House Site	556
Railway Transshipping Depot—Establishment at Coolgardie	557
Sulphur, Brimstone, and Pyrites—	
Norseman Pyrites	557
Prices	557

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.