

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Although some of them do apply it, most of the States have found that it is not the answer to the problem. I repeat: if we want to call a halt, we will call a halt to prosperity. A growing country like this is bound to have its troubles; where we have a progressive country we are bound to have problems; we will have growing pains, but the way to prevent them is not to clamp down and stop the child from growing. Rather than criticise us, help us to get on with the job.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

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

Third Reading

Bill read a third time and passed.

House adjourned at 9.7 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, the 9th August, 1960

CONTENTS

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—		Page
Agricultural Department Officers : Number north of 26th parallel		236
Air Strips : All-weather type for North-West		229
Banking Facilities : Establishment at Wyndham		236
Bicycles : License fees		238
Breeding Stock : Rate of slaughter		237
Centre Ride Boggles : Tenders and contract for construction		228
Cloverdale School : Inspection of site prior to commencement of building		237
Coal Deposits : Locality and quality		230
Crosswalks—		
Maintenance of zigzag lines		227
“ No standing ” rule		227
Dairying Industry : Commonwealth committee's survey in Western Australia		236
Electoral Districts Act : Proclamation and redistribution		231
Five-Year High School : Establishment at Harvey		237
F.R.V. “Peron”—		
Effect of breakdown on research		227
Number of Crew, and Expense involved in breakdown		228
Period of disablement		235

CONTENTS—continued		Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—continued		
Geraldton Harbour : Improvements		230
Geraldton Water Supplies : Additional storage		230
“ Highlights of Parliament ” : Discontinuance of broadcast		232
Iron Ore : Operation of ore leases at Koolyanobbing		227
J. & E. Ledger Pty. Ltd. : Shareholders		228
Lower King Bridge—		
Method of construction		231
Plans and specifications		231
Merredin Sewerage Installation—		
Proposals under Hawke Government		234
Proposals under present Government		234
Midland Junction Workshops—		
Manufacture of spare parts		229
Purchase of bar steel		228
Substitution of axle steel for bar steel		228
Transfer of tools and materials to Tomlinson Ltd.		229
Mother-of-Pearl Shell—		
Prospects for industry		235
Tonnage, split-up, and price		235
Motor Vehicles : Title ownership certificate		237
Mt. Lawley High School : Availability of classroom accommodation		238
Natives—		
Construction of homes at Allawah Grove		236
Construction of new hostel		236
Pemberton Sawmill Workers : Future employment		232
Perth Airport Extensions : Resumptions from State Housing Commission		232
Perth Girls' High School : Completion of tennis courts		239
Radio School of the Air : Establishment at Meekatharra and Kalgoorlie		237
Railway Boggles : Contract and tenders		239
Salmon Heads : Importation into Western Australia		230
Spencer Park School, Albany : Connection to electricity supply		230
State Shipping Service : Cost of fleet repairs		228
Stirling Highway : Traffic prosecutions and accident rate		288
Veterinary Surgeon : Location in North-West		229
Violet Valley : Standard of maintenance by lessee		235
Water Catchments in Norpa Area : Investigations		234
Water Supply Department—		
Increased revenue from sewerage rates		231
Interest and sinking fund charges		231
Wilson : Postal mail		234
Wool Promotion : Contributions to and results of scheme		235
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—		
Closed Railway Lines—		
Government policy		241
Promises made by Ministers		241
Reopening and operating costs, etc.		243
Reopening of Katanning line		240
Report of public meeting		241
Commonwealth Disposal Sale : Cartage of goods without permit		239

CONTENTS—continued

	Page
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE—continued	
Constable G. E. Walton—	
Reimbursement of damages and costs	239
Comparison with Hardy case	239
Dentures : Direct purchase from dental	
mechanics	242
East-West Road: Bituminisation	240
Football Pools :	
Disbursement of profits	242
Legality	242
Goldmining Industry : Rail freight con-	
cessions	240
Highlights of Parliament : Possibility of	
televising	243
Rail Freights—	
Breaking of pledge	241
Country Party policy on increases	241
Press report	242
Railway Fares : Increases	242
Railway Requirements : Manufacture of	
driving pump shafts	242
ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FOURTH DAY—	
Speakers on Amendment—	
Mr. Brady	260
Mr. Court	266
Mr. Heal	272
Mr. J. Hegney	281
Mr. May	256
Mr. Moir	251
Mr. Oldfield	270
Mr. Rowberry	278
Mr. Toms	276
Mr. Watts	244

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

CROSSWALKS

"No Standing" Rule

1. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Works:

Will he lay on the Table of the House the Main Road Department Traffic Engineering Branch files dealing with the "no standing" arrangement at the approach side of marked pedestrian crossings?

Mr. WILD replied:

Yes.

The papers were tabled.

IRON ORE

Operation of Leases at Koolyanobbing

2. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) Is any form of work, drilling or otherwise, being performed by the State on the iron ore leases of B.H.P. at Koolyanobbing?

- (2) If so—

- (a) what is the nature of the work;
(b) when did work commence;
(c) what expenditure has been incurred to date;
(d) why is the State involved in this expenditure?

- (3) Are there any other examples of the Government paying for work to be done on mining leases?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) B.H.P. holds no leases for iron ore at Koolyanobbing. The iron-ore deposits at Koolyanobbing, Bungalbin, and Dowd's Hill were recently contract-drilled for the Government by the B.H.P. Company.

- (2) Information regarding this work is as follows:—

- (a) Drilling.
(b) January last.
(c) Total cost of drilling was £35,928.
(d) The work was part of the Government's plan to obtain an accurate assessment of the ore reserves in the main iron deposits in the State.

Similar work is being undertaken on other deposits by other contractors.

- (3) The deposits drilled, and being drilled, are not leased to any party. Apart from Koolan Island and Cockatoo Island, all iron-ore deposits are at present reserved to the Crown.

CROSSWALKS

Maintenance of Zigzag Lines

3. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What is the cost of the initial marking of the zigzag lines at the approaches to a pedestrian crosswalk?
(2) How frequently on the main highways is it anticipated repainting will be necessary?
(3) What is the estimated cost of each such repainting?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) £3 10s. on two-lane roads, and £7 on four-lane roads.
(2) Four to six months.
(3) As for No. (1).

F.R.V. "PERON"

Effect of Breakdown on Research

4. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) Did the breakdown of F.R.V. *Peron* for eight weeks cause the curtailment of the investigations into catching of schnapper by trapping?

- (2) What other investigations or research had to be curtailed or cancelled for this season?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) No. The research vessel "Lancelin" is being used for this purpose.
 (2) The prawn and scallop resource investigation has been postponed.

Number of Crew, and Expense Involved in Breakdown

5. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) How many are in the crew of F.R.V. *Peron*?
 (2) What is the total amount of weekly wage paid to the crew?
 (3) What other expenses would have been incurred while this boat was laid up at Carnarvon?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Three, plus a cadet in training.
 (2) £90 18s. 5d.
 (3) Subsistence allowances totalling approximately £12 12s. a week.

CENTRE RIDE BOGIES

Tenders and Contract for Construction

6. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Is it not a fact that centre ride bogies are being manufactured for the W.A.G.R. by J. & E. Ledger Pty. Ltd., either by direct contract with the W.A.G.R. or by sub-contract with Tomlinson Steel Ltd.?
 (2) If so, which method of contract is employed?
 (3) Were tenders called publicly for these bogies, or was the contract let privately?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) No. J. & E. Ledger Pty. Ltd. are sub-contractors to A. E. Goodwin Ltd., the contractors for the bogies concerned.
 (2) Answered by No. (1).
 (3) Tenders were called publicly.

MIDLAND JUNCTION WORKSHOPS

Purchase of Bar Steel

7. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Is it not a fact that the Midland Workshops has purchased 4-inch bar steel at a cost of £120 per ton?

Substitution of Axle Steel for Bar Steel

- (2) Is it not a further fact that old wagon axles are being cut up and the steel sold to Hadfields (W.A.) 1934 Ltd. at the scrap price of £12 10s. per ton?

- (3) If the answers to Nos. (1) and (2) are in the affirmative will he inform the House—

- (a) Could not the axle steel still be used in place of bar steel;
 (b) if not, why not;
 (c) if so, why is it not being used?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) No.
 (2) Condemned railway wheel sets are being demolished and the resultant scrap—wheels and portions of axles—is being sold to Hadfields at the current contract rates.
 (3) The old axles concerned are fatigued after 40 to 60 years' service and do not conform to the specifications for which new steel would be obtained.

STATE SHIPPING SERVICE

Cost of Fleet Repairs

8. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Premier:

- (1) Is it not a fact that all State Shipping Service fleet repairs are carried out by the State Engineering Works?
 (2) If so, is it for the reason that these repairs are executed by the State Engineering Works at a cost less than that which could be provided by private firms of a similar nature?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) No. The State Engineering Works only perform boiler making and heavy engineering shipboard repairs by reason of the fact that practically all of this work is performed in connection with overhauls on the slipway which is restricted to State Engineering Works.

Prices are obtained for all quotable repairs and the best price accepted.

The State Engineering Works do not perform repair work in connection with plumbing, electrical refrigeration, instruments, shipwrighting, rigging, painting, etc.

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

J. & E. LEDGER PTY. LTD.

Shareholders

9. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Attorney-General:

Will he inform the House who are the shareholders of J. & E. Ledger Pty. Ltd., and the individual shareholding?

Mr. WATTS replied:

An annual return made up to the 31st March, 1960, filed with the Registrar of Companies, discloses that J. & E. Ledger Pty. Ltd. has an issued capital of 82,000 shares of £1 each. Particulars of the shareholders are as follows:—

Court, Charles Walter Michael of 46 Waratah Avenue, Nedlands—Number of ordinary shares held—1.

Ledger, Joseph Francis of 2 Bishop Road, Dalkeith—Number of ordinary shares held—60,998.

Ledger, Gladys Muriel of 2 Bishop Road, Dalkeith—Number of ordinary shares held—1. Ledger Investments Pty. Ltd. of 239 Pier Street, Perth—Number of "A" ordinary shares held—20,000.

Ledger, Colin Francis of 11 Mahlberg Avenue, Doubleview—Number of 5% preference shares held—1,000.
Total 82,000.

AIR STRIPS

All-Weather Type for North-West

10. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Premier:
What steps has the Government taken to bring pressure to bear on the Commonwealth authorities to have airstrips in the North-West made suitable for aircraft landings in all types of weather?

Mr. BRAND replied:

Subsequent to representations made by the Minister for the North-West, the acting Minister for Civil Aviation advised on the 18th March, 1960, that a report by airport engineers would be prepared on the wet weather performance of some of the North-West aerodromes.

A survey has been made and we now await official advice from the Commonwealth of what is proposed. This advice is expected shortly.

The State Government is keeping in touch with the Commonwealth Government. The desirability of improving the wet weather availability of North-West aerodromes is appreciated by the Government.

VETERINARY SURGEON

Location in North-West

11. Mr. BICKERTON asked the Minister for Agriculture:

Will he endeavour to obtain a veterinary surgeon employed by his department to be stationed centrally in the North-West?

Mr. NALDER replied:

The acute shortage of veterinary surgeons in the Department of Agriculture, in spite of repeated advertising, prevents any officer being made available for full-time duty in the North-West at the present time.

Continued attention is given to any special problems notified from the North-West and the Chief Veterinary Surgeon and one of his officers have just returned from a visit to the area.

The department has 14 veterinary cadets in training; and when a sufficient number of them becomes available as graduates, further consideration will be given to this matter.

MIDLAND JUNCTION WORKSHOPS

Manufacture of Spare Parts

12. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Minister for Railways:

Where a spare part can be produced at a cheaper rate in the W.A.G.R. Workshops, will he undertake to see that the work is performed in that establishment?

Mr. COURT replied:

It is not considered necessary to give direction to the commissioner in respect of this phase of workshops administration. There are many aspects to be considered, including manufacturing facilities, availability of drawings and suitable material, patent rights, royalties, extent of demand, and overall economics. This is a matter which the railway administration may be relied on to deal with as may be most appropriate.

Transfer of Tools and Materials to Tomlinson Ltd.

13. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Is it not a fact that certain tools, jigs, gauges, etc., and materials have been supplied to Tomlinson Steel Ltd. from the W.A.G.R. Workshops for the purpose of building the KA wagons?
- (2) If so, will he itemise for the House the materials supplied and the cost involved?
- (3) Have Tomlinson Steel Ltd. been charged for these items; and if so, to what percentage of the actual value?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) No jigs, tools, or gauges were supplied to Tomlinson Steel Ltd. but certain other materials were supplied under the conditions of contract for the manufacture of 200 KA wagons.

- (2) (a) The undermentioned items were supplied to Tomlinson Steel Ltd. in the terms of the tender documents:—

Wheels and axles.
 Draghooks.
 Draghook pins.
 Lubricating oil.

- (b) The following items were supplied and charged to Tomlinson Steel Ltd.:—

	£	s.	d.
(i) 400 only wagon card clips	250	0	0
(ii) 200 sets wagon timber	8,600	0	0
(iii) 800 only lubricating pads	2,400	0	0
(iv) Quantity steel sections	400	19	1
(v) Quantity bolts and nuts	122	15	7
	£11,773	14	8

- (3) Yes. The amount of £11,773 14s. 8d. as detailed in answer No. (2) (b) was deducted from progress payments made to Tomlinson Steel Ltd. during the currency of the contract. Items (i), (ii), and (iii) in answer No. (2) (b) were at prices nominated by the contractor in his tender, and in each case, the amount was higher than the book value. Concerning items (iv) and (v) the sale price was the current market value which was also higher than the book values.

GERALDTON WATER SUPPLIES

Additional Storage

14. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Has the report of the engineer been received in the matter of providing additional water storage in the northern section of the Municipality of Geraldton?
- (2) If so, is it the intention of the Government to provide another reservoir in Geraldton to make sure that consumers have sufficient water to carry them through peak periods?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) A preliminary report covering the entire reticulation system has been received.
- (2) Improvements to the whole system, including further service storage, will be undertaken in order of priority and urgency as finances permit.

GERALDTON HARBOUR

Improvements

15. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Works:

Is it the intention of the Government to give immediate attention to improving the harbour facilities at Geraldton, and to remove

the rock bar in the entrance channel which is causing concern to shipping interests chartering cargo boats?

Mr. WILD replied:

No immediate attention to the provision of further improvement of harbour facilities is proposed. The possible provision of increased depth of water in the harbour and the outer approaches is now under examination.

COAL DEPOSITS

Locality and Quality

16. Mr. HALL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Mines:

- (1) What coal deposits are known to exist in this State other than the Collie coalfields?
- (2) If other coalfields do exist, what is the quality of coal at such deposits?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) We know of coal occurrences at Fitzgerald River, Irwin River, and Wilga.
- (2) The two first-mentioned comprise very low-grade coals, and the latter is somewhat equivalent to the poorest Collie seams. Sporadic occurrences of thin, low-grade lignitic coal are known to occur in the South-West portion of the State.

SALMON HEADS

Importation into Western Australia

17. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) What tonnages of salmon heads were imported into this State for the crayfishing industry in 1958-59, 1959-60?
- (2) Of the tonnages imported, how many tons came from foreign countries?
- (3) What are the names of the countries from which salmon heads were imported?
- (4) What tonnages were imported from other States, and what are the names of the States and the tonnage per State?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1), (2), (3), and (4) This information is not available to the Fisheries Department.

SPENCER PARK SCHOOL, ALBANY

Connection to Electricity Supply

18. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Electricity:

With the further development taking place in the Spencer Park area, Albany, by way of shopping

centre and proposed State Housing building programme, will he give consideration to having electricity connected to the Spencer Park Primary School?

Mr. WATTS replied:

It is understood that the Education Department is willing to contribute to the cost of the extension when the contributory scheme is applied to this area.

LOWER KING BRIDGE

Plans and Specifications

19. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Works:

- (1) Have plans and specifications been completed for the building of a new Lower King bridge, Albany?
- (2) If so, what will be the approximate cost of the bridge, and when is it anticipated that work will commence?

Method of Construction

- (3) Will the bridge be built by the Main Roads Department with day labour, or will contracts be called for its erection?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) Plans and specifications are being prepared.
- (2) The estimated cost is £16,000. It is expected that the work will be started before the end of the year.
- (3) Tenders will be called for the erection of the bridge.

WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT

Increased Revenue from Sewerage Rates

20. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) What is the anticipated increase in revenue to be obtained this financial year from sewerage rates?

Interest and Sinking Fund Charges

- (2) Does the amount of £25,662 which was quoted in answer to a question on the 2nd August as being the amount included in the Revenue Estimates for 1960-61 to provide payment of interest and sinking fund charges include the amount which should have been debited for the year 1959-60?
- (3) If not, in what way is provision to be made for 1959-60?
- (4) What amount was calculated as being due for 1959-60 to meet interest and sinking fund charges on sewerage treatment works amplification?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) £160,000.
- (2) No.
- (3) Interest was funded in accordance with past practice with major works in the course of construction.
- (4) £25,261.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS ACT

Proclamation and Redistribution

21. Mr. TONKIN asked the Attorney General:

- (1) Does not the Electoral Districts Act, 1947, provide that whenever the Chief Electoral Officer has reported to the Minister that with regard to the rolls made up for any triennial election it appears that the enrolment in not less than five electoral districts falls short of or exceeds by 20 per centum the quota as ascertained for such districts under the Act, the Governor shall by Proclamation appoint three commissioners and direct a redistribution?
- (2) As the Electoral Districts (Cancellation of Proclamation) Act, 1950-1959, which was assented to on the 7th July, 1959, cancelled the provisions causing them to be deemed not to have been in operation, has the Governor yet issued a proclamation directing a redistribution?
- (3) As the Electoral Districts (Cancellation of Proclamation) Act, 1950-1959, cancelled "the several appointments of three Electoral Commissioners" and provided that they "shall be deemed not to have been made," has the Governor yet discharged the obligation to appoint three commissioners which is imposed upon him by section 12 (3) of the Electoral Districts Act?
- (4) Has the Government advised the Governor that he has already fully discharged the obligations imposed upon him under section 12 of the Electoral Districts Act, 1947?
- (5) If not, when does the Government propose to advise the Governor that he has some undischarged duties under the Electoral Districts Act which require His Excellency's attention?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) The authority to appoint commissioners does not arise until a redistribution has been directed by proclamation.

- (2) Since the issue of the proclamation on the 1st April, 1959, no further proclamation under the Electoral Districts Act has been made.
- (3) No further appointment of commissioners can be made until a further proclamation is issued. Commissioners cannot again be appointed under the proclamation which was cancelled by Parliament and deemed not to have been in operation.
- (4) The Government has advised the Governor that His Excellency had no further obligations to discharge under the Act after the 1st April, 1959. Act No. 1 of 1959 did not impose new obligations, revive former ones, or extend any time for the presentation of the final report and recommendations.
- (5) Answered by No. (4).

PEMBERTON SAWMILL WORKERS

Future Employment

22. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Premier:

On Wednesday, the 3rd August, in replying to debate, he stated, *inter alia*, "I have not damaged or kicked the ordinary people and have no intention of doing so," or words to that effect.

In view of this, will he give the House an undertaking that the number of men employed in the Pemberton State Sawmill will not be reduced, or that alternative employment will be found for anyone found to be redundant, so that the value of Pemberton as a town will be retained?

Mr. BRAND replied:

The Pemberton State Sawmill is a trading concern as part of the over-all State Building Supplies operations and no undertaking that the number of men employed at Pemberton will not be reduced can or should be given. For instance, the erection of a new mill as proposed by the Previous Government would have brought about a reduction in the number of men needed.

When any rearrangement is being made, the Government will have full regard for the importance of the sawmill in the economy of Pemberton.

"HIGHLIGHTS OF PARLIAMENT"

Discontinuance of Broadcast

23. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Premier:

- (1) What were the reasons that prompted the Government to discontinue availing itself of the time on the air accorded to it by the A.B.C., termed "Highlights of Parliament"?
- (2) Does he not want the people of the State to hear the doings of his Government?
- (3) Does he not admit that the people are entitled to hear of these doings?
- (4) Is he aware that the Government's refusal to continue participating in "Highlights of Parliament" could result in the Opposition being deprived of this privilege?
- (5) If he is aware of this, will he—
 - (a) give an undertaking that the Government will resume participation in "Highlights of Parliament"; or,
 - (b) use any influence he has to have this privilege restored to the Opposition?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) to (5) The Government believes that the broadcast in question was not fulfilling the purpose for which it was designed and therefore decided to discontinue its participation.

PERTH AIRPORT EXTENSIONS

Resumptions from State Housing Commission

24. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Has the Commonwealth Government given written notice of land required to be resumed from the State Housing Commission, improved and unimproved, for the southern extension of the Perth Airport?
- (2) If such notice has been given, would he supply a list of such properties?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) A list of the properties involved is attached. A further property, totalling 27a. Or. 35.7 p., will be acquired by the Commonwealth in a notice to be issued in the near future. A list of this property is also attached.

RESUMPTION OF LAND FOR EXTENSION PERTH AIRPORT
STATE HOUSING COMMISSION

(Commonwealth Government Gazette, 28th July, 1960)

Swan Loc. No.	Lot No.	Streets	Plan or Dia- gram	Area			Certificate of Title
				a.	r.	p.	
33	338	Hardey, etc.	3245	13	2	12	1068/135
33	1, 3/6, 8, 9, Pt. 7, 337	do.	D. 17429	14	2	7.8	673/78
33	Pt. 2	May and Pearl	D. 17429		2	2.5	Pt. 1168-109
33	1	Hardey and May	5216	4	1	8	1124-51
33	Pt. 2	do. do.	5216	3	0	3.2	Pt. 1122-586
33	3	do. do.	5216	4	1	8	1202-339
33	Pt. 4	do. do.	5216	3	2	25.6	Pt. 1138-727
33	57	do. do.	2799	8	2	17	1164-898
32	1	Middleton and Violet	3026			30.3	572-40
32	2, 3	do. do. do.	3026	1	19		659-152
32	4/7	do. do. do.	3026	2	39.3		1128-129
32	8/9	do. do. do.	3026	1	18.6		1163-642
32	10/12	do. do. do.	3026	2	8.6		1075-369
32	13 and 48	Violet and Mozart	3026	1	16		593-93
32	14, 15, 46 and 47	do. do.	3026	2	32		801-153
32	16-20 inc., 41-45 inc.	do. do.	3026	1	3	0	825-14
32	21, 22, 39 and 40	do. do.	3026	2	32		511-165
32	23 and 24	Violet	3026	1	16		1150-346
32	25	do.	3026			28	1162-760
32	26, 27, 34 and 35	do.	3026	2	32		504-129
32	28 and 29	do.	3026	1	16		1150-345
32	31	Hardey and Mozart	3026			28	1174-132
32	32	Mozart	3026			28	1139-711
32	33	do.	3026			28	1139-712
32	36	do.	3026			28	1162-834
32	38	do.	3026			28	628-9
32	49 to 59 inc.	do.	3026	1	3.28		1169-198
32	60, 61, 62, 71 and 72	Mozart and Longfellow	3026	3	28		533-47
32	63, 64, 69 and 70	do. do. do.	3026	2	32		535-95
32	65 to 68 inc.	do. do. do.	3026	2	32		1080-202
32	74 to 76 inc.	Longfellow	3026	1	34		Pt. 1159-800
32	77	do.	3026			28	1182-502
32	79-80	do.	3026	1	16		1142-98
32	81	do.	3026			28	1156-915
32	84	do.	3026			28	662-126
Total				66	1	5.9	

PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR EXTENSION PERTH AIRPORT

Swan Loc. No.	Lot No.	Streets	Plan or Dia- gram	Area			Certificate of Title
				a.	r.	p.	
32	379	Violet and Middleton	2283	app. 6	3	0	293-72
33	48	Pearl and Rose	2799	app. 6	0	0	(see attached Drawing) 1156-586
33	336	Hardey Road	3245	app. 6	3	24	(see attached Drawing) 1008-110
33	Pt. 339	Hardey and Scott	3245	app. 4	1	0	(see attached Drawing) Pt. 622-137
33	Pt. 335, Lots 14/22	Whitside Street	3245	app. 2	1	15.3	(see attached Drawing) 1187-641
31	Pt. 13	Maida Vale Road	6836	app.	1	21	(see attached Drawing) 1200-74
30	Pt. 39	Sydenham	6716	app.	0	7.0	(see attached Drawing) Pt. 1206-918
*31	28	Maida Vale	6836	app.	1	8.4	(see attached Drawing) 1200-190
*31	29	do.	6836	app.	1	0	(see attached Drawing) 1200-194
Total				27	0	35.7	

* Improved Properties—Lot 28, C.S. Purchase Home; Lot 29, W.S. Purchase Home.

SUMMARY

					a.	r.	p.
Area resumed 28/7/60 (see page 233)	68	1	5.9
Area to be acquired (see page 233)	27	0	35.7
Total Area	93	2	1.6

WILSON

Postal Mail

25. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Is he aware that people resident in the suburb of Wilson (formerly Beeloo) have recently experienced their mail having been sent to Wilson Park, Collie?
- (2) Would he request the Minister to give further consideration to the final name of this suburb, due to this and possibly more postal mix-ups?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) The General Post Office advises that neither "Wilson Park" nor "Wilson" are postal districts, and mail should be addressed "Wilson, via Cannington," and "Wilson Park, via Collie."
- (2) The Post Office advises that there are comparatively few mis-sorts noticed; in fact, no more than in other suburbs where mail is incorrectly addressed.

MERREDIN SEWERAGE
INSTALLATION*Proposals Under Hawke Government*

26. Mr. KELLY asked the Premier:

- (1) What conditions were extended to the Merredin Road Board, by the Hawke Government, to encourage the installation of sewerage in the township?
- (2) What capital was to have been made available to the board?
- (3) What was the board's contribution as its share of the total capital required to complete the proposal?

Proposals under Present Government

- (4) What conditions were imposed by the present Government in its offer to the Merredin Board?
- (5) What financial involvement was undertaken by the Government and the Merredin Road Board?
- (6) What was the percentage increase in property valuations on Merredin town lots, imposed by the present Government?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) A £5,000 grant.

A loan of £10,000 for a period of 15 years, the first five years to be free of interest and repayments to commence at the expiration of five years.

Moneys should be made available when the road board had either spent or committed itself to spend £17,000 on the project.

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

- (3) £17,000.

- (4) The proposal was that it be a Government scheme and that the sewerage rate would be 3s. in the £ on the annual value.

- (5) This being a Government sewerage scheme, estimated to cost £32,000, the Merredin Road Board had no financial involvement.

- (6) General increase in valuation was 61 per cent. based on a revaluation carried out by the Taxation Department. In view of this increase in valuation, the rate was fixed at 2s. in the £ for the first year of operation, but this rate would be subject to review in later years according to the financial aspects of the undertaking.

WATER CATCHMENTS IN NORPA
AREA*Investigations*

27. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Have investigations been undertaken by officers of the department concerning the possibility of developing rock catchments in the Norpa area, or has a survey been made covering any other scheme whereby reticulated water would be made available to settlers of this area?

- (2) If so, with what result?

- (3) If not, what are the prospects of an investigation at an early date?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) Five rock outcrops have been investigated within a 10-mile radius of Norpa, and there are at least two others to be surveyed.

- (2) Of those investigated, one was useless, three would carry minor storage, and one (Tandegin) could possibly be developed for up to 20,000,000 gallons.
- (3) Further investigations will be made at the first opportunity.

MOTHER-OF-PEARL SHELL

Tonnage, Split-up, and Price

28. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) What was the tonnage of mother-of-pearl shell recovered in Western Australian water for the years 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960?
- (2) What was the relative tonnage split-up of the various grades?
- (3) What was the yearly average price recorded in each grade?

Prospects for Industry

- (4) What are the present prospects for the industry?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) 1957, 990 tons; 1958, 753 tons; 1959, 508 tons; 1960 (to the 30th June), 158 tons.
- (2) The master pearlery grade shell according to the requirements of overseas buyers, and buyers prescribe different gradings. It is therefore not possible to be precise on this matter.
- (3) The average over-all prices in the years mentioned were as follows—
1957—£610 per ton.
1958—£462 per ton.
1959—£560 per ton.
1960—Not yet available.
- (4) There is little prospect of expansion, by reason of the strong competition from plastics. The industry appears to be just about able to hold its own.

F.R.V. "PERON"

Period of Disablement

29. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) Besides the captain, how many hands are employed on the vessel *Peron*, and in what category?
- (2) How long is it anticipated that the vessel will be out of order?
- (3) What will become of the crew during this enforced stoppage?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Two: one mate and one engineer. A technical officer is also employed. He is not a member of the crew. A cadet has been placed aboard for training.
- (2) Perhaps two weeks longer.

- (3) They are remaining at Carnarvon, where, in addition to general maintenance duties on the vessel and experimental fishing gear, they have been engaged, at the request of the Public Works Department, in surveying Tegg's Channel and erecting posts and leads.

WOOL PROMOTION

Contributions to and Results of Scheme

30. Mr. KELLY asked the Treasurer:

- (1) What amount of finance has the State Government contributed towards wool promotion?
- (2) What other direct contribution has the State Government rendered to the wool industry in W.A.?
- (3) Is he aware of the amount contributed annually by the Commonwealth Government towards wool promotion, and to whom?
- (4) Is the scheme of wool promotion bearing worthwhile results?
- (5) What is the basis of individual producer's contribution to the wool promotion scheme?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) There is no specific contribution by the State Government towards wool promotion. Wool produced by research stations is subject to the usual levy.
- (2) The main direct assistance is that part of the Department of Agriculture expenditure which can be recognised as assisting sheep and wool producers. An estimate made recently revealed that approximately £240,000 of the department's expenditure for 1958-59 was for the benefit of the sheep industry.
- (3) The Commonwealth Government does not contribute to funds for wool promotion.
- (4) As far as I am aware, there is no reliable evidence on which to base judgment.
- (5) Producers' contributions for wool promotion are made on the basis of 5s. per bale, 2s. 6d. per fadge or butt, and 10d. per bag.

VIOLET VALLEY

Standard of Maintenance by Lessee

31. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for Lands:

Does he consider the lessee of Violet Valley (formerly a Native Welfare Department cattle station) is maintaining the conditions of the lease, and keeping the buildings, yards, windmills, etc., to the standard they were when the property was leased?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

The land is vested in the Commissioner of Native Welfare and is the subject of a lease negotiated by him. The carrying out of conditions under the lease is his responsibility.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT OFFICERS

Number North of the 26th Parallel

32. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) How many officers of the Agricultural Department are stationed north of the 26th parallel?
- (2) Is it the intention of the department to increase the number of officers?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) There are 55 men employed by the Department of Agriculture north of the 26th parallel. Of these, 21 are officers employed under the Public Service Act; 22 are wages employees; and 12 are employed by the Agriculture Protection Board.
- (2) The numbers will be increased as soon as suitable staff can be obtained.

DAIRYING INDUSTRY

Commonwealth Committee's Survey in Western Australia

33. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What was the name and occupation of the personnel of the members of the survey into the dairying industry appointed by the Commonwealth Government?
- (2) What were the dates of the commencement and end of this survey?
- (3) What areas were visited in Western Australia?
- (4) How many persons were interviewed and in what localities?
- (5) How long did members of the survey remain in Western Australia?
- (6) What tangible result was achieved?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Mr. M. E. McCarthy, a former Commonwealth Public Servant (Chairman).

Mr. J. P. Webb, Chairman and Managing Director of Victorian Producers Co-operative Ltd.

Mr. J. A. Jones, Secretary of Queensland Council of Agriculture.

Mr. G. McGillivray, former Chief Dairying Officer in New South Wales.

Mr. G. H. Chessell, Chairman of the Rural and Industries Bank, Western Australia.

- (2) The committee was appointed in July, 1959. It has not yet completed its work.
- (3) The committee visited Pinjarra, Brunswick, Margaret River, Augusta, Manjimup, Pemberton, Northcliffe, Walpole, Denmark, Albany, and Mt. Barker.
- (4) Information not available. Inquiries of this nature a list of witnesses usually forms part of the report.
- (5) The committee was in Western Australia between the 30th September and the 9th October, 1959.
- (6) See answer to No. (2) above.

NATIVES

Construction of New Hostel

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

- (1) Has any decision been made by the Government to build a hostel for natives requiring medical attention, to replace the present hostel at East Perth, which is overcrowded from time to time?

Construction of Homes at Allawah Grove

- (2) Have any plans been made to build homes for natives at Allawah Grove when present land is taken over by the Civil Aviation Department?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) No; but increased and improved accommodation is being arranged adjacent to Bennett House.
- (2) No.

BANKING FACILITIES

Establishment at Wyndham

35. Mr. RHATIGAN asked the Minister for Lands:

In view of the vast amount of Government works now in progress in the Wyndham district, is he still of the same opinion regarding banking facilities at Wyndham as he was when he answered my question—*Hansard*, page 3603—of the 25th November, 1959?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

The large amount of work planned by the Government for the Wyndham district is occasioning a close

watch being maintained on the need for banking facilities there. However the cost of a branch establishment is not yet warranted.

MOTOR VEHICLES

Title Ownership Certificate

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

Has the Government examined the system of "Title Ownership Certificate" for motor vehicles, similar to the New South Wales and Victorian systems?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

Yes.

RADIO SCHOOL OF THE AIR

Establishment at Meekatharra and Kalgoorlie

37. Mr. BURT asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is it the intention of the department to place the radio school of the air at Meekatharra on a permanent basis next year?
- (2) Is it intended to establish a similar radio school to operate from Kalgoorlie?
- (3) If so, when is it anticipated that a commencement can be made?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The position is still being investigated.
- (3) Answered by No. (2).

FIVE-YEAR HIGH SCHOOL

Establishment at Harvey

38. Mr. I. W. MANNING asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Will he please advise what progress is being made with the establishment of a five-year high school at Harvey?
- (2) When can it be expected that work on the erection of the building will commence?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) It is not intended to establish a five-year high school at Harvey until the numbers offering for fourth-year and fifth-year courses warrant such a step.
- (2) It is intended to establish a separate three-year high school as soon as the buildings are available. The following rooms are to be established on the new site in this financial year:—2 classrooms; 1 composite home science centre.

BREEDING STOCK

Rate of Slaughter

39. Mr. I. W. MANNING asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he aware that concern is being expressed by many farmers at the rate of slaughter of breeding stock of both beef and dairy cattle?
- (2) Has he any statistics available to indicate if the present rate of slaughter of these cattle can be regarded as a serious depletion of breeding stock?
- (3) If so, will he please advise the House?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1), (2) and (3) Attention has been drawn during the last two years to the trend in the slaughter and also export of breeding cattle.

Investigations, however, indicate that there is no immediate cause for concern. The Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry has been requested, and has agreed, to keep the position under review.

The following statistics indicate the position in Western Australia:—

	Beef Cattle	Beef Cows	Dairy Cows
1957	733,000	319,000	224,000
1959	784,000	335,000	215,000
1960	851,000	not available	218,000

CATTLE

	Slaughtered	Exported
1956-57	175,000	7,040 tons
1958-59	220,000	11,200 "
1959-60	214,000	12,800 "

Although there is a slight drop in numbers of dairy cows, production is being maintained or slightly increased.

CLOVERDALE SCHOOL

Inspection of Site Prior to Commencement of Building

40. Mr. JAMESON asked the Minister for Education:

Due to the apparent obvious bad geographical location of the proposed Cloverdale Primary School, would he personally inspect the site in respect to the housing in the Cloverdale area before any move is made to commence the building?

Mr. WATTS replied:

Following representations by the honourable member, officers of the Public Works Department, Town Planning Board, and Education Department made a complete inspection of the Cloverdale area for a suitable site and recommended

the area opposite the Belmont High School as being suitable for school purposes.

The schoolsite (portion of lot 379) in the Cloverdale housing area cannot be built on until a final decision is reached concerning the future of the Perth Airport.

BICYCLES

License Fees

41. Mr. LEWIS asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) What revenue is received by the Police Traffic Branch for license fees from pedal cyclists?
- (2) What is the present registration fee per cycle?
- (3) Are new license plates issued for each year for these cycles?
- (4) What is the cost of these license plates?
- (5) Is this the only State in which it is necessary to license pedal cycles?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) No revenue was received from license fees paid on pedal cycles. For the twelve months ended the 30th June, 1960, the sum of £4,255 was received for the issue of number plates.
- (2) No registration fee is charged on pedal cycles.
- (3) Yes. Plates of a different colour are issued each year.
- (4) Two shillings.
- (5) Yes, as far as is known.

STIRLING HIGHWAY

Traffic Prosecutions and Accident Rate

42. Mr. CROMMELIN asked the Minister for Transport:

- (1) How many motorists were prosecuted for speeding on Stirling Highway between Louise Street, Nedlands, and Waroonga Road, Claremont, for the—
 - (a) year ended the 30th June, 1959;
 - (b) year ended the 30th June, 1960?
- (2) How many reported vehicle accidents on the same stretch of the highway were reported in each of the four quarters of the years—
 - (a) ended the 30th June, 1959;
 - (b) ended the 30th June, 1960?
- (3) How many pedestrian accidents on the same stretch of the highway were there in each of the same quarters of the same years ended—
 - (a) the 30th June, 1959;
 - (b) the 30th June, 1960;
 not including pedestrian accidents taking place on crosswalks?

(4) In regard to No. (3), in each of the quarters how many motorists were held responsible for the causing of the accidents?

(5) How many accidents involving pedestrians on crosswalks were reported for each of the quarters of the years ended—

(a) the 30th June, 1959;

(b) the 30th June, 1960;

on Stirling Highway between Louise Street and Waroonga Road?

(6) In regard to No. (5), in how many cases was the motorist held responsible?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

(1) No statistics are kept relating to this particular locality.

(2) Vehicle accidents:

1958—

3rd quarter 9

4th quarter 6

1959—

1st quarter 10

2nd quarter 15

3rd quarter 6

4th quarter 6

1960—

1st quarter 4

2nd quarter (figures
not yet available) -

Total 7 quarters: 56

(3) Pedestrian accidents:

1958—

3rd quarter—1 accident, resulting in two pedestrian deaths.

1959—

4th quarter—1.

Remaining 5 quarters—No pedestrian accidents reported.

(4) In none of the accidents reported in reply to No. (3) was the motorist stated to be responsible.

(5) No accidents were reported involving pedestrians on crosswalks during the seven quarters under review.

(6) Answered by No. (5).

MT. LAWLEY HIGH SCHOOL

Availability of Classroom Accommodation

43. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Minister for Education:

Adverting to question No. 12 of Thursday, the 4th August, wherein he replied that further classroom accommodation would be available at Mt. Lawley High School, "as soon as possible," will

he give the House some indication as to what date this accommodation will be available?

Mr. WATTS replied:

Advice available now is that tenders will be called in five weeks' time. Buildings are expected to be ready by April, 1961.

PERTH GIRLS' HIGH SCHOOL

Completion of Tennis Courts

44. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Education:

- (1) Has it yet been decided when work will be undertaken to complete the tennis courts so that they may be used by the pupils of Perth Girls' High School?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) How long is it since work ceased?
- (4) At how many schools have tennis courts been developed, including surround fencing, since work on the courts commenced at Perth Girls' High School in 1958?

Mr. WATTS replied:

- (1) As the future of this school is at present under consideration, no further work is being undertaken for the time being.
- (2) Answered by No. (1).
- (3) Work ceased at the direction of the then Acting Minister for Works on the 21st August, 1958. Expenditure on dust-proofing to preserve the work already done was authorised on the 16th October, 1958, and completed on the 16th April, 1959.
- (4) 12 high schools.

RAILWAY BOGIES

Contract and Tenders

45. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Has a contract been let to Hadfield's for the manufacture of bogies?
- (2) If so, what is the contract price?
- (3) Were tenders first called?
- (4) Who was the second lowest tenderer?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) £311 7s. 9d. per bogie plus £4 5s. to £6 maximum caused by variations in marginal rates.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Under the policy followed by the Tender Board, details of tenders such as this are not disclosed.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

COMMONWEALTH DISPOSAL SALE

Cartage of Goods Without Permit

1. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Railways:

Does the Minister know that certain motor vehicles were carting goods away from the Commonwealth disposal sale at Nungarin last week without a permit from the Transport Board, but with the alleged authority of the Minister for Railways? If so, will he comment on the position?

Mr. COURT replied:

I have no knowledge of the particular matter to which the honourable member refers, but I will have it investigated and advise him, or the House, as he chooses.

CONSTABLE G. E. WALTON

Reimbursement of Damages and Costs

2. Mr. HAWKE asked the Premier:

- (1) What were the main reasons which caused the Government to reimburse Constable G. E. Walton for the total damages and costs awarded against him, and his solicitor's fees, in a Supreme Court action in 1959?

Comparison with Hardy Case

- (2) Is there any difference, in principle, in the Government's decision in this instance, and in a decision made in a previous instance in favour of Constable F. J. Hardy?

Mr. BRAND replied:

I have to thank the Leader of the Opposition for notice of this question. The answers are as follows:—

- (1) Constable Walton quite obviously endeavoured to do the right thing, and there was not the slightest suggestion of any malice or ill-treatment on his part, of the accused, and it was necessary in the public interest to ensure that a constable did not suffer severe financial loss as a result of an honest mistake in the execution of his duty.
- (2) In the case of Constable Hardy, the judge commented that he was unnecessarily unpleasant and went far beyond what was called for. He had handled Trowbridge unnecessarily and bundled him unceremoniously into the police van. The two cases are therefore not parallel.

EAST-WEST ROAD

Bituminisation

3. Mr. MOIR asked the Premier:

It was reported in the daily Press earlier this year that the Premier had had consultations with the South Australian Premier as to a joint approach to the Commonwealth Government for the purpose of requesting the Commonwealth Government to provide funds to enable an all-black road to be laid down between South Australia and Western Australia. Was an approach made to the Commonwealth Government; and, if so, with what result?

Mr. BRAND replied:

During the Premiers' Conference, I discussed this matter with Sir Thomas Playford, and we had only a very brief interview with the Prime Minister on the question. No decision has been made; and it is proposed, in a visit which I intend to make to Canberra in the near future, to follow this matter up further.

GOLDMINING INDUSTRY

Rail Freight Concessions

4. Mr. EVANS asked the Minister for Railways:

In view of the appeal made by the member for Kalgoorlie in 1959 on behalf of the goldmining industry, with regard to rail freights, would the Minister please reply to the following questions:—

- (1) Was consideration given by Cabinet to the extraordinary circumstances under which this industry operates, i.e., 1960 cost levels are being borne, whilst its product is being sold at the price level existing in 1949?
- (2) If not, why not?
- (3) If the answer to the first question is "Yes," is any exemption in the proposed freights to be granted to this industry, particularly as to diesel fuels, oils, explosives, mining timber, and machinery?
- (4) If not, would the Minister, in his dual role as Minister for Railways and Minister for Industrial Development, consider referring the matter to Cabinet for urgent review?

Mr. COURT replied:

The honourable member was good enough to give me notice of this question when I was entering the Chamber. Firstly, he would agree that representations were made by others, in addition to himself, regarding this particular problem last year. The problems of all industry, including the goldmining industry, were taken into account by Cabinet; and particular emphasis was given to industries which have to operate on fixed prices, or price levels fixed overseas.

I should also add for the information of the House that when the Minister for Mines was in Kalgoorlie last weekend, representatives of the mining industry approached him on several matters, and they apparently had assumed that a freight rise was imminent from Press references that had been made. The Minister, whilst he naturally could not agree that a freight rise was imminent or contemplated, did say that if and when a freight increase took place, the Premier and I, as Minister for Railways, would receive representations from the goldmining industry if its members considered they had a special case to be stated.

CLOSED RAILWAY LINES

Reopening of Katanning Line

5. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Railways:

In *The West Australian* of Monday, the 25th July, there is the following correspondence from Nyabing:—

We who live near the line know best what is required and we know that our line would show a profit if efficiently managed. The present Government pledged that it would reopen lines where settlers demanded it.

There is a note to the effect by Railways Minister Court which says—

Closed lines were being examined. A decision would be made soon. There was no prospect of the Katanning-Pingrup line showing a profit. The Government did not pledge itself to reopen lines where settlers demanded. It promised proper examination and consultation. This was being done.

Is the reported statement emanating from the Minister for Railways correct?

Mr. COURT replied:

Yes.

Report of Public Meeting

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

I would like to refer to a statement which appeared in *The Farmers' Weekly* of the 21st July, 1960, in which there was a report of a meeting which was attended by the Minister for Agriculture and the Minister for Transport. The following is a brief statement made by one of the persons present:—

Mr. A. Beeck criticised the Minister because he said a Country Party election promise that the line would be restored had not been fulfilled.

The election promise was not for a part service as Mr. Perkins has outlined here today . . . This view was supported by Mr. A. J. Adis who also suggested a guarantee be obtained for the figure of 4d. per ton mile.

The Minister is reported to have said—

We will honour our promise if the people want us to. The promise was to open the line for heavy traffic.

Is that report correct?

Mr. PERKINS replied: The report of my statement is correct.

Promises Made by Ministers

7. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Premier: Whose promise can the people believe in connection with the re-opening of closed railway lines? Should they believe the promise made by the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party (the Minister for Railways) or that made by the Minister for Transport?

Mr. BRAND replied:

I do not know whether I am compelled to answer this question.

Mr. Graham: Oh, of course!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Hawke: If you cannot, do not bother.

Mr. BRAND: In that case I will not bother.

The SPEAKER: The tendency has developed in this House to base questions on newspaper reports; and also to ask questions other than those concerned with the administration of a particular department under the control of a Minister. Strictly those questions are not in order. Some of the questions this afternoon have not complied with the requirements.

I am endeavouring to arrange to give members some guidance in this matter; but I would point out that in this particular case the Premier is being asked to comment on statements in the Press made by two different people, when he himself was not present on either occasion, to the best of my knowledge. Consequently, the only question that can be asked of him is whether those statements represent Government policy or not.

Government Policy

8. Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Premier: I am glad you have guided me in this respect, Sir. I would now like to ask the Premier whether the statement is in accordance with the Government's promise; and, if so, which one?

Mr. BRAND replied:

As a result of the election speeches made, a Government decision as published in today's Press indicates that certain railway lines have remained closed, while others have been opened on a temporary or seasonal basis. It appears that, by and large, the people concerned have accepted the situation.

*RAIL FREIGHTS**Country Party Policy on Increases*

9. Mr. HAWKE asked the Attorney-General:

Has the policy of the Country Party with regard to increased railway freights altered since he delivered his party's policy speech in Mt. Barker in February, 1949?

Mr. WATTS replied:

In so far as I am obliged to answer this question, I will do so by saying that the governing body of the Western Australian Country Party had its annual general conference; and the position regarding railway finance was submitted to that conference and a decision reached that the proposals being made were reasonable.

Breaking of Pledge

10. Mr. HAWKE asked the Attorney-General:

With reference to the increase in railway freights that is to come into operation in the near future, does the Attorney-General consider any conference has a right to break a pledge the leader of the party has given to the whole of the people of the State at a previous election?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Circumstances have changed.

Mr. WATTS replied:

If the honourable member were to read the full statement he would find it was conditional; and, of course, the persons who should be responsible are those determining the course of action.

Press Report

11. Mr. HAWKE asked the Attorney-General:

I wish to ask the Attorney-General another question.

The SPEAKER: I hope it will deal with the administration of the department.

Mr. HAWKE: It will deal with railway freights, which will detrimentally affect your electors, Mr. Speaker. I would refer the Attorney-General to a report on his speech at Mt. Barker in February, 1959, that the Country Party will not agree to any further increase in rail freights. Is the report correct?

Mr. WATTS replied:

I have already answered the question.

FOOTBALL POOLS

Legality

12. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Chief Secretary:

- (1) Will the Minister inform the House whether the football pools being run by a leading newspaper are contrary to the Lotteries Act or not?
- (2) Has the Minister made inquiries as to whether it is illegal or not?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

As far as I can ascertain at this stage, the football pools are not illegal and may be carried on.

Mr. Graham: East Perth will be financial now!

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: However, consideration is currently being given to it, and the position is being watched closely.

Disbursement of Profits

13. Mr. OLDFIELD asked the Chief Secretary:

Will he inform the House who benefits from the profits, if any, being made by these pools?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

At this juncture I am not able to answer that question. I will have inquiries made and inform the honourable member.

DENTURES

Direct Purchase from Dental Mechanics

14. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) Did he receive a draft Bill in the year 1959 from the dental technicians requesting the introduction of a Bill to Parliament so as to enable the public to purchase dentures direct from the technicians?
- (2) If the answer is in the affirmative, does he propose to introduce a Bill during this session to enable the public to purchase dentures direct from dental technicians?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.

RAILWAY FARES

Increases

15. Mr. HEAL asked the Minister for Railways:

It has been announced that metropolitan railway fares are to be increased. It has also been announced that country railway fares will not be increased. Will the Minister indicate to the House whether he or Cabinet has considered country railway passenger fares? If so, what is the reason for the country railway passenger fares not being increased?

Mr. COURT replied:

I presume the honourable member refers to country passenger fares. The over-all rail freights and fares structure was considered. Having regard for the respective positions of the different sections of the community, it was decided there would be no increases in country passenger fares.

Mr. Graham: Why?

Mr. COURT: For a very good reason. After all, we profess to believe in decentralisation, and we do all we can to assist in that regard. In view of the service that is offered to the people in the country, it was considered that the present fares should remain.

RAILWAY REQUIREMENTS

Manufacture of Driving Pump Shafts

16. Mr. TONKIN asked the Minister for Railways:

On Thursday last I drew the attention of the Minister to the apparent conflict in the two answers which he gave. He undertook to elucidate the position and to give me the explanation. Has he the explanation now?

Mr. COURT replied:

I have the answers to the questions asked by the honourable member and by the member for East Perth. The reconciliation of the two answers is a very simple one. It is simply this: The three shafts which were the subject of orders on the 25th February, 1960, were, in fact, completed on Thursday, the 4th August, and passed for inspection that afternoon. That answers the questions and reconciles the two answers; it makes them both correct.

Mr. TONKIN: I do not think it does. If an answer states that the department makes shafts—and not “is making”—it makes them. The answer stated that none had been made. Surely there is an apparent conflict, and the Minister's explanation does not resolve the conflict. Was he informed properly by his department when he gave his first answer that shafts were in the making?

Mr. COURT: If the language used by the department in preparing these answers does not meet with the honourable member's wishes I cannot be responsible for that. The answers are perfectly clear, if taken in conjunction with the answer I have just given. Had the question been asked a day later the answer would have been to the effect that the shafts had, in fact, been made. At the time, the question was answered factually and fairly by the department, because the shafts had not been completed.

I am prepared to read the two questions asked by the honourable member, and the answers given so that members of this Chamber will be able to appreciate the import of what I have said.

The question asked on the 2nd August was as follows:—

- (1) What is the cost to the Railways Department of the following items:—
 - (a) 5 - inch flange mounting pump;
 - (b) bearing sleeve, X11132;
 - (c) shaft for driving pump, X11148?
- (2) Could the department have items (b) or (c) made at its workshops?
- (3) What is the estimated cost of making items (b) and (c) respectively?
- (4) Does the department make any of the items abovementioned?

The answer given was—

- (1) (a) £150 16s. 2d. each.
(b) £11 3s. 1d. each.
(c) £30 16s. 3d. each.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) (b) £1 16s. 1d.
(c) £17 approximately.
- (4) Yes—items (b) and (c).

On the 4th August the honourable member asked—

- (1) How many shafts for driving pump, X11148, have been made at the railways workshops, Midland Junction?
- (2) When was the order for making item X11148 placed with the workshops and for what number of shafts?

The reply given was—

- (1) None.
- (2) 25th February, 1960, for three shafts.

I suggest perhaps the officer preparing the answer to the question was a little pedantic on the eve of the parts being finished, but he was factual and fair.

“HIGHLIGHTS OF PARLIAMENT”

Possibility of Televising

17. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Premier: Referring to the answer given to question No. 23 on radio broadcasts by the A.B.C., “Highlights of Parliament,” is he aware there is a possibility that in the near future this feature could be televised? If he was influenced in the matter by “photogenicity,” or the lack of it, would he consider authorising some of the more handsome of his Ministers—say, the Minister for Works—to deputise for him?

Mr. BRAND replied:

We shall jump that hurdle when we come to it.

CLOSED RAILWAY LINES

Reopening and Operating Costs, etc.

18. Mr. COURT: On Tuesday, the 2nd August, 1960, in reply to a question asked by the member for East Perth regarding the Burakin-Bonnie Rock and Lake Grace-Hyden lines, I replied that the final audited figures were not yet available to enable me to answer parts (a), (b), (c) and (e) of his question. He indicated that unaudited figures would suffice for the time being.

This information has now been forwarded to me and is as follows:—

Questions:

- (a) the costs of reopening the lines;
- (b) the operating costs, plus administration charges, depreciation and interest;

- (c) the earnings;
 (e) the total amount payable by the Treasury Department to the Railways Department.

Replies:

- (a) Burakin-Bonnie Rock—£12,320.
 Lake Grace-Hyden—£9,760.

(b)

	Burakin- Bonnie Rock £	Lake Grace- Hyden £
Expenditure		
Maintenance of		
Way & Works	5,984	9,976
Traffic	1,977	1,917
Motive power	5,865	7,711
Maintenance of		
rolling stock	3,322	4,725
Payroll tax, work- ers comp., ad- ministration, etc.	1,587	2,149
Departmental		
freight	197	1,054
Depreciation	8,939	6,128
	27,851	33,660
Interest	14,034	9,803
Total	£41,885	£43,463

- (c) Burakin-Bonnie Rock — £16,466
 Lake Grace-Hyden — £15,092

(e)

	Burakin- Bonnie Rock	Lake Grace- Hyden
(i) In respect of re- opening ..	£12,320	£ 9,760
(ii) In respect of season's opera- tion	£11,385	£18,568

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Fourth Day

Debate resumed from the 4th August on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, to which Mr. Hawke (Northam) had moved an amendment to add the following words:—

We wish to protest strongly against the failure of the Government to honour the promise given by the Attorney-General to Parliament last year to issue a fresh proclamation under the provisions of the Electoral Districts Act and against the Government's failure to foreshadow legislation to keep prices of essential commodities under reasonable restraint.

We wish also to protest strongly against the Government's policy of undermining the future of its own railways workshops at Midland Junction by refusing to allow even the management to tender with private firms for large-scale manufacturing jobs, including the building of the two new

Westland trains, and against the policy of disposing of State trading concerns and of abolishing the Public Works day-labour construction organisation.

Furthermore we would protest strongly against the mishandling by the Government of the Water Supply Department's finances and the recent severe increases in the department's rates, and the failure of the Government to take or propose any action to protect small traders from combines and monopolies.

MR. WATTS (Stirling—Minister for Education—on amendment) [5.26]: As I view the amendment which has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition, it is calculated in the main to put fear and apprehension in the minds of a great number of very worthy people for which, I would submit, there has been no sufficient justification up to date. Not only the amendment itself, but also the speeches which have accompanied it have been directed almost entirely along those lines. I suggest, particularly in regard to the second paragraph of the amendment, that that is the design which underlay the moving of this amendment.

People are being asked to believe—when I refer to these people, I mean those who are at present engaged in the various enterprises that I mentioned—that action by this Government in respect of those particular enterprises is likely to involve them in a condition of unemployment and general misery, instead of the reasonable situation in which, under present conditions and awards, they find themselves.

I would like to make it very plain at this juncture that that sort of talk is entirely unnecessary and, in my opinion, completely unworthy of those who have put it forward in this House, because there is as yet precisely no justification whatever for any of it. As yet no action whatever has been taken which is likely to prejudice these people or create fears in their minds. I would submit very strongly that such action is not likely to be taken by the Government hereafter.

There have been quoted in this House on several occasions statements that have been made in respect of the principles upon which such State trading concerns as are contemplated for disposal would be disposed of; and those statements have made provision, as has been indicated by their being read out, for an assurance for a reasonable price to be obtained; for an assurance of continued employment; and for an assurance that the business conducted will continue as part of the State's economic structure. It is obviously impracticable to give details of any proposal which might involve the disposal of any one or more of the two or three concerns which have so far been suggested for sale until one knows what is the proposition that is likely to require a decision.

But those statements have been made, and reiterated on more than one occasion, with the idea of informing the public—and particularly those concerned—that in any decisions that may be reached, those prime questions will be taken into consideration. I venture to suggest, without much fear of successful contradiction, that the members of this Government, and those who sit with them here, are at heart just as much concerned with the welfare of their fellow citizens as is anyone else.

Mr. Graham: Your actions belie that statement.

Mr. WATTS: No action as yet has belied any such statement because there has been nothing whatever done which would unfairly prejudice the rights of any such people. As I have said, there has been a conglomeration of statements made by other people which have been made in an endeavour to strike fear into the hearts of those concerned—

Mr. Graham: You have struck it.

Mr. WATTS: —without any justification, as I have endeavoured, in the last few minutes, to demonstrate.

Mr. May: What about the thousands that were sacked in the Public Works?

Mr. WATTS: I did not catch that interjection.

Mr. May: What about the Public Works Department employees who have been sacked?

Mr. WATTS: Even there the people who have ceased to work—

Mr. Tonkin: Who were sacked?

Mr. WATTS: —on those construction groups, have obtained satisfactory employment elsewhere—

Mr. Tonkin: All of them?

Mr. WATTS: —and some are personally known to me, and they are better pleased where they are now than where they were before.

Mr. Tonkin: Have all of them obtained work?

Mr. WATTS: Well, the greater proportion of them have.

Mr. Tonkin: Ah, now we are getting the truth!

Mr. WATTS: The honourable member himself, when Minister for Works, did not hesitate—

Mr. Graham: My word he did!

Mr. WATTS: —to see that some people at that time were no longer employed by that organisation.

Mr. Tonkin: They were all re-employed subsequently.

Mr. WATTS: Maybe they were.

Mr. Tonkin: But they have not been under your Government.

Mr. WATTS: I would like to know the exact percentage of those not employed. I am given to understand it is a very small one indeed.

Mr. Graham: They have given up the ghost and left the State.

Mr. WATTS: They have not given up the ghost and left the State at all. On the contrary, the most recent figures indicate that there is an addition to the number of persons coming here as opposed to those going away; and I am referring to the tradesmen, too. Therefore, it is no use the honourable member trying to buttress up this element to which I have referred by statements of the character of the interjections he has just been making. There has been nothing done up to date which reasonably can give rise to any of the statements which have been made during the course of this debate in regard to matters contained in the second paragraph of this motion to which I am now referring.

Reference has been made to the attitude of the party which I have the honour to lead, and I should have thought that it was crystal clear and had been for at least three years past, that there are very sound reasons for that attitude. On the 31st July, 1957, the member for Narrogin, on behalf of the Country Party, moved this motion—

That this House, in view of the necessity for additional funds for expansion of both primary and secondary industries and essential requirements, requests the Government to sell the following trading concerns:—

Mr. Graham: To hand the money to the theatre proprietors.

Mr. WATTS: The motion continued—

(a) State Hotels.

(b) State Saw Mills.

(c) State Brick Works.

(d) State Implement Works.

and place the funds so receivable partly to the capital of the Rural and Industries Bank and the balance to providing essential requirements.

During the course of the remarks the honourable member made on that motion, he was at pains to point out, firstly, the losses that the majority of the instrumentalities mentioned had made; secondly, the fact that they made no contribution to the revenues of the Crown by way of taxation, land tax, and the like, which, if conducted by other than the Crown, they would have to do; and, thirdly, that the proceeds, which from any reasonable sale would be a very substantial sum indeed, could be utilised partly for the capital of the Rural and Industries Bank and the balance for providing essential requirements.

Mr. Rowberry: Why dispose of those assets? Why not negotiate a bank loan on the value of those assets, as the farmers do?

Mr. WATTS: The member for Warren wants to make a little research before he trots out such a statement as that. He knows—or he should know—that the loan raisings of the State Governments depend upon the decisions of the Australian Loan Council; and he knows—or he should know—that the amount which the Premier and Treasurer of this State has put forward as being the desired amount of loan raising, so far as the State is concerned, has always been considerably reduced when the question of the decision of the Loan Council came to be made. Consequently, therefore, over a very long period of years, there has never been enough raising authorised by the Loan Council to cope with the State's essential requirements and the development, to what extent is possible, of its various industries. As a result, there has been—and is now—a very serious lag in the requirements so far as Western Australia is concerned.

It is not peculiar to Western Australia, I agree, because the same principles of the Australian Loan Council have, no doubt, been applied to the other States; but we are only dealing with Western Australia, and that is the position here, and has been for a considerable time.

If there were more funds available, it would be possible to do other things which at present cannot be done, some of them being very essential to be done; and if it were possible to increase the allocation of certain departments—for instance, the Education Department and the Public Works Department—it would be practicable to do many things which I would like to see done, and which other people would like to see done but which, under the present circumstances, cannot be done. And that is what underlay the motion in 1957 and would underlie so far as I am concerned, the present situation; because it has been established quite clearly that whatever proceeds were received from the reasonable disposal of these assets would be available in addition to—and not in substitution for—the ordinary loan raisings through the Loan Council.

Therefore, they would be available, as I say, to make some contribution towards the lag in certain essential public requirements which are causing, if not concern, at least disappointment to many people who consider—and with some justification—that they are entitled to see these things done. Included among those might possibly be the member for East Perth.

The matter went further than that. Although, as I say, the member for Narrogin, on behalf of the Country Party, moved the motion to which I have referred three years ago, let us see what I had to say on the subject on the 27th February, 1959.

Mr. W. Hegney: You are not going to refer to the proclamation, are you?

Mr. Graham: Do you always keep to what you say?

Mr. WATTS: I have an exact copy of what I said, because it was part of a broadcast and is as follows:—

We believe that this State which is almost always short of money for many essential services such as schools, hospitals, and other public requirements which are lagging behind even current needs, cannot afford to involve its restricted loan funds in developing State trading concerns. We therefore propose to set our faces against any further State trading and to encourage instead private capital to carry on worthwhile and necessary enterprises. Later I will refer to ways and means by which the Government can assist in this matter.

The "later" was after the broadcast ceased. In the same way, the Premier—in delivering the same sort of broadcast speech as the other, during the same week, said the following when dealing with the question of the disposal of certain State trading concerns—

It is not our desire to close these concerns down. We are anxious to make them payable based on sound business principles. Our policy will be to transfer them progressively to the field of private industry without loss of employment and where their continued operation will no longer be a drag upon the economy.

Mr. W. Hegney: He is going to make them pay first.

Mr. WATTS: The situation, therefore, is that I have mentioned these things because I do not wish there to be any misunderstanding on the part of the members opposite as to the attitude which I and those who sit with me here take on these matters. We shall, as the Government will, be particularly careful in any transaction which comes up out of the intention on the terms outlined and reiterated, as I have said, to dispose of any of these concerns. We shall be particularly careful to see that they are satisfactory proposals on all three counts and satisfactory to the State as well.

I think that in the end results for the reason that I have given dealing with the financial aspect, we shall be well advised to do so provided that it is done on the terms as I have mentioned and with due regard to the economy and affairs of Western Australia. I have no doubt whatever in my mind that when the time comes—if it does come—to consider any proposition which is made in regard to any of these concerns, all those aspects will be taken fairly into consideration; for, I repeat, as far as I am personally concerned—and, I believe, as far as all associated with us here are concerned—we stand

second to none in having a reasonable appreciation of the facts and a reasonable desire to ensure that our fellow citizens are not placed in an invidious position because there happens to be a desire to change the policy which has operated over a considerable number of years and which bitter experience financially—so far as I am concerned—has induced us to see changed.

Mr. Graham: The Leader of the Opposition gave you the answer to that the other day.

Mr. WATTS: The Leader of the Opposition has answered many things.

Mr. Graham: He showed they made a profit, outside of the State Shipping Service; and you are not thinking of selling the State Shipping Service.

Mr. WATTS: They have not made a profit. In many cases the answer is "No." There are a few instances where the position is a little better.

Mr. Graham: The Deputy Premier had better check his figures.

Mr. WATTS: We know perfectly well what the figures are.

Mr. Graham: You have been listening to the Liberal Party.

Mr. WATTS: Not at all.

Mr. Tonkin: What is wrong with the profit made by the State Engineering Works?

Mr. WATTS: That is the only one the honourable member can pick on.

Mr. Tonkin: The State Hotels?

Mr. WATTS: They have always made a loss except for a few of the last years. They have made profits only at long intervals; and they have paid no rates or taxes.

Mr. Bickerton: Do they have to make a profit for them to be an advantage?

Mr. WATTS: If they had paid rates and taxes, they would not have made profits on the occasions that they did. Now I am going to deal with the first part of the amendment.

Mr. Graham: You are making heavy weather of it up to date.

Mr. WATTS: A great deal has been said about the alleged promise made by me on the 1st July, 1959—

Mr. Tonkin: It was a straight-out assurance.

Mr. WATTS: —when dealing with the Bill to rescind or cancel the proclamation which had been issued by the preceding Government in the dying hours of its existence, and approximately three days after the general election, with a maximum of one week before it was completed through Executive Council.

Mr. W. Hegney: While the Country Party was wrangling with the Liberals over office.

Mr. WATTS: They were not wrangling.

Mr. Brand: There was no wrangling.

Mr. W. Hegney: There was plenty of it.

Mr. WATTS: There was no wrangling at all.

Several members interjected.

Mr. W. Hegney: Let the Deputy Premier get his breath again.

Mr. WATTS: I am waiting for the honourable member to allow me to proceed. On the occasion in question there was no promise to do anything at all. The statement that was referred to was one in which I said, "The onus would be placed upon the Government of issuing a fresh proclamation to ensure the law is carried into effect." The word "onus" means burden; and the meaning of that sentence, so far as I am concerned—and I think any reasonable person—is that the burden of coming to a decision in regard to the issuing of a proclamation was upon the Government—

Mr. Graham: No.

Mr. WATTS: —if the proposition we put up were not acceptable; and that is all it could mean.

Mr. Graham: No.

Mr. WATTS: I will go a bit further.

Mr. Tonkin: A lot further.

Mr. WATTS: It was in no circumstances accepted at the time as being an assurance.

Mr. Graham: In this interpretation of yours—

Mr. WATTS: No interpretation such as the honourable member or his colleagues suggest was made or put upon the remarks at the time.

Mr. Tonkin: It was confirmed by the Minister for Railways.

Mr. WATTS: I said that there was no acceptance by the member for East Perth, or his colleagues, of the assurance that it is now alleged was given at the time.

Mr. Graham: It appears to be getting more slimy as you proceed. I was right when I first used that word, apparently.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WATTS: I think it is necessary to be clear, first of all, as to the law on this matter.

Mr. Tonkin: There is not much doubt about that.

Mr. WATTS: I have great respect for the Deputy Leader of the Opposition as a political strategist or tactician, but I have no respect whatever for him as an interpreter of the law.

Mr. Tonkin: There are a few Q.C.'s, in the city, you know.

Mr. WATTS: I do not doubt that for a moment. I have had the benefit of the advice given by a couple of them, and

they do not arrive at anything like the conclusions arrived at by the honourable member. Therefore I say that I have great respect for the member for Melville as a political tactician or strategist, but I have no respect for him as an interpreter of the law.

Mr. Tonkin: That is my idea of you.

Mr. WATTS: I am not asking the honourable member to accept my interpretation in this matter. At no stage in these proceedings have I suggested that the interpretation I am about to give is my own. On the contrary, I have accepted the best advice available to me on the subject, and I now propose, supposing the honourable member will allow me to proceed, to endeavour to inform the House what it is.

Mr. Tonkin: Do you remember the Pilbara by-election? Do you remember the temporary appointments to the Transport Board?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WATTS: I shall be coming to that in a little while; I have not overlooked it.

Mr. Tonkin: Your opinion was not too good then.

Mr. WATTS: As the honourable member was allowed to proceed, in his own way, with his observations, it would not be a bad idea if he allowed me to do the same. That is a suggestion I make to him in perfectly good faith.

Mr. Tonkin: It is a reasonable request. You might have a talk to the Minister for Railways, though.

Mr. WATTS: Apparently the honourable member finds it extremely difficult; but perhaps he will do better in a minute or two. I said that it is necessary to be clear as to what the law is in the matter. The law is contained in section 12 of the Electoral Districts Act, and it is to the effect that a proclamation will issue when either a resolution is passed by the Legislative Assembly, or the Government so determines. That is what the law is; because if the honourable member will take the trouble to look at section 24, I think it is, of the Interpretation Act—

Mr. Tonkin: Your promise is to be found on page 36 of *Hansard* for 1959.

Mr. WATTS: It is section 23, which provides—

When in any Act the Governor is authorised or required to do any act, matter, or thing, it shall be taken to mean that such act, matter, or thing may or shall be done by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Executive Council.

As the member for Melville knows from long experience, Executive Council is the Government. In consequence, the Government has the right to determine matters

by advising the Governor in Executive Council; and it shall be taken to mean that the Governor shall do it only on that advice.

Mr. Tonkin: But the Government has to give him the right advice.

Mr. WATTS: Therefore, as I say, the fact is that a proclamation will issue when either a resolution is passed by the Legislative Assembly or the Government so determines. That was borne out only too well between March, 1953, and December, 1954, by the fact that the then Government, headed by my worthy friend, the Leader of the Opposition, did not take any steps to issue that proclamation for a matter of 21 months.

There was no automaticity about it. In fact, the honourable gentleman went further to make it clear that there was nothing automatic about it; because, when he was asked questions on several occasions, his reply was always that the matter was receiving consideration. On one occasion he said, "The Government has not yet been able to give this matter full consideration." Later he said, "I will undertake to have the matter investigated."

The member for Melville was a member of that Executive Council or Government; and he did not at any time, that I know of, complain either here or elsewhere, publicly, that this automatic procedure had not been adopted. Actually what happened was that a Bill was introduced something like 19 months after the election, and it was rejected by the Legislative Assembly.

I said a little earlier that no suggestion was made, at the time, that this alleged statement of mine was an undertaking or promise. In fact, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in addressing himself to the Bill on the same day, said—this appears in column 2, page 46, of *Hansard* of the 1st July, 1959—"The Government will immediately do precisely nothing about it."

But I will go a little further. On the 6th July, 1959, in the course of a broadcast under the heading, "Highlights of State Parliament", by the Leader of the Opposition and Parliamentary Leader of the Labour Party, no reference was made to any such alleged promise. So, far from referring to any alleged promise in dealing with the matter of the Bill to revoke the proclamation, the Leader of the Opposition said, "The present Government has now decided not to carry out the law and has suspended its operation". I suggest to any reasonable man that if at that time there had been some undertaking given to do something, he would not have said that.

Mr. Tonkin: Your Bill was not introduced until three or four months later.

Mr. WATTS: This had nothing to do with the Bill. This was five or six days after the alleged undertaking. This has nothing to do with the Bill which was introduced five months later. This took place a week after the 1st July.

In another broadcast made by the Leader of the Opposition on the 2nd November, 1959, dealing with the Bill to amend the Electoral Districts Act, which had been introduced by the Government the previous week, the whole of the broadcast was devoted to the Bill in question, and the Leader of the Opposition made no reference whatever to any such alleged promise, but merely attacked the provisions of the Bill—that was the Electoral Districts Act Amendment Bill, introduced in November, 1959.

I mention this because, if at that time the Leader of the Opposition had had such an alleged promise in mind, it would have been reasonable for him to advocate rejection of the Bill, not only on the ground that he did advocate such rejection; but on the ground, also, that if the Bill were rejected he would assume that the alleged promise would be carried out.

But he did not do such thing. He made no assumption that the alleged promise would be carried into effect, because at that time he did not know that any such statement had been made; and certainly he did not regard it as a promise. The situation was that after a dig around, later, he came across this statement and decided to make some political capital out of it.

I will go on to deal with the Electoral Districts Bill. His line of attack was based on this text—this is an extract from the broadcast in question—

These proposals are an attempt by the Government to defeat the reasonable democratic right of the people to elect their Government and fairly to decide the personnel of the Legislative Assembly. The legislation we are now considering proposes to increase the number of parliamentary representatives in one part of the State and to peg the number in another part of the State—the metropolitan area. In other words, the number of members is to be raised in that portion of the State where population has not increased and is to be pegged at its present number in that part of the State where population has increased considerably.

He went on to say—

What principle is it; what tradition is it; what argument is it which would give to a man and his wife living at, say, Bulyee out in the country at least twice the voting power and probably three times the voting power of a man and his wife who live at Leederville, Subiaco, or any other part of the metropolitan area.

There have been references, by members on the other side of the House, to hypocrisy. In the face of that speech, I am going to suggest that the cap fits members on the other side of the House better than it fits members on this side. This speech that I have referred to as having been broadcast by the Leader of the Opposition, is the more amazing when reference is made to the Bill which was introduced by him when Premier in 1954. That Bill not only pegged the metropolitan area—certainly on a different basis from the one suggested—by taking in a larger number of electors and widening the area known as the metropolitan area beyond its present figure, but it pegged that area when constituted. Not only did it do that, but it provided, among other things, that redistribution of seats could not take place more often than after six years—which would be approximately seven years—in order, apparently, to avoid the prospect of redistribution too frequently.

Here I would point out that we had a redistribution of seats in 1955, which was operative in 1956. Not only did the Government do that, but also it made special provisions for the retention of the three northern seats, which we are all willing to retain; but which, because there is no requisite number of electors required for either of those seats, gives an elector in those northern areas—and in my view quite properly—a voting strength about six or seven times as great as the elector in Leederville and not twice as much as the elector in Bulyee referred to by the honourable member. We all agree to that proposition, and so does the Leader of the Opposition.

However, in addition to that, he goes a bit further in his Bill and makes special provision in the outer Goldfields area and gives the commissioners, if appointed, an additional margin of up to 15 per cent.; whereas, in the metropolitan area, he confines it to 2½ per cent., and in the country districts to 5 per cent. Therefore, it would have been practicable, under that Bill, to have a member in the outer areas to which he referred as representing approximately 2,500 to 3,000 electors as against 10,000 or 12,000 in the metropolitan area, which would have made it approximately 4 to 1.

So I suggest that, when it comes to a question of hypocrisy, for a man to make that broadcast on the lines that he did, after having introduced the Bill, which, in principle, so far as voting strength is concerned, is precisely the same as the one on which he was making his complaint, is surely the essence of hypocrisy. The situation is that, in a most interesting letter which the honourable gentleman wrote on the 17th January, 1955, to the

Secretary of the Great Eastern Road Board Association at Narembbeen, he said this, among other things—

I would point out the Bill which the Government introduced in the Legislative Assembly towards the end of last session did provide for a maximum number of seats to be fixed for the metropolitan area. However, that Bill did not pass the Assembly because the required constitutional majority was not available to support the Bill and all members of the Opposition voted against the Bill. Therefore, the Act introduced by the McLarty-Watts Government, will continue. Unfortunately, that Act does not limit the number of seats to be given to the metropolitan area.

So the honourable member was quite clear on what he wanted to do in regard to the metropolitan area. Yet in that broadcast I referred to, he proceeds to abuse us up hill and down dale for pegging the metropolitan area. Not that his own system was a better one, but on the principle of whether the metropolitan area should be pegged, which is the very thing the honourable member wanted to do in a slightly different way under his proposal.

Mr. Hawke: Not at its then present number.

Mr. WATTS: The Leader of the Opposition should not forget that he greatly increased the number of electors to arrive at his additional two seats.

Mr. Hawke: Not greatly.

Mr. WATTS: Yes, by a considerable number. If I remember rightly, the number of electors in those areas, based on the figures issued by the Chief Electoral Officer, increased from 198,000 to 210,000. Therefore, there would have been an additional 12,000 persons brought into the metropolitan area. That alone would have justified at least one additional seat irrespective of any other considerations.

Mr. W. Hegney: It does not look as if you are going to issue the proclamation.

Mr. Hawke: Will you quote to the House paragraph 2 on the right hand side of page 39 of *Hansard* No. 1 of last session?

Mr. WATTS: I have not it available here.

Mr. Hawke: Could I send the *Hansard* over to you? The paragraph is underlined and it will be easy to pick out.

Mr. Graham: But embarrassing to read, perhaps.

Mr. Court: It would take more than that to upset the Deputy Premier.

Mr. Hawke: The Minister for Industrial Development will upset all of them over there before long. In fact, they are practically all in the cart now.

Mr. WATTS: In the course of his remarks, the member for Melville said—

Do not rely too much upon the advice which is tendered from the Crown Law Department.

Then he went on to say that the advice that that department had tendered was found to be completely false in regard to a certain matter and that was in connection with the appointment of members to the Transport Board.

Mr. Tonkin: You will recall that there is also a second matter about the Pilbara by-election.

Mr. WATTS: That was even before the one that I have referred to.

Mr. Tonkin: It was found that its advice was all cockeyed.

Mr. WATTS: It seems strange to me that the honourable member should find it necessary to go back 13 years in order to defame persons who are not here to defend themselves.

Mr. Tonkin: It is not a question of defaming them; it is a question of stating facts.

Mr. WATTS: It is a question of defaming them. The honourable member said that advice which was tendered by the Crown Law Department was completely false.

Mr. Tonkin: It was wrong! What is that?

Mr. WATTS: How many times is the judgment, even of the High Court, reversed by the law lords of the Privy Council?

Mr. Hawke: Too often!

Mr. WATTS: Is the honourable member going to say that, in those circumstances, a decision given by the High Court is completely false? I suggest that he would do nothing of the kind. In this particular matter there was ample room for disagreement. As a matter of fact, although I was not able, of my own knowledge, prior to today—and not even then, except on inquiry—to form an opinion on exactly what happened at that time—because I was not anywhere near the Crown Law Department—it is quite clear to me now that there was a divergence of opinion; and the majority, including some outside practitioners, with whom the matter was discussed, held the view—which was tendered to the Government at the time—that the transaction concerning the appointment of members to the Transport Board was valid. Subsequently, however, further consideration was given to the matter; and just as I have said that it is extremely difficult in these matters—as it is between the High Court and the Privy Council—to arrive at a complete determination as to who is right, fortunately, or unfortunately, the Privy Council has the last say.

It was decided by the Crown Law officers to recommend to the Government that it place the matter beyond all dispute, beyond all possibility of divergence of opinion, by submitting a validating Act; and that is

what the Government did. But to suggest that the opinions given by the officers of the Crown Law Department were entirely false is, I suggest, completely undeserved and a strange statement to be made in this House by a man who has had many years of administrative responsibility, and who must be well aware of the probity and capacity of the gentlemen in question within the limitations which I have already indicated must be imposed on them when some difficult and abstruse problem of the law should arise.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister has five minutes left.

Mr. WATTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The member for Melville, in the course of his remarks, also indicated that if this proclamation was not issued, the validity of the next election and the possibility of a Government being established would be in jeopardy. In fact, he even went so far as to say that it would be invalid. I have already expressed my opinion on the capacity of the honourable gentleman to determine these matters. But I ask: Where does he get his authority from to begin with?

Mr. Tonkin: I might tell you later.

Mr. WATTS: Secondly, the honourable member would agree, I take it, that it would not only be in this particular case—supposing he was right at all, which I deny—that the circumstances he mentioned would arise. For example, suppose, during the period of 1953-54, when the Government of that day was giving—as I have indicated over a long period of months—consideration to this matter, there had been—and there could have been because there was a stage when both sides of the House were equal at the time—a dissolution of the Parliament.

Mr. Tonkin: That is purely hypothetical.

Mr. WATTS: It is not hypothetical at all. There would have been a certificate issued by the Chief Electoral Officer months ago; there would have been no proclamation issued; and there would have been an election; and, according to the honourable member, it would have been invalid.

Mr. Tonkin: That is my advice.

Mr. WATTS: In my opinion, it is completely wrong. The case which the honourable member brings here is purely a political one. I have been told that, according to the provisions of the Interpretations Act, the Governor should do something or may do something only on the advice of the Executive Council, or he does not act at all. A mandamus cannot be obtained, so therefore it is not compulsory to issue the proclamation. As a matter of fact, in conclusion—I could go on for some time, but the time is limited—there is this to be said: That the certificate having been issued at the end of March,

1959, by the Chief Electoral Officer, after the triennial election, makes the Chief Electoral Officer *functus officio*.

Mr. Tonkin: That is a very convenient interpretation.

Mr. WATTS: It is a most correct interpretation.

Mr. Hawke: What about your promise?

Mr. WATTS: I have told the honourable member that there is no promise.

Mr. Hawke: Will you read paragraph 2 to which I have referred?

Mr. WATTS: I have read the whole of what is there, and the honourable member has repeated it to me *ad nauseum*. The burden of deciding the matter would be on the Government and it still is.

Mr. Hawke: Oh no it wasn't! You are dodging the issue!

Mr. WATTS: The honourable member knew no such undertaking in eight months after it, and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did not, either.

Mr. Tonkin: Is a proclamation without provisions a proclamation?

Mr. WATTS: Provisions of what?

Mr. Tonkin: The Government has a proclamation without any provisions, because you cancelled them as if they were never in operation.

Mr. WATTS: We have not a proclamation at all.

Mr. Hawke: What have you got?

Mr. WATTS: We have Act No. 1 of 1959 which has obliterated the proclamation which the honourable member's Government issued—

Mr. Tonkin: You read the statement with regard to that! You have put your foot in it now!

Mr. WATTS: No I have not. The Act was brought before the House in order to get rid of the proclamation issued by the honourable member's Government for the reasons given at that time.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

MR. MOIR (Boulder—on amendment) [7.31]: I would like to contribute a little to this debate on the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I might say I listened with great interest to the Attorney-General when he was speaking prior to the tea suspension. To my mind, the Attorney-General made some very extraordinary statements in view of previous statements which he made in this House when the Electoral Bill was under discussion last year.

He made reference to the fact that the Labour Government, before going out of office, and in the period following the election, caused a proclamation to be issued under the Electoral Act. I think he would

be the first to admit that the Government has a duty to advise the Governor on certain questions. It must be remembered that that was a time just following an election—an election that was fought very strenuously—and the main matter that the now coalition Government placed before the electors was that, in its opinion, the Labour Government was not fit to be entrusted with the duty and the obligation of governing this State. It waxed very eloquent on that topic at the time of the elections.

It came to office when it won the elections by a very narrow majority. But what did we find? It was quite content to allow the Labour Government to remain in office—the Government in which it told the people it had no faith. However, it was quite in order for that Government—I speak from memory—to remain in office for ten days after the elections. Therefore, that Government was charged with the duty of governing the country.

I think we all know why there was a lapse of time. We know that the coalition parties were engaged, during that period, in a wrangle, which I prefer to call bargaining amongst themselves to see who was to receive the plums of office on that side.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member is going to relate these remarks to the amendment.

Mr. MOIR: Yes, Sir; they are pertinent to what I am going to say. After that, the Government has the effrontery to come here and say that the Opposition, when in Government, did something that was entirely wrong by carrying out the law of the land which should be in operation at all times but which, at the present time, is not in operation or is not being carried out in its essential requirements by the Government of the day.

In his speech, the Attorney-General gave certain explanations of certain statements he made in this House during the last session of Parliament. I am just a man who is representative of a cross-section of the people. I do not lay any claims to having any high order of intelligence, but I do claim to have a reasonable knowledge of the English language. So I think it is time that somebody brought down a Bill.

We know that for a proper understanding of the laws of the country, and so that lawyers and judges may understand them, we have what we call the Interpretation Act; and I think it is high time, in view of the statements made not only by the Attorney-General, but also by other Ministers on that side of the House, that we had an Interpretation Act so that members of Parliament, and people in general, can really understand what is meant when members of the Government make certain statements.

Words used here by Ministers on the other side of the House convey a certain meaning to me; and I would undertake

they would convey to the majority of the people the meaning I take from them. When members of the Government are confronted with what they said previously, their words have an entirely different meaning or construction placed upon them.

I am going to quote some of the remarks of the Attorney-General on the debate on the Electoral Bill during the last session of Parliament, in which he made certain statements; and in which, to my mind, he gave an undertaking to this Parliament that in the event of certain things transpiring, the law would be carried out. In other words, that if the Electoral Districts Bill, then before the House, was not carried, the Act would be implemented. The Attorney-General had this to say in *Hansard* Vol. 1 of 1959, page 39—

The revocation of the proclamation, however, as proposed in this Bill, is only to do this: to give the present Government an opportunity of seeking the agreement of Parliament to proposals for the alteration of the law so that if Parliament accepts those alterations, and in the light of those alterations, the necessary proclamation can be issued to enable the commissioners to proceed with adjustments of electoral boundaries in accordance with the amended law to which Parliament would then have agreed.

This is the important part—

On the other hand, if Parliament should reject those amended proposals, or any proposal which might be brought forward, then it is quite clear that the present statute will remain and the onus would be placed upon the Government of issuing a fresh proclamation to ensure the law is carried into effect.

Mr. W. Hegney: That is plain enough.

Mr. Graham: What does the Premier say about that?

Mr. MOIR: There is only one construction to be placed on those words: If the Bill before the House failed to become law, then the existing law would be carried out. I think it is quite clear that an undertaking was given, not only to this House, but to the people of Western Australia that the Government would proceed to carry out the law. Evidently the Leader of the Opposition was in some doubt because, when he was commenting on the Bill, he had this to say—

I would not go that far; but it is a very slippery pig in a poke. Fancy asking members of a representative assembly, such as we have here, to embrace this thing without our knowing one word about what the Government is going to introduce later on in the session by way of amendments to the parent Act. That is what the Bill is doing. It is asking every member of this Chamber to embrace its proposals—to accept it—without the

faintest knowledge of what is to follow it. Any member of this House who swallows that is ever so much sillier than I thought he was.

Mr. Court: He does not commit himself to the new Bill.

Mr. Hawke: Of course he does not commit himself to the new Bill! But he cancels out the operation of the existing Act; and that is a very vital consideration.

Mr. Court: No he doesn't! The Attorney-General explained why it would not do that.

There we have the Minister for Industrial Development in no doubt whatsoever as to what the Attorney-General said; and his interpretation was evidently the one placed on that assurance by members on this side of the House.

Mr. Graham: He is as slippery as that pig in the poke.

Mr. MOIR: Evidently the Minister for Industrial Development held the firm belief that if that amending Bill were not passed, then the parent Act should prevail. The Attorney-General, on page 56, in reply to an interjection by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, said this—

It was certainly intended that when a certain state of affairs was reached, a proclamation should be issued in reasonable time.

What does that mean? I think any reasonable person would have no other interpretation to place on it except that a proclamation would be issued. Yet we have had the Attorney-General say in this Chamber that he has no intention of issuing a proclamation. I do not know where we are getting to. At one time—years ago—people used to place a lot of reliance on what was said in Parliament. I must admit to being naive enough myself to believe that solemn undertakings given by the people in this Chamber, or elsewhere for that matter, had to be taken at their face value, and that one could rely on them. But apparently in this year of 1960 we have a different conception as to what solemn assurances given in this Chamber mean.

Mr. May: By the present Government, you mean.

Mr. MOIR: Yes.

Mr. May: I thought you meant that.

Mr. MOIR: I never thought that solemn assurances given by people who sit on this side of the House would be disregarded. If the present situation continues, the affairs of this State must get into a rather extraordinary and chaotic condition; and the whole responsibility lies at the door of this Government. I know it takes its responsibilities very lightly. That is quite evident from the many matters that have transpired since it has been in office. But the people of this State deserve something better than that.

The Attorney-General referred to this amendment of the Leader of the Opposition as being designed to create fear and apprehension in the minds of employees of State concerns. All I have to say to that is that there is no need for anyone to move motions designed to do that; because by its ham-fisted and bull-headed methods, the Government has already done it, unfortunately.

I recently journeyed to the South-West of the State in the electorate of the member for Warren where, as members know, there are State trading concerns; and I found that because of the deliberate policy of this Government—and I say "deliberate" advisedly—there are people there, employed in those concerns, who certainly feel great fear and apprehension; and they have every reason to. In moving around, one could see that a policy has been carried out which, in my opinion, was deliberately designed to sabotage those concerns. I found employees who were fearful of what was going to happen in the future; because where previously there was employment for them in their jobs, quite a few of them found that while they had a place of employment to go to, there was very little work for them to do. Quite a few of them told me they were deliberately filling in time at the behest of the managements of those concerns.

That indicated to me that a policy is being followed by this Government of deliberately causing those concerns to run down. We know it is the Government's expressed intention to sell those concerns, to dispose of them; and it appears that to justify its action, the Government wants to see them run down as much as possible. I suppose there would be people—probably political supporters of this Government—who will be getting those concerns at a very, very reasonable price indeed. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. May: You mean at a ridiculous price.

Mr. MOIR: Well, at a ridiculous price—

Mr. Rowberry: Reasonable to the buyer.

Mr. MOIR: It is idle for the Attorney-General—or anybody else on that side of the House—to say that if these concerns are disposed of, the welfare of the workers in those concerns will be taken care of by this Government; that they will have continuity of employment. Where will that be? In Fremantle gaol, after they have stolen bread to ease their hunger, because they have no money to buy bread? Anybody knows it is absolutely ridiculous to speak of ensuring that these people will have continuity of employment in those concerns after the Government has disposed of them. Even a child not long out of kindergarten class at school would know that once one has disposed of anything to another person and it passes into his possession, he decides what he will do with it.

It is no good the Government saying, "We want those employees kept on; we want to see that you continue to employ them"; because, on the face of it, that is absolutely ridiculous. It is impossible to impose that condition on the person purchasing a particular concern or various concerns. After he has taken over the concern, he is the sole arbiter of whom he employs; how many he employs; whom he puts on, or whom he puts off; or whether he closes the whole show up—which is very likely to happen; because, in the areas where some of these concerns are situated, there are other concerns operating; and no doubt the people who are operating those private concerns would be very very anxious to have given them, or secure on very, very favourable terms, these State trading concerns in order that they might eliminate competition.

As a matter of fact, there is no doubt at all that that is behind the Government's move in getting rid of these concerns: it does not want any competition with private suppliers. The Government is not a bit perturbed, after having read the Railway Commissioner's report, that there will be a greater possibility of collusive tendering amongst the sawmillers who are tendering for Government contracts, and that they will be able to put their own prices upon commodities which they retail to the people. We know that State Building Supplies lost £47,000 last year. Why did they lose? The answer is quite simple—because they received £500,000 less in orders from the Government.

Mr. Court: Which year are you talking about—June, 1959?

Mr. MOIR: Last year.

Mr. Court: That was mainly your year of office.

Mr. Hawke: How do you make that out? You should check up on the dates.

Mr. May: Did you take over on the 1st April?

Mr. Court: You had it for nine months.

Mr. MOIR: The Minister for Industrial Development is evidently tangled up in his dates.

Mr. Hawke: Just tangled up!

Mr. Court: You check your dates.

Mr. MOIR: It is quite apparent that there has been a deliberate policy of channelling Government orders from channels away from where they have been going previously, and away from the State trading concerns. That has been done with a twofold purpose in mind: on the one hand, to give added business to these private concerns; and on the other hand, to run the State trading concerns down as far as they can possibly do so.

It was also interesting that the Attorney-General referred to his motion, moved in this House in 1957—to the effect

that the State trading concerns be disposed of in order that money could be made available for essential public requirements—as we know, as elicited in this House since we commenced a few short days ago, that the Government is not at all worried as to how it spends its money—or apparently so. If the Attorney-General was so concerned about saving money in order that it might be spent elsewhere on essential requirements of the State, why does he not turn his attention to some of these items that have been brought forth here by way of question and answer in this House?

On Tuesday last, in answer to questions by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the Minister for Railways gave the very disturbing information—very disturbing to members on this side of the House if not on the other side—that the Government is purchasing the requirements of the Midland Junction Workshops at a cost far in advance of what that same article could be manufactured for in the Midland Junction workshops. We find, according to the Minister's answers, that one item purchased from outside the workshops for £11 3s. 1d. each could be manufactured in the workshops for £1 16s. 1d.

Mr. Graham: I wish the Minister would laugh that one off.

Mr. Roberts: Which item is that?

Mr. MOIR: I suggest the honourable member look up the *Votes and Proceedings*. He was present. Another item, for which the Government is paying £30 16s. 3d. each, could be manufactured in the workshops for approximately £17. These are not figures from anybody on this side of the House, but they are figures given by the Minister for Railways. We also find that, concerning cylinder heads—

Mr. Tonkin: That's a beauty!

Mr. MOIR: —this Government is purchasing them at an imported cost of £128 each when, according to the Minister, they can be manufactured at Midland Junction for £65 5s. 5d.

Mr. Graham: We shall have to sack the Minister, I think.

Mr. MOIR: If the Minister was managing a business for any of his friends, he would not last two days.

Mr. Graham: That is precisely what he is doing, unfortunately.

Mr. MOIR: And he tells us, knowing these facts—I hate to think he only learned of this as a result of the questions asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—that as short a time ago as the third day of the fourth month the Government ordered 24 of these cylinder heads at this inflated cost of £128. So is there any wonder that I rather question the intention of the Attorney-General to save money in order that it can be spent on essential requirements of the public?

Mr. J. Hegney: No wonder they have to increase railway fares and freights.

Mr. Graham: And hospital charges!

Mr. W. Hegney: And water rates!

Mr. MOIR: High costs become inevitable if money is to be squandered, and the people who are going to pay for it are the workers of Western Australia. Evidently the Government is not concerned about that at all—could not care less. There is the matter of cylinder sleeves, which the Government purchases from outside suppliers at £11 each, and which can be made in the workshops for less than £2.

Mr. Court: Why has this suddenly become important? When you were in office, it did not seem to be important.

Mr. MOIR: We were governing the country properly; we were not giving the country away.

Mr. Court: You were buying spare parts.

Mr. Graham: It was a different set of circumstances.

Mr. Tonkin: Why don't you tell the whole story?

Mr. Court: You know the whole story.

Mr. Tonkin: You know very well you aren't!

Mr. MOIR: I am afraid that some of the utterances, and some of the statements made here, would have to be more convincing than they have been up to date for me to believe them.

Mr. Court: There are more parts being made there than ever before.

Mr. Tonkin: That statement was debunked last Thursday.

Mr. Court: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. May: What about your remarks on TV last night?

Mr. MOIR: I think the less said about the Minister for Railways and his appearance on TV the better it would be for him; because he made some extraordinary statements on TV.

Mr. W. Hegney: That is not the only place either.

Mr. Graham: They tell me that Ashton's Circus is after him!

Mr. MOIR: As reference has been made to TV I should like to say this about it: While the Minister for Railways admitted the McLarty-Watts Government equipped the workshops with expensive and up-to-date machinery at a cost of £2,000,000, and he admitted that some of it would be idle, he passed it off airily by saying, "That is inevitable in a large concern." I come from a part of the country where the industry on which the people depend for a livelihood could not adopt such an attitude; the people there have to make expensive equipment earn every penny that it is possible to earn. They cannot afford to have valuable equipment lying

idle; it has to be well used, and I would say that practice is followed with any private industry. Where private industry does not follow such a course it will end up in the liquidator's hands, or in the Bankruptcy Court.

Mr. Graham: That is where we are heading.

Mr. MOIR: One has only to consider the fact that capitalisation and interest charges are very costly, and when machinery is not utilised to the full it must add to the over-all cost of every item that is made in the plant, which means an inflated cost for every article produced. It makes one wonder whether in this instance it is being done by deliberate design.

Mr. Graham: Of course it is!

Mr. MOIR: Is it being done so that at some future date the Government will be able to say, "We will have to get rid of this machinery. It is just lying idle and we cannot afford to have it idle. We will just have to dispose of it"? And somebody will come along and get some cheap machinery.

I have been interested, too, about the Government's proposals with respect to the building of two *Westland* trains. Other speakers have dealt with the pros and cons of the matter, but the thought that strikes me is with respect to the economics of the whole question. It appears that the Government does not desire to find out whether these trains can be built at the Midland Junction Workshops cheaper than they can be purchased from works outside it. Apparently the Government is not concerned about that aspect of the matter; but I wonder whether it is an economic proposition to purchase these trains at all. After all, we have existing *Westland* trains that operate between Kalgoorlie and Perth; and I would say, without fear of contradiction, that the *Westland* train is far better than some, if not most, of the main trains operating in other parts of the Commonwealth. It is better than any train on which I have travelled in New South Wales; and it is far better than any train on which I have travelled in Queensland.

Mr. Bovell: Then you have not travelled on the *Sunlander* from Brisbane to Cairns; because that is a very fine train, and the gauge is 3 ft. 6 in.

Mr. MOIR: I am sorry that I spoke so loudly that I woke the Minister for Lands up.

Mr. W. Hegney: He will doze off again.

Mr. MOIR: I am wondering if it is really necessary to have these two new *Westland* trains built when we consider that proposals are afoot to have a standard gauge railway from Kalgoorlie to the metropolis.

The construction of such a railway does not appear imminent, but it is something which is projected by the Commonwealth Government. If and when that comes about, any rolling stock at present being used on the Perth-Kalgoorlie run will, to a certain extent, become redundant. I am aware, of course, that the 3 ft. 6 in. gauge would be retained, but the coaches which the Government intends to have built would not then be required. I also wonder, in view of the Premier's answers to questions I asked tonight about the proposition he has put forward, in conjunction with the Premier of South Australia, that an all-black road be built across the desert from east to west—

Mr. Bickerton: We want one from north to south first.

Mr. W. Hegney: My word, we do!

Mr. MOIR: I can remember reports at the time the statement was made which seemed to indicate that the Premier was hopeful that such a road would be built. It is a laudable object, and some day we may have it; but I am wondering whether the Premier is altogether on the beam when he advocates that a black road be built by the Commonwealth Government and, at the same time, is prepared to commit the State to the expenditure of £500,000 for each of the two trains that I have mentioned—making a total well in advance of £1,000,000.

We know perfectly well that if an all-black road were built across the continent there would immediately be a falling off in passenger traffic on the Trans-train, and there would also be a severe falling off in the amount of freight carried on the Kalgoorlie-Perth train. We know that some types of freight are carried on the Commonwealth part of the line but are not carried over our lines, because they are taken off at Kalgoorlie and brought down by road.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is getting a bit away from the amendment.

Mr. MOIR: I am speaking on the expenditure of money, Mr. Speaker. It appears that the Government has not looked closely at its responsibility in these matters, and it cheerfully goes on spending money unnecessarily. Despite that, the Government says that by moving a motion in this House we are putting fear and apprehension into the minds of people employed at these concerns.

We have been told by the Minister for Railways that the employees at the Midland Junction Workshops have nothing whatever to fear; that there will be no sackings at Midland Junction. I heard him state that on the TV programme last night; he said that the work force would be reduced by not replacing men when they left their employment at the workshops either through sickness, old age, or voluntarily.

Mr. Brand: Wasn't that the policy your Government followed with the railways?

Mr. Graham: Not with skilled tradesmen.

Mr. MOIR: When I was a lad, or just a boy, I was always adjured by my parents not to interrupt when their elders were speaking.

Mr. Brand: All right! I won't embarrass you any further.

Mr. MOIR: Perhaps the Premier will give a little bit of thought to what I am going to say.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes to go.

Mr. MOIR: What would happen if there was a greater preponderance of tradesmen than tradesmen's assistants who, for one reason or another, left the workshops? What would happen to the tradesmen's assistants? Would they be employed to look at one another? What would happen if there were more tradesmen's assistants than tradesmen? I can remember that last night the Minister for Railways frequently used the word "unbalance." I cannot think of anything more designed to create an unbalance in the work force than just to allow something to happen haphazardly.

If the Government's policy is allowed to continue, we will find that certain people will be told they are redundant, because people who were necessary to their employment—or a certain section of them; or a certain number of them—have left for various reasons. The Government will say, "I am sorry old chap, but you have to go." Then, on the other hand, my experience of the Government in this House, after hearing assurances that have been given, has been that they are either forgotten or denied. If I were an employee of the Midland Junction Workshops, or any of the State trading concerns, I would not place one iota of reliance on the utterances or promises given by Ministers of this Government.

MR. MAY (Collie—on amendment) [8.12]: I am glad the Attorney-General has returned to his seat, because I really intended to say some nice kind things about him; but I am afraid his attitude with respect to the electoral situation has thrown a certain amount of restraint on me. It is well known, and it is in evidence in *Hansard*, that the Attorney-General did make the statement to which reference has been made; and in ordinary circumstances the promise would be kept. However, in this case, it is not being kept. I would suggest to any Minister that when a promise has been made and he finds that, because of certain circumstances, it cannot be fulfilled, the proper thing to do is to come to this House and inform members as to the reasons why it is not possible to carry out the promise made.

I think that applies to almost everything, and I was surprised tonight to hear the Attorney-General say, or at least deny, that he ever made the promise. I think that all Ministers, and private members, too, would be well advised to take the attitude I have mentioned. If they make statements that they intend to do certain things, and circumstances change and they are unable to carry out what they intended to do, I think they should be men enough to come to this House and inform members of the circumstances which have prevented them from carrying out their intentions.

I now wish to say something regarding essential commodities, the basic wage, and prices. There is no doubt that this Government has been most remiss; it has failed to maintain any control whatsoever over prices, and, as far as I can ascertain, it has made no effort to control them. Members of the Government, and the Premier in particular, have grizzled—

Mr. Graham: That is nothing new for him.

Mr. MAY: —when the Government has been called upon to find an extra £1,000,000. I can understand the Premier going out of the Chamber at this particular moment.

Mr. Roberts: So can we.

Mr. MAY: He grizzled in the Press that it would mean the Government would have to find another £1,000,000 to make up for the recent increase in the basic wage. I also notice a grizzle has come from the private employers. If my memory serves me right, they claimed it would cost them £1,300,000. Supposing the Arbitration Court had not approved of the basic wage increase, it would have meant that the workers of this State would have had to do without the essential commodities they need, such as food, clothing, and everything else, to the extent of £2,300,000.

It is useless to argue that because of the basic wage increase made by the Arbitration Court, prices have risen. That is too silly for words; because had prices not risen over the three months under review, the basic wage would not have been altered. That brings me to the point that unless some action is taken by the present Government to try to control—to some extent at any rate—the prices of commodities, we shall have the spectacle of the basic wage being increased every quarter.

I want now to say something about the State trading concerns. If I remember rightly, the McLarty-Watts Government, from 1947 to 1953, took no action to dispose of any of the State trading concerns. The policy of the Liberal Party in those years was just the same as the policy of the Brand-Watts Government today. But the McLarty-Watts Government was not concerned with the disposal of State trading concerns; and I want to know the reason why this particular Government is so agitated about the matter. In looking along the ministerial benches, we find that

the Minister for Health was not a Minister in the McLarty-Watts Government. Nor was the Minister for Agriculture, or the Minister for Railways and Industrial Development.

Mr. Graham: He should not be in this one.

Mr. MAY: The Minister for Lands was not a Minister in the McLarty-Watts Government and neither was the Minister for Transport. In looking over those new Ministers—

Mr. W. Hegney: What a bunch!

Mr. MAY: —could anyone imagine the Minister for Health being so set on the disposal of State trading concerns? It would not have entered his head. The same applies to the Minister for Agriculture. He is too worried about the price of wheat, and the price of wool and other things, to worry about the disposal of State trading concerns. I will have something to say about the Minister for Railways and Industrial Development shortly. The Minister for Lands has never shown any interest or desire since he has been in this House to dispose of State trading concerns; and that also applies to the Minister for Transport. As a matter of fact, I think the Minister for Transport would be in favour of keeping them.

Mr. Perkins: Don't you recall one occasion when I tried to get rid of one of the State pubs?

Mr. MAY: I remember no such thing. But I did not make any promise in connection with it, so I am not breaking a promise! I said I would return to the Minister for Railways and Industrial Development. He is one of the new Ministers; he has not previously held a portfolio. Having looked at the Minister for Health, the Minister for Agriculture, the Minister for Lands, and the Minister for Transport, my interest now centres on the Minister for Railways and Industrial Development.

Mr. Graham: Ten little nigger boys.

Mr. Court: Your fellows are making me feel important.

Mr. MAY: I wonder to what extent this Minister in question—

Mr. Graham: Question mark.

Mr. MAY: —has bulldozed this Government into seeing his point of view in relation to this matter.

Mr. Perkins: I can assure you that none of us sees any virtue in using loan funds to keep the State trading concerns going.

Mr. Graham: You keep subsidising your theatre proprietors.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Collie will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MAY: I certainly will, Mr. Speaker, and I am sorry I allowed myself to be drawn away by the Minister for Transport;

I should not have done so. But I think he should put his suggestions to Cabinet, and not to this House, because nobody on this side will take any notice of him.

Mr. Perkins: You need a lot of advice.

Mr. MAY: Whatever advice I may need, I would much rather come to you, Mr. Speaker, than ask the Minister for Transport.

Mr. Court: You'll get on!

Mr. MAY: As we all know, the policy of the Government—which, of course, is referred to in the amendment to the Address-in-Reply—is the disposal of all trading concerns.

Mr. Norton: Was that the policy of the Minister for Industrial Development?

Mr. MAY: In my opinion there has been so much pressure brought to bear on the Minister for Railways and Industrial Development from his colleagues in St. George's Terrace, that he is now beginning to wilt under that pressure; and, as a consequence, has convinced all those unbelieving Ministers in the Government that what he wants to do is the right thing.

Mr. Graham: There is tremendous pressure behind them.

Mr. MAY: He has no alternative under the set-up under which he came into this Parliament, and under which he continues to be in this Parliament.

Mr. Graham: Lashed by a string of sausages!

Mr. MAY: He must obey the dictates of his colleagues on St. George's Terrace.

Mr. Jamieson: I thought he owned St. George's Terrace.

Mr. MAY: Not yet; but I believe he has aspirations in that direction. There is no question but that the Minister has been highly pressurised by those people who live in the grand offices in St. George's Terrace. They have said to him, "You have got to do this, and you have got to do that; you have got to get rid of this and you have got to get rid of that—or else". I believe the Minister concerned has been a very willing tool. I believe that the people living in St. George's Terrace are the hungriest people in this State; and I am sure the Minister knows it. Every morning we see the tremendous profits that are made by these various companies; they are included in *The West Australian*. Yet we have an immediate outcry if the worker is given 5s. or 6s. a week extra in the basic wage.

Mr. Rowberry: Extra!

Mr. MAY: According to their thinking it is extra. I wonder what the worker would do if he were taking part in the profits shown in the business sheets of *The West Australian* every morning; the

profits made by this company and that company. That pleases the instincts of the Minister for Industrial Development.

Mr. W. Hegney: The killer instinct.

Mr. Court: The same old record.

Mr. MAY: While the Minister was in England, he was called a little ball of fire; but I think that was misplaced. He feels it is his job to liquidate the workers as soon as possible, and to increase the profits of the various companies we see announced in *The West Australian* every day. That is the sum total of the Minister's ambition at the present time. What explanation could there be for the present attitude of the Government when we find that the McLarty-Watts Government made no attempt to do what has been done by this Government?

The McLarty-Watts Government had the same policy that this Government has, and yet there was no mention of the Midland Junction Workshops being over-staffed; there was no mention of the men not doing a good job; there was no mention that the railways were having it all their own way; or that workers there were not doing their job.

Sir Ross McLarty: It is a great pity we ever got rid of that Government.

Mr. MAY: If I ever had to make my choice, I know which Government I would choose; but if the Minister for Industrial Development had been a Minister in the McLarty-Watts Government the same trouble would have arisen.

Mr. Roberts: Did you ever criticise the McLarty-Watts Government?

Mr. MAY: I did, and I am prepared to criticise this Government; indeed, I am doing so now, because I do not think it has the right to do what it is doing to the working class of this State at the moment. It is all very well for the Minister to say there is no anxiety in the country; that the people are not worried.

Mr. Court: It is you who are making them worried.

Mr. MAY: The Minister is mixing with the wrong fraternity; he does not know what is going on. Of course there is anxiety in the country; particularly is there anxiety among the womenfolk, whose job it is to see that the children are fed.

The Minister for Public Works is not here. We all know the anxiety he has caused by dispensing with labour in the Public Works Department. It is useless to say that those men have gained employment elsewhere. Some of them certainly have; but when men are displaced from their jobs at 50 years of age—from jobs in which they have been all their lives—they have very little chance of securing employment with private interests. No private employer will engage a man over 50 years of age, when he can obtain the services of younger men. That was the

most cruel part of the action taken by the Minister for Works. It would have been all right if those men he displaced had immediately secured employment in other vocations; but a lot of those between 40 and 60 were not acceptable to private employers; and, as a consequence, they had to be given social service benefits. Some of them are still receiving social service benefits; while others, luckily, obtained the old age pension—for what it is worth.

It is quite wrong for the Minister to say that no anxiety has been caused. Of course there is anxiety. If he wants to be reassured on this point, let him ask the member for Warren, or the member for Fremantle, or the member for Guildford-Midland. Thousands of people are anxious and worried as to what the next action of this Government is likely to be to deprive them of their livelihood. I do not want to prolong this debate unnecessarily; but I felt I should express myself on what this Government is doing in the direction to which I have referred. Surely some of the Ministers have a little feeling in this matter!

Mr. Perkins: You are ill-informed; we have a shortage of skilled tradesmen.

Mr. Tonkin: No wonder; you are getting rid of the apprentices.

Mr. MAY: That sort of thing will not wash. These men who were displaced from the Public Works Department followed their particular callings during the best years of their lives. They were not adaptable, at the time when they were dismissed, to the other jobs referred to by the Minister. How long will the rising generation continue to become trained for these jobs mentioned by the Minister? Apprentices are to be sacked.

Mr. Perkins: Rubbish! We are short of tradesmen.

Mr. MAY: There would be a greater shortage, too. One of the reasons for the shortage of tradesmen at present results from the advertisements of Victoria and New South Wales for tradesmen. Those States are prepared to pay the fares of tradesmen desiring to leave this State. That is where they are going to—where they can be assured of continuous employment. That is something which this Government cannot assure.

Mr. Court: How do you explain that our work force is up by 3,000 compared with the same time last year?

Mr. MAY: What I say is correct. The men from the Railways Department and the Midland Junction Workshops have left us because of the insecurity of their employment here.

Mr. Court: You are guessing.

Mr. Roberts: How many have left?

Mr. MAY: It is just as easy for the honourable member to find out; only he is not as concerned as I am, because he is

a supporter of the present Government. I am not guessing. The Minister can see the advertisements in the newspaper; and, what is more, the men here are responding.

Mr. Perkins: Actually the traffic is in the other direction. We are getting people from the Eastern States.

Mr. MAY: I am not talking about tourists but about working people. I realise the Minister did not know what I was talking about. Now he is groping.

Mr. Bovell: We are encouraging migration.

Mr. MAY: The Minister is assisting—

Mr. Bovell: As much as we can.

Mr. MAY: —in order to create a stockpile of unemployed.

Mr. Bovell: What rubbish!

Mr. MAY: Members opposite do not enjoy what I am saying a bit. We all know it is true. The same remarks apply to the Federal Government under Mr. Menzies. We know why they want so many new migrants to Australia. They are not satisfied unless they have a stockpile of unemployed so that they can say to the working man, "If you do not take what we give you, you can follow some of the other unemployed".

Mr. Roberts: That is rubbish! Would you not rather see people coming into the State?

Mr. MAY: Not in the tourist class. I am talking about the wage earner. Surely the honourable member understands, because I gave him credit for understanding. I want to tell him this: If a situation arises in Collie whereby 300 to 500 people are thrown out of employment, Bunbury will feel the pinch because the Collie residents have always supported Bunbury and the business houses there. If the honourable member makes himself a party to the supporting of any action which puts 400 to 500 men in Collie on the scrap heap, he will receive his just retribution.

Mr. Roberts: You are now guessing.

Mr. MAY: Should that eventuate he will have the opportunity of seeing some of the people living at Bunbury leave, because of lack of support from the residents of Collie arising from such action by the Government.

Mr. Roberts: It will not have the result which you suggest.

Mr. MAY: Should that eventuate it is possible that the honourable member will have to leave Bunbury, and it will be a dreadful thing for Bunbury if he has to leave. I have expressed my dissatisfaction with what the present Government is doing in various centres, and to the State trading concerns. I sincerely hope that if what they are doing, and will do brings anxiety to the homes of the people to

whom I refer, they will receive their just retribution and before long will be sitting on this side of the House. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry for you, but that cannot be helped. We will have the present members supporting the Government sitting on this side, while we as the Government will rectify the mistake made by the present Government and relieve the anxiety brought about by it.

MR. BRADY (Guildford-Midland—on amendment) [8.35]: I support the amendment to the Address-in-Reply. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall read the amendment in order that members may be conversant with the position. It states—

We wish to protest strongly against the failure of the Government to honour the promise given by the Attorney-General to Parliament last year to issue a fresh proclamation under the provisions of the Electoral Districts Act and against the Government's failure to foreshadow legislation to keep prices of essential commodities under reasonable restraint.

We wish also to protest strongly against the Government's policy of undermining the future of its own Railways Workshops at Midland Junction by refusing to allow even the management to tender with private firms for large-scale manufacturing jobs, including the building of the two new *Westland* trains, and against the policy of disposing of State trading concerns and of abolishing the Public Works day-labour construction organisation.

Furthermore we would protest strongly against the mishandling by the Government of the Water Supply Department's finances and the recent severe increases in the department's rates, and the failure of the Government to take or propose any action to protect small traders from combines and monopolies.

The amendment is very comprehensive. It is amazing what drift can take place in a community within a period of 12 months when there is a Government in office which looks after vested interests rather than the interests of the people as a whole.

I could speak on any one of the matters mentioned in the amendment for the full three-quarters of an hour I am permitted, whether it be the restraint on prices, the position of the railway workshops, the sale of State trading concerns, the Public Works day-labour organisation, or the mishandling of the finances of the Water Supply Department. If I were to speak at length on one of these topics I would be doing an injustice to my electors, and particularly to the employees of the workshops, who largely comprise the bulk of the electors in my electorate.

In speaking to the amendment I shall deal mainly with the Railways Department. One of the most important matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition was his condemnation of the Government for having failed to implement the Electoral Districts Act, to issue a proclamation, and to set up a committee to investigate the boundaries, as a result of the report by the Chief Electoral Officer. The Act lays down that when an electoral district is out of balance, a committee has to be set up to review the situation, to make adjustments, and to create extra districts, so that the people of this State can be properly represented, as envisaged by the Act.

Unfortunately, the present Government cancelled the proclamation which was issued by the outgoing Labour Government. In my opinion that proclamation was correctly issued by the previous Government, when it acted as a caretaker Government and when there was a doubt as to whether the incoming Government would be a Liberal Party, a Country Party, or a coalition Government made up of four parties, including the Independents. It was suggested to me that the D.L.P. had a chance of representation in this House at one stage, but all the D.L.P. did was to make it possible for one or two Liberal members opposite to be elected. The D.L.P. itself has no representation.

I do not apologise to the Attorney-General, the Premier, or the Minister for Railways for my remarks. In my opinion, as a humble and lay member of this House, during the time it acted as a caretaker Government the Labour Government was entitled to issue the proclamation when it received a report from the Chief Electoral Officer. That was the actual position. I am aware that many technicalities can be raised. It was contended that we as the outgoing Government did not have the numbers and that we had been put out of office by the people. During the last week we were in office, one seat—the Murchison—was in doubt, and we were acting as a caretaker Government. What did we do when we found we were out of office? Under the Electoral Districts Act we were obliged to issue a proclamation.

THE SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member can discuss that point when speaking to the amendment. This matter is not mentioned in the amendment.

Mr. BRADY: In due deference to your ruling, I shall depart from that aspect. The proclamation is referred to in the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition to the Address-in-Reply. He mentioned the failure of the Government to issue a proclamation. The outgoing Government had issued a proclamation and the present Government cancelled it. In

my view, it should not have done that, because the outgoing Government acted within the law in issuing the proclamation. Ultimately a great deal of harm will result from the non-implementation of the Electoral Districts Act, and that harm will be irreparable. I should not continue along this line except to say that the Labor Government, in issuing the proclamation, was acting within its rights.

Dealing more specifically with that part of the amendment which condemns the action of the Government in respect of the Midland Junction Workshops I can speak with great authenticity, because of my 30 years' association with the workshops and the employees. Not only are those employees concerned with the present position arising from the intention of the Minister to call tenders for the construction of the Westland trains, but also the businessmen of the district. The Midland Junction Municipal Council is also concerned; the families of the railwaymen are concerned; and the general public are concerned.

Why should they be concerned? The business people are concerned because they can see that in the implementation of the policy adopted by the Present Government, each year 200 employees in the workshops will not be replaced when they retire through old age or ill-health. There will be 200 fewer in their numbers at the end of each year. I asked a question of the Minister the other evening and—speaking from memory—he said that for the year ended the 30th June, 1960, there were 126 employees fewer than for the previous year; and that the wages bill had been reduced by £127,000 compared with the previous year. We can thus see why the business people are concerned with the over-all position.

Not only are the business people concerned in this, but so is the municipal council, which is comprised mainly of businessmen. The council called a public meeting at which members of the Government were present. At this meeting a resolution was carried unanimously favouring the action of the men. The feeling was that the work that could be done in the workshops should be done there. As mentioned by an earlier speaker tonight—either the member for Boulder or the member for Collie—we are concerned about the unemployment position. For some time there have been anything between 350 and 400 unemployed in and around Midland Junction.

Within the last six weeks two new Australians have come to me to say they want to return to Europe because they have been unable to find employment here. That situation is going to react adversely against Western Australia; and I hope the Minister for Immigration, who is advocating more immigration, is taking notice of

that point. One of the two new Australians who came to my place was a permanent way employee, but I cannot recall what the other one was.

Mr. Bovell: Two swallows do not make a summer.

Mr. BRADY: As the Minister says, two swallows do not make a summer; but when there are 400 swallows, then I think there is something in the nature of a summer.

Mr. Bovell: Statistics show that the employment position is better today than it has been for years.

Mr. Tonkin: Where did you read that fiction?

Mr. BRADY: The Minister, of course, will no doubt attempt to put me off my line of thought by interjecting, but I will take no notice of him. I would remind the Minister, however, for his information, that there recently appeared in *The West Australian* an article which stated that Western Australia had the lowest wages in Australia. That is what the present Liberal Party-Country Party Government has done for the workers. By encouraging contracts and other systems, the Government is responsible for Western Australia having the lowest wages.

Is it any wonder that business people are beginning to ask where we are going as a State; and, in my electorate, where we are going as an electorate? The continued unemployment of these 400 workers in Midland Junction will have an adverse effect upon the business people. As a result, the council will not receive its rates, and necessary work in the district will not be accomplished.

Apart altogether from the indirect activities, there is to be considered the loss of employment to the sons of the men in the workshops. The apprenticeship rate will have to be reduced because there will not be the over-all tradesmen to warrant the employment of apprentices. As the Minister knows, the trade union has a system whereby apprentices are employed on a ratio basis; and if the ratio is not sufficient, the apprentices cannot be put on. In that way there will be fewer tradesmen for Western Australia.

As a matter of fact, we are already short of tradesmen in the workshops, and have been for some years. I remember asking questions several years ago about boilermakers and blacksmiths. We were short then, and we are even shorter today. Yet the Government is so arranging things that a new group of apprentices are not being employed to ensure that there are sufficient tradesmen later on. The other day it was mentioned to me that approximately 100 boilermakers have left Western Australia in the last twelve months, and there are only 50 apprentices being appointed. That means we are going to be even shorter of tradesmen in the future than we have been in the past.

On TV last night the Minister mentioned that he wanted to keep the correct balance in the workshops and that was one of the reasons why the *Westland* would not be built there. The manpower can be out of balance in the workshops, obviously, because it is already out of balance; but what is the Minister doing about that? It is no good his talking about keeping a correct balance in regard to repairs, maintenance, and capital construction, if the other side is out of balance. It has been done before.

I remember going through the workshops with the previous works manager some years ago and asking about rail crossings. He said, "That is no concern of ours. We are only concerned with the workshops." That was during a period when there was trouble with the three commissioners of railways and they could not agree about what work should be done.

The Minister needs to consider the over-all position and not try to mislead us in this House, or the general public outside, by saying he is trying to keep the correct balance. I am satisfied that the Minister could quite well give the job of constructing the *Westland* to the railways workshops and it could be accomplished side by side with the repairs. In that way the Government would stand to save hundreds or thousands of pounds.

The Minister is trying to blindfold this House, and me, as member for the district, in regard to costing. The other night I asked him a question as to whether he was satisfied with the railway costing system, and he gave a yes-no answer. It was an answer that he could talk himself out of. First of all he said that it was satisfactory for the railway position but it was not satisfactory for general costing—or words to that effect. What does that mean? That suggests no answer at all, because under the system of railway costing it could be less than the outside system of costing. In my opinion it cannot be otherwise if the proper system is adopted.

I hope the Minister for Railways will tell us more about the costing in the workshops; for if it is not what it should be, it is about time it was, because as far back as 1948 a Royal Commissioner was brought to Western Australia to investigate the situation in the workshops; and one of the objects of his scathing criticism was the costing in the railway workshops. If any workshops in Western Australia should now be working under a proper costing system, it is the railways workshops at Midland Junction because of the adverse criticism which Mr. Gibson, the Royal Commissioner, made in his report in 1948.

We will assume for a moment that after twelve years an efficient costing system has not been arrived at. I submit to the Minister for Railways that with all his knowledge and experience as a professional man in the accountancy and costing world,

he could within twenty-four hours ensure that a proper costing system was implemented.

The workshops are in a position to do jobs at a lower price than the outside shops, because they have a considerable amount of other work to do which the other shops do not have. No-one knows more than the Minister that they have about half a million pounds' worth of repairs and maintenance work which could be carried out side by side with other capital construction jobs. This has been done over the years.

The shops were constructed in 1904 and there are 167 acres of land set aside, on 27 of which buildings have been erected where the work is carried out. The maintenance and repair work has been going on side by side with capital construction right down through the years; and the Minister knows that the administration of costs spread over the capital works as well as the maintenance and repair work is a satisfactory arrangement, and because of this it is possible for it to be done cheaper there than outside. That brings me back to my opinion that the reply of the Minister for Railways was a yes-no answer. It is "Yes; it is all right for the railway costing" and "No; it is not good enough for outside commercial costing."

Well, as I said, the Minister probably knows standard costing better than I do, that being part of his training for years. He knows the variations which take place in costing and which can be applied to the workshops. In 24 hours, the Minister could put the costing system right, if it is not as it should be now, and the obligation is on him to do so.

Let me tackle the position from the over-all angle, in regard to the Country Party members. I mention them—and include some Liberal Party members—because they represent constituencies in which the railways play a vital part. If the railways are to be so administered that outside firms will make profits and take millions of pounds of work away from the workshops, the over-all position of the railways will be worsened and will be such that fares and freights will have to be increased; and no-one else but the people in the electorates of Country Party members—and some Liberal Party members—will have to bear these. Therefore, those members should be supporting the Labor Opposition's amendment so as to ensure that all work that can possibly be done in the workshops is done there in order that the costing can be kept down to a minimum.

I did think at one stage last year that the Minister was going to be a little bit more sympathetic and allow constructional work of a capital nature to be carried out in the workshops, but I am very disappointed with his recent approach. I was at a very important meeting last night, which I left in order to hear the Minister

on the air. I was amazed to hear those railwaymen tell us about the different parts of an engine which could be made in the shops but which are not being made there. The Government, as a result, is paying twice as much as it should be paying for those parts.

Let me mention an article which appeared in *The Western Sun* in July headed "Alleged Waste Seen at Midland." It was the following paragraphs:—

The public is paying heavily for the Brand Government's policy of favouring private enterprise with railway orders.

Many alleged instances of financial waste involving purchases from private sources were recently pointed out to a party of journalists inspecting the Midland railway workshops.

The party was shown a $\frac{3}{4}$ in. locking nut (pictured below). Nuts like these were said to cost the railways £6 6s. each. They are supplied by Metropolitan Vickers Ltd., in England.

On the bottom of the page in this newspaper is a photograph of that £6 6s. nut, which is $\frac{3}{4}$ in. wide and about $\frac{3}{4}$ in. or $\frac{1}{2}$ in. thick. According to railway employees, that nut is costing £6 6s. It is incredible; it is fantastic; it is unbelievable that any sane Government could be paying such a price for these nuts.

I asked a question recently of the Minister as to whether he was to blame or the Commissioner of Railways was to blame, or who was to blame. He put it on to a poor little short chap of 5 ft. 2 in. who I do not think for a moment would condone paying £6 6s. for a nut which can be made at the Midland Junction Workshops for 2s. 6d.

Mr. Court: Do you know when that was ordered?

Mr. BRADY: I do not know when it was ordered, but the fact remains that the responsibility is on this Government to run the State economically and efficiently; and if an article was wrongly ordered by the Labor Government, it should have been cancelled by the present Government. There is no reason why it should be accepted if it is not required. That sort of thing is being done every day in commercial houses. Articles can be returned if they are not required, and the Minister knows that better than I do. So it is no good the Minister trying to blame the Labor Government for something for which it—the Liberal Government—is responsible.

The Minister also wanted to know why the honourable member was so concerned; and the honourable member was I. He was trying to make out that our Government was responsible for some of the shortcomings in regard to the ordering of

parts. Let me say this to the Minister: At the time this Liberal-Country Party Government took office, the Labor Government had a Royal Commission sitting to investigate these shortcomings. But what did this Government do? One of its first jobs was to get rid of the Royal Commissioner so that he would not bring to light some of the shortcomings in the railways, despite the fact that the Labor Government had been trying to get rid of them. The Royal Commissioner was gradually bringing the shortcomings to light; some apparently were carry-overs from the McLarty-Watts Government. If the costing system is still not up to the standard desired by the Royal Commissioner, it is no good the Minister for Railways trying to put the responsibility for the shortcomings, in regard to the ordering of parts, on the Labor Government.

No doubt under the warranty system, Metropolitan-Vickers would have a provision in the contract that, until such time as the warranty expired, the railways would have to order any necessary parts from them. But the fact remains that on last night's TV the railwaymen mentioned several other parts that were 100 per cent. dearer in cost and that could be made in the railway workshops.

It is fantastic that railway costing has been built up by the present Administration so that ultimately the Country Party electors and some of the Liberal Party electors will have to pay the increased price in freights and fares in conjunction with the metropolitan people who have already started to pay an increase.

I would be failing in my duty if I did not mention these matters in the House tonight. I feel that the railways are being made a political football by the Government; and the railwaymen are the first ones to get the kicks. They will get the kicks because the Government wants to see the railways workshops reduced to a repair shop, although they are able to do both manufacturing and repair work.

I cannot help but draw a comparison between the Minister's profession of accountant and auditor and the work of the railway workshops. What is happening is like saying to the accountants and auditors, "As from next week you shall only do audit work and not accounting." That is the same as saying to the workshops, "Henceforth you are only to do repairs and maintenance work, and no capital work or construction work of any sort."

The men at the workshops are naturally going to buck; and they are entitled to. One way they have of bucking is to get the Leader of the Opposition to move an amendment of the kind that has been moved, and to come to the House and listen to the debates in a quiet and orderly manner as they have done over the past few days. Over the years that has been

the only way that people who have suffered an injustice can attempt to get redress.

Some time ago the people working in the dairying industry paraded up to the House. They upset milk-cans at various stations between here and Bunbury as a protest against the unfair prices they were getting for the milk they were producing. The railwaymen are just as entitled to ask that this amendment—which has so adequately been moved by the Leader of the Opposition—shall be moved to the Address-in-Reply to show their disgust.

One would think from the activities of the Minister for Railways, that all railways are destined to be losing concerns and that there is no hope for them. Perhaps the Minister has overlooked the fact that in Australia itself there is one which is making considerable profits—the Commonwealth Railways. The latest figures—those for 1958—show that the Commonwealth Railways made a profit of £1,250,000. The capital investment in the Commonwealth Railways is only about half of the capital investment in the Western Australian railways. With all that capital invested in our railways, the Minister might do well to have a look at the overall position to see whether, instead of tenders being let to private employers to do the work, it should not be done in the railway workshops.

If the workshops are allowed to do the work, then I venture the opinion that the costs will be brought down to such an extent that the outside firms will not be able to get within cooee of them. That is so because the elements are such as to enable the railway workshops to do the work at a lesser cost than that at which it can be done by the outside people. The railways workshops have a dozen avenues to draw upon to keep their tradesmen going as well as having the capital construction which is taking place at Midland.

Another aspect that I feel I should mention and to which the Minister may give some consideration, is that in the other States, when the railways are faced with having to carry losses, they look around to see what they can do to ensure that they get the work they are entitled to. In New South Wales, where there is a Labor Government, the people who do work for the railways are required to have most of their carrying done by the railways. The Minister might have a look at that aspect.

Not only does the Labor Government in New South Wales ensure that the railways get the traffic that they are entitled to, but the Liberal Government in South Australia does it, too. The Playford Government in South Australia ensures that the people trading with the railways use the railways to the maximum capacity. As a matter of fact, I have read the *Road Transport Digest*

here for September, 1959, and the following is an extract termed "Railway Black-mail":—

An unsavoury principle seems to be extending into the realm of policy pursued by Australian Government railways. The South Australian Road Transport Association confirms this view in the following report:

The South Australian railways have adopted the policy of refusing to purchase goods from their suppliers unless the supplier undertakes to use rail transport. We understand that the policy not only requires this in respect of goods which have been purchased but also requires the supplier to undertake to use rail transport generally.

So a Labor Government in New South Wales insists that the railways be used to the maximum, and so does a Liberal-Country Party Government in South Australia. I mention these matters because I feel that the Minister, instead of looking at the railways from the point of view of seeing what can be a predetermined minimum amount of work that can be handled by them, and what predetermined maximum amount of saving can be effected, in regard to the employees in the workshops, might turn his attention to ways and means of having the railways used to their maximum.

You will recollect, Sir, that earlier tonight I asked a question in regard to motor trucks being permitted to take railway transport from Nungarin.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member should relate his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. BRADY: I have outlined these matters so that the Minister can look at them. I feel that the railways are being singled out for special attention. They are being used as a political football; because, as a result of the measures that have been put into practice, there is the possibility of the railwaymen having difficulty in holding their jobs. In addition, a member in another place, in answer to a question, received a reply to the effect that the department was looking at the possibility of reducing the metropolitan transport system.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must relate these remarks to the amendment.

Mr. BRADY: I am mentioning them in passing and I do not intend to elaborate on them. On all sides railway men are faced with an extremely difficult position. They feel that there is no continuity of employment for them. Only one day this week a railway man came to my house and shook hands with me and bade me goodbye because he was going to the Eastern

States. He is of the opinion that there is a better future for him there than in this State. I am sure there will be many more railway men who will follow him.

The people who will reap the whirlwind as a result of the Government's policy on the railways will be the members of the Country Party. Even if the railways do not fall down on the job financially as a result of what the Government is doing administratively, they will fall down, as a transport organisation, from a practical point of view. As a result, questions will be asked by those residing in the country areas as to who is to get priority for transport. There will be requests from the fruit-growers at Mt. Barker; the stock people who are trying to have their stock transported to the abattoirs; from the people who are growing cereals in the country and who are trying to have their wheat and oats railed to the port for transhipment. That will be the position.

There will be a practical breakdown of the efficiency of the railways, on the one hand because of a shortage of tradesmen; and, on the other hand, because of the unbalance that exists in the Midland Junction Workshops. Therefore, the position is becoming extremely serious, and it is not something that the Minister for Railways can lightly ride over. I know he is a very busy man and that he has several important portfolios to administer. Nevertheless, he should have another look at the Government's policy in regard to the railways.

The Minister had not been in office more than a couple of months when he attended a meeting of railway men and told those present that he visualised saving £600,000 a year on the railways. On the one hand, he may save an expenditure of £600,000; but, on the other hand, he will cripple the railways if he continues to try to save £600,000 at the rate the railways are going at present. He will put the railways transportation system in the hands of the motor hauliers of Western Australia and help to build up the B.P. organisation which already has capital assets nearly equal to those of the railways although it has been in existence for only a few years. The money that will flow to that organisation will be lost to the railways, whilst the B.P. refinery and 1001 other people who will be manufacturing and handling road trucks, tyres, and all the other accessories associated with road transport, will reap the benefit, and, as I have already said, it will be the members of the Country Party who will pay for all this.

I know that the member for Moore is anxious to tell me about the railways; but at the moment he is fortunate, because he has a private railway firm serving his particular area which makes its own rolling stock and carries out its own repairs in its own workshop. The member

for Moore is well placed, and he has no need to worry. However, his fellow country members will be worrying next year when they find the railways are in such a position that they are unable to cope with the transport needs.

There is an old saying that to be forewarned is to be forearmed, so I am giving the Minister for Railways a friendly warning: "You can fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time". The position has now been reached when we, on behalf of the people of Western Australia, have disclosed a nigger in the woodpile. The supporters of the Country Party and the friends of the Liberal Party supporters in the country are going to pay the piper as a result of the Government policy in regard to the railways.

Mr. Lewis: Who closed the 840 miles of railway?

Mr. BRADY: How many hundreds of miles of railways did the McLarty-Watts Government close? It closed about 750 miles of railway. The member for Moore is not saying a word about that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has to confine his remarks to the amendment, and he has another five minutes left.

Mr. BRADY: I have to keep the member for Moore in his place because he is trying to put me off the track; but I do not think he will. I was a member of the Cabinet that helped to close down 800 miles of railway.

Mr. Graham: No, suspended operations.

Mr. BRADY: Yes, suspended operations, as I have been corrected by the member for East Perth. Had we been instrumental in closing those lines it would not have been possible to open them up in the last six months, as they have been opened up. I will be quite frank and honest with the railway men in my electorate. I have had to toe the line on more than one occasion as a result of my Cabinet's decision to suspend railway services.

The SPEAKER: This has nothing to do with the amendment.

Mr. BRADY: I was going to tell the railway men why I voted for the suspension of those lines; it was to secure their jobs. I hope the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Railways will take notice of the warning I have given to them. I repeat that the railways are in a serious position, and I consider the Minister would be well advised to try to retrieve the position at this late hour and to take heed of what the Royal Commissioner said in his report of 1948 on the shortcomings of the railways, particularly in regard to the costing system. I consider that when he has the costing system in line, he will find that the railways will do the job as cheaply as any other organisation.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Railways—on amendment) [9.17]: I propose, in the main, to confine my remarks to the particular part of the amendment which deals with the Midland Junction Railway Workshops, because that seems to be the subject that is getting under the skin of quite a few members in this Chamber. My own considered opinion of this malicious propaganda that is going on—

Mr. Graham: Extravagant words!

Mr. COURT: — is that it is nothing more than a cruel and ruthless attempt by the members of the Labor Party in this State to intimidate and frighten the men who work at the Midland Junction Workshops and the families of those men. It is nothing more than an attempt to try to put these innocent men on a party political rack.

Mr. Toms: Get out of St. George's Terrace and get among the men and find out!

Mr. COURT: I do not think members of the Opposition are as well informed on the views of the rank and file as they think they are. One honourable member has spoken about not being able to fool all the people all the time. That is very true, and many things which have been told to the railway men about what this Government is going to do have not happened. They find, on reflection, that the matter has been handled with a great deal of caution, commonsense, and understanding.

Mr. Graham: Where was this?

Mr. COURT: It amazes me to hear all the sudden outbursts to these men that they are all going to be sacked tomorrow. They are not. Any rearrangement will be through normal wastage. What about when the Hawke Administration reduced its railway work force by about 700 men? What did we get from the Leader of the Opposition when I interjected the other night? One would think that these men did not matter. However, they are men. The reaction was that they are not skilled men; that they are just men who help to make up the railway system. In our estimation those men are just as important as skilled men.

Mr. Graham: Of course they are.

Mr. COURT: In fact, the responsibility in respect of those men is even greater than in respect of skilled tradesmen. Because all the porters, shunters, guards, and that type of worker have no special skill they are unable to obtain work outside the railways readily. They are railway men, first, last and always.

Mr. Graham: They were not sacked.

Mr. COURT: They were retrenched.

Mr. Graham: No; they were not retrenched.

Mr. COURT: I am sorry. The work force was reduced by the normal wastage methods.

Mr. Graham: Because there was no work for them. But you are reducing the work force at Midland Junction as part of a deliberate Liberal Party policy, and there is work for them.

Mr. COURT: If there was no work for the numbers the honourable member's Government reduced, how was it that they were put on the payroll?

Mr. Graham: Because you farmed the work out to your friends. Have a look at the idle machines at the Midland Junction Workshops.

Mr. Brand: The men were put off because you closed 842 miles of railway.

Mr. Graham: You are putting them off because of a deliberate political policy.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot have two or three interjections at once. The Minister for Railways has the floor.

Mr. COURT: Let us examine the situation. What is the position at the workshops?

Mr. W. Hegney: Terrible.

Mr. COURT: The previous Government suspended the services on 842 miles of railways. Surely when the services of 842 miles of railways are suspended we have to make a readjustment throughout the whole of the service? I would suggest that whilst the Government of the day was prepared to make a readjustment of the work force in respect of the people outside the workshop, it was not, because of political pressure, prepared to face up to the more difficult task of work within the workshops. Let us examine the position in the workshops. Anyone would think they had no work to do; that it had all been farmed out to private enterprise.

Mr. Graham: Why are there machines lying idle?

Mr. COURT: The position is that the programme of capital works in the workshops this year is £200,000 more than it was in the last year of the Hawke administration.

Mr. Graham: There would still be idle machines.

Mr. COURT: Why is this suddenly so different? If a programme of £584,000 was so satisfactory in 1958-59, why is it that a programme of £791,000 is inadequate this year, because there is a change of Government?

Mr. Heal: It costs a lot more to make them this year.

Mr. COURT: Let us examine the situation in the railways workshops. Surely the job of the workshops is first and foremost to maintain the rolling stock and equipment of the railways. If it does that job it has the basic component to build up a skilled and balanced work force. If on top of that there can be superimposed a diversified programme of work, surely that gives the workshop its greatest security!

That has been the policy of the Government in consultation with the commissioner.

Mr. Graham: What about those idle machines?

Mr. COURT: These idle machines, that have suddenly assumed such great significance, were there during the administration of the Hawke Government; and we now have a bigger programme of capital works than was performed during the last years of that Government's administration.

Mr. Graham: Why are those machines idle now?

Mr. Brand: They were idle then.

Mr. Graham: No.

Mr. COURT: I refuse to continue this on-again, off-again argument with the member for East Perth. He knows there is no great change with respect to the workshops; in fact, the position there today is much better than it was before.

Mr. Toms: You ask the men; you've been walking around Dalkeith too much.

Mr. COURT: If I were to choose between the *Westland* train sets being put in there, and a diversified programme of work, I would choose the latter because the type of work we have allocated to the workshops is of such a nature that it is a basis for a balanced work force; it is a basis for a continuing programme. How often do we build a *Westland* train set? We have not called tenders yet; let alone accepted them. Are not the men better off; are they not more secure and stable in every way by having the type of work that is going on through the workshops continually; where they do not have to go out to compete for it; where it is allocated for the year? We are already working on the programme for next year, and I have given an assurance that there will be no retrenchments.

Mr. Tonkin: What is the story about the RCA wagons?

Mr. COURT: I am not the manager of the workshops, and I cannot be expected to know every nut and bolt around the place. To come back to the *Westland* train sets. Had we put the *Westland* train sets in the workshops on the basis asked for by the union representatives, we would have to postpone the essential works that are necessary to keep the railways vitalised—the type of work we have in the workshops for this year—so that a glamour train could go in.

Mr. Tonkin: Why have you to do that? The glamour train will not be built for 12 months or so.

Mr. COURT: We will deal with that; the member for Melville should not jump his hurdles too quickly. We either have to put the glamour train in and let the other work out to private enterprise, or postpone it. Surely the more secure thing is to

have the routine type of repetitive work in the workshops! What will happen after the glamour train has been built? There will be an unbalance of skills and insecurity.

Mr. Tonkin: What is the company going to do that is going to build this?

Mr. COURT: I am amazed at how naive the Deputy Leader of the Opposition can be. If we let this out to a private enterprise firm, it will not be wholly and solely dependent on this; it can switch from one thing to another; it has flexibility that is not possessed by the Government workshops.

Mr. Tonkin: Who is there in this State who can do this?

Mr. COURT: I am surprised at the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. As soon as I ask him a question by interjection he gets quite hurt, because he feels I am interfering with his train of thought.

Mr. Tonkin: That will be the day when I get hurt by interjection; the only one who gets hurt is the Speaker.

Mr. COURT: The *Westland* train sets that have been used as a sort of butt in all this argument cannot be built for many months. Even if we call tenders and let the contracts they will not be built for months yet; whether they are built in the workshops or outside. In the meantime, another year will have gone by, and we must provide another programme of work for next year. Is it not better to plan on the type of work that is covered by this year's programme? Some of the figures for this year's programme are as follows:—

10 diesel rail car trailers at a cost of £212,000.

50 RCA wagons at a cost of £160,000.

20 cool storage vans costing £105,000.

10 Z vans costing £45,000.

10 QCF bogie wagons costing £31,000.

50 covered bogie wagons costing £210,000.

Mr. Toms: Now read the list of work that is going outside.

Mr. COURT: If the honourable member wants to make an issue of that, I would say that at this point of time no major work at all has been called for outside of the workshops this year.

Mr. Toms: The men are looking to the future.

Mr. COURT: If they are well advised—and I am sure there is somebody who can advise them—they will be more concerned about having a programme like this for 1961-62 and 1962-3, than about having the *Westland* train sets built in the workshops. The honourable member is allowing himself to be influenced by the propaganda that has surrounded these *Westland* train sets. If we can get rid of that propaganda it will be seen what the Government is doing for the workers in the

Midland Junction Workshops. I am amazed at the member for Boulder, because I thought he would have been pressing for a glamour train to be run between Kalgoorlie and Perth.

Mr. Oldfield: The *Westland* train is not the Kalgoorlie express.

Mr. Moir: The *Westland* does not cater for the Kalgoorlie people.

Mr. COURT: Does the honourable member not regard the Trans.-train as important to Kalgoorlie? I thought he would be agitating for a better train between Perth and Kalgoorlie.

Mr. Moir: I wanted to see a better train provided for people coming from the gold-fields.

Mr. COURT: The question of spare parts has suddenly assumed great significance like the works programme. Although this one we are implementing is bigger and better, just because it is being done by this Government, members opposite can see no virtue in it. The spare parts position is exactly the same. It is not a situation in which the Government gives a direction. Heaven forbid that the Government should start talking about every nut, bolt, and spare part that the workshops should make. That is a matter for the management.

Mr. Graham: It is time the Minister took an interest. As has been established, this is a scandal. If the Minister has done nothing about it, he should not continue to be a Minister.

Mr. COURT: The over-all policy in respect of spare parts is clearly defined. As spare parts are required, so a greater number will be made in the workshops. It would not matter whether we or the Labor Party were in power. There is a certain speed at which we can accelerate the making of more spare parts. Most of these spare parts have to be made from drawings, which in turn have to be drawn up from worn parts. The tolerances have to be carefully examined. It is not as easy as it would appear. One does not get a brainwave to make this or that part. The materials, the jigs, and the gauges have all to be prepared for these parts.

The workshops are progressively getting the tools—if that is the right expression—to enable them to undertake the manufacture of more and more of these parts. I am told there are 50,000 parts in a diesel locomotive. Just imagine trying to get to the stage of preparing jigs, drawings and gauges, and all the rest, for those 50,000 parts! That is not possible. If the Government, through the management, is progressively making a greater proportion of these parts, that is the sensible and logical approach; and, in fact, the only approach.

I want to repeat something I said on another occasion. During the recent conference of the heads of branches in this

State, the Chief Mechanical Engineers of the other States expressed amazement at the proportion of spare parts we are manufacturing in this State. Surely that gives the lie to the assertion that this Government is deliberately buying spare parts to reduce the capacity of the Midland Workshops.

Mr. Graham: All railways Ministers have expressed amazement at the capacity of the Midland Workshops.

Mr. COURT: That is quite beside the point. We are now talking about the proportion of spare parts made in the workshops.

Mr. Tonkin: Do you think that four months is a reasonable time to make a shaft for a pump?

Mr. COURT: No, if that is the only job; but if it is taken in conjunction with the thousand and one jobs to be done around the place the answer is "Yes." The honourable member well knows the position, because there are certain programmes which have to be observed. If one drops everything to make a particular spare part, one neglects something else, and there will be a complaint.

Mr. Tonkin: What would you have to drop to make a shaft for a pump?

Mr. COURT: The workshops are a very complicated organisation.

Mr. Tonkin: That is nonsense. I have been through them.

Mr. Fletcher: I can make a shaft myself in a day or less.

Mr. COURT: If members opposite are so concerned about this, I suggest that we have a few busy bees from some of the former tradesmen here, during week-ends and free of charge to help the railways to overcome its problems.

Mr. Tonkin: You ought to be concerned, too, if they are paying £128 for cylinder heads which they can make for £65.

Mr. COURT: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition gets on to a theme and cannot get off it. We are going ahead and are making more and more spare parts. I am not going to tell the management which ones are to be made. How silly would it be if a Minister tried to tell the Chief Mechanical Engineer what should be made and in what priority. The fact is that he has to make a bank of parts that are drawn up in a logical sequence.

Mr. Tonkin: You are not justified in putting up railway freights while this wastage is going on.

Mr. COURT: Nonsense! Why did the Labor Government put them up by two million pounds in 1953?

Mr. Tonkin: This wastage was not going on. It is all right for members who have no answer to laugh.

Mr. COURT: The member for Guildford-Midland concentrated most of his speech on the workshops, because no doubt they are near and dear to his heart. They are in his electorate. He got on to the question of a balance in the work force. I am not an engineer. Heaven forbid I try to be one! At least, when we have a problem like this there are certain policy objectives that can be laid down. The commissioner and his staff were told to produce a programme which, taken in conjunction with the maintenance work in the workshops, would give us a balanced labour force. I think I can safely back their judgment, after all the time they have put into this question, against the judgment of some members of this House. They are conscientious in their efforts. They know what we seek to achieve. When we look at this programme we see that it does provide for a diversity of tradesmen and for a balance of tradesmen.

Mr. Tonkin: What number of tradesmen?

Mr. COURT: At the 30th June we had 2,834 men at the workshops and we had fewer than 10,000 other men in the rest of the railway system.

Mr. Tonkin: What will it be on the 30th June next year?

Mr. COURT: I have already told the union that on present planning the figures will be down by 200 and there will be no retrenchments or sackings, again trying to produce a balanced programme. Surely there must be some relativity between the number of men driving trains, the number handling freights and customers, and the number of men maintaining the system.

Mr. Graham: Of course there must be.

Mr. COURT: Does the honourable member think that the number of 2,800 is unreasonable compared with just on 10,000 in the rest of the railway system?

Mr. Graham: I have no idea. I object to Government machines lying idle while you give these jobs to private interests.

Mr. COURT: If we can keep the work force gainfully employed and maintain a balanced work force, we will achieve our objective, which is a desirable objective.

Mr. Tonkin: We had a balanced work force in the Public Works Department!

Mr. COURT: The member for Guildford-Midland referred to costing and flattered me by saying that because of my experience in this matter I could go into the workshops and after 24 hours put in a system which would satisfy everybody.

Mr. Brady: Satisfy you.

Mr. COURT: I thought the honourable member used the word "everybody". I would not make such a bold claim because the introduction of a costing system in a workshops is a tremendous undertaking.

Mr. Brady: You had 12 years to think about it. The Royal Commissioner made his report 12 years ago.

Mr. COURT: We shall skip the six years when the honourable member's party was in office. I shall get down to the facts as they are. It is possible to have a system that will achieve certain practical results for a certain purpose at a cost of £x. a year. It is possible to have a system which will produce all those results, plus a lot of other frills, at £x. plus many more pounds per year. One has to make up one's mind, in a place like this, whether one is prepared to have all the niceties, extras, or frills for the sake of having them, when in fact they will not earn or save another pound.

Mr. Graham: What are the frills you are talking about?

Mr. COURT: One can go into the question of costs until one produces all sorts of answers and figures.

Mr. Graham: We have had examples in the last few days.

Mr. COURT: One has to make sure the results achieved have some practical value. So it has been the objective of myself, in consultation with the commissioner, to try to produce a system which would be satisfactory to the Auditor-General while, at the same time, meeting the needs for an ordinary railway system. These people do not have to go out and trade; they only have to make the goods given to them for making and repair the equipment given to them for repair.

Mr. Tonkin: They want to know what it costs to make them.

Mr. COURT: One can know for railway purposes.

Mr. Tonkin: For railway purposes?

Mr. COURT: That is the important thing. After all, it is a railway system we are running.

Mr. Tonkin: Why not compare them with outside prices for railway purposes?

Mr. COURT: We do not have to.

Mr. Tonkin: Why can't you?

Mr. COURT: If these people have a full programme of practical work, and prices and costs are kept under control by a railway method, surely that is the only thing needed!

Mr. Tonkin: Doesn't it matter if you can make it cheaper than you can buy it?

Mr. COURT: The member for Guildford-Midland referred to our objective of breaking these workshops down to a repair and maintenance works only. I think I have made the position clear. We are trying to produce a balanced and efficient workshop; and to do this, it must always make some capital equipment to give it that balance with the repair work.

I have made this clear on more than one occasion. The commissioner knows the policy and the C.M.E. knows the policy; and without some of the capital works going through it is not possible to get a balance between the maintenance work and the work force which is necessary to provide the required diversity of skills.

Mr. Jamieson: The commissioner wishes he had never left Tasmania.

Mr. Graham: I do not wonder.

Mr. COURT: I do not think so. I think he is happy in doing a difficult job here with great conscientiousness and, I think, with great satisfaction to the workmen and the Government.

Mr. Graham: He has never had so many discontented employees in his life.

Mr. COURT: Before sitting down I wish to make reference to some remarks made by the member for Beeloo in which he made a very scathing, and I think, dastardly attack on Sir Haiford Reddish, bearing in mind that that gentleman cannot come here and defend himself or take legal action against the honourable member.

Mr. Jamieson: It was only half the things I will say about him.

Mr. COURT: The honourable member has just highlighted the point I wish to make: What chance has Western Australia of attracting industrialists who can give it so much by way of diversity of industry and expansion of industry—

Mr. Graham: At what price?

Mr. COURT: —when we have members of Parliament who are prepared to say such things about that man? At this point of time he is still negotiating to try to get some industrialists to come to Western Australia.

Mr. Graham: Or to get the State Brick-works.

Mr. Jamieson: At your price.

Mr. COURT: How can we expect people to come here and subject themselves to this sort of treatment when there are so many places in Australia and in other parts of the world where the hand of friendship would be gladly extended? I oppose the amendment.

MR. OLDFIELD (Mt. Lawley—on amendment) [9.44]: In supporting this amendment I would say that the Minister who has just resumed his seat has entertained us with a repeat performance of that which he gave last evening on station TVW 7.

Mr. Court: They did not give me that much time.

Mr. OLDFIELD: It was a repeat performance. In fact, every utterance the Minister made contained almost every cliché known in the English language except "Time, gentlemen, please."

Mr. W. A. Manning: Whose side are you on?

Mr. Graham: The right side, if he is against you.

Sir Ross McLarty: You must have great admiration for him.

Mr. Heal: You did for some years.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Mr. Speaker, would you ask the Government members to maintain order? During the debate to close 842 miles of railway lines the member for Moore said that that action had something to do with the present predicament of the railways.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already said that members cannot discuss that. I told the member for Guildford-Midland that that had nothing to do with the amendment.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I think the amendment has to do with the workshops and the predicament in which the railway system finds itself today. I wish to point out that the Minister for Railways was first in the division, with a total of 25 to 6.

Mr. Court: The motion as amended.

Mr. I. W. Manning: Which side was Oldfield on?

Mr. OLDFIELD: The honourable member can look at *Hansard* and see where I was. I would also remind back benchers of the Government that they are disobeying instructions not to interject this session because they might let the cat out of the bag.

Mr. Owen: Where did you get that idea from?

Mr. OLDFIELD: I can see what is going on by looking at the faces of members. The Minister for Railways gave an assurance that any contracts for *Westland* sets—this was in reply to questions put to him—would be kept in Western Australia. He was asked what would happen if nobody in Western Australia tendered for the contract for these sets. Would the sets be made outside the State by an Eastern States firm? In reply, the Minister said quite emphatically that the Government had no intention of sending any work outside the State of Western Australia. In answer to some questions placed on the notice paper today by myself—these were in connection with the manufacture of centre road bogies—it was revealed by the Minister that these were being manufactured by the firm of J. E. Ledger Pty. Ltd. and this firm was the sub-contractor to A. E. Goodwin Ltd., the contractors for the bogies concerned.

The name of A. E. Goodwin was a new one to members on this side of the House; so the first thing we did was to look at the telephone directory. Strange as it may seem, no name of A. E. Goodwin appears in the directory of Western Australia. The only name of Goodwin happens to be that of the State Secretary of the R.S.L.

Certain members went further and we found from the telephone directories of the Eastern States that A. E. Goodwin is an Eastern States firm. It is a firm of engineers and ship-builders in Melbourne and also engineers of 315 Parramatta Road, Sydney. Further inquiries during the tea suspension revealed that the local agents of A. E. Goodwin are J. E. Ledger Pty. Ltd.

We see here an example of Government policy of letting contracts for materials, articles and equipment which were previously manufactured in the Midland Junction Railway Workshops. For instance, these centre road bogies were not let to a Western Australian firm or to a firm that has even a small branch within this State, but to a Sydney-Melbourne firm which, in turn, sublet the contract to a Western Australian firm. If economy is to be effected, as promised, surely the contract should have been let to J. E. Ledger Pty. Ltd., in the first place!

Mr. Graham: Not enough rake-off.

Mr. OLDFIELD: If the Minister is of the opinion that it will be to the advantage of the State's economy and better for a balanced work force to let contracts to private enterprise, surely the contract to which I have referred should have been let, in the first instance, to a local firm and not to a firm in the Eastern States which, in turn, sublet the contract to a local firm, because none is naive enough to believe that Goodwins have tendered this contract and then sublet it in the interests of Western Australia! They have done it in the interests of themselves and their shareholders, and they must be making some profit, if not a handsome one.

Mr. Graham: I would like to have a list of the shareholders of that firm.

Mr. OLDFIELD: That is an example of what we can anticipate will occur. It is obvious that no firm in Western Australia is equipped to build two sets of *Westlands*. No firm has yet undertaken a job of such magnitude. No firm has the various dies, jigs, or great lathes that are required for the completion of such a job. Nor have these firms the material. Many of the firms in the Eastern States had to do a lot of the work themselves because the large engineering companies such as Clyde and Commonwealth engineering companies were not equipped to do it.

Therefore when the Minister assures us that the work will not be sent outside the State but will be performed within the State, he is right; but a lot of money will go out of the State because no doubt the firm in the Eastern States will undertake the contract and sublet it to various firms in Western Australia. That will be a condition of the tender: that the work must be performed in this State. However, there will be no condition in the tender that the firm which undertakes the contract and then sublets it must be a Western Australian firm. Therefore we can see what will

happen. The contract will be let to a firm in the Eastern States and then sublet to firms here, one firm to supply the wheels; one to supply the axles; one the steelwork; and so on.

I would like also to agree somewhat with the member for Boulder in regard to the vital question concerning the expenditure of half a million pounds on these sets of *Westlands*. One point which must be raised at this time is as to whether at this stage the purchase of these trains is warranted. The present *Westland*, we know, is no luxury train. It is, however, a comfortable one and equal to almost anything in the Eastern States. It is not equal to the *Overland*, which runs between Adelaide and Melbourne and is only about nine or 10 years old. Nor is it equal to the Trans.-train, which again is only seven or eight years old. It could not be expected to be. Nevertheless, it is certainly equal to any overnight train in New South Wales, and it is a very comfortable one.

But we will agree that possibly, in the interests of this State, our travelling public is entitled to something better. However, in this instance it will not be the people in Western Australia who will be travelling on these trains, but people from the Eastern States or people in this State travelling to and from the Eastern States.

Mr. Roberts: They are Western Australians.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Yes; but the whole train is not full of local people. We have to bear in mind that the majority of people today travel by air. On a train, approximately 138 to 140 people are carried. An aircraft can lift approximately 130 people, and the young people are choosing to travel by air.

We have to be realistic and realise what is happening today. A great number of people travelling by train are elderly people who have not acclimatised themselves to this new mode of transport by air; and the remainder are railway employees, Government employees, and members of Parliament, who are all travelling on free passes. Those are the people using the trains, and for whom this luxury travelling is to be provided.

We will agree that they should be provided with an overland train that is equal to what might be found elsewhere in the world; but can we afford to outlay money when we are struggling for funds for more urgent works and to provide efficient wagons to carry cargo to and from country districts?

We must bear in mind also that in the very near future a uniform gauge is to be introduced from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle. If that occurs within five years we will have these luxury trains on our hands, because they will be built for a 3ft. 6 in. gauge. It might be argued that the train could then be used for local traffic, for instance to Kalgoorlie and Bunbury. But

who knows what the situation will be in regard to intrastate transport in four or five years?

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member has continued long enough on that topic. The subject is not as to whether or not the trains should be built, but whether or not they should be built in the Midland Junction Workshops.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I feel that the amendment is quite correct, inasmuch as this work rightly belongs to the workshops which are fully equipped to carry it out; and that is, the Midland Junction Workshops. These shops have the skilled labour to build these trains, and therefore are equipped to do so. They have the most up-to-date railway machinery in the world, as well as the trained workmen and skilled draughtsmen and management, and are therefore capable of performing the work better than anyone outside.

The Minister also seemed to take exception to the remarks the member for Beeloo made in regard to Sir Halford Reddish. I would like to remind the Minister that there are those on his side of the House who are not backward in branding unionists who are fighting for better conditions, as a pack of Communists.

To refer to another part of the amendment, it has been said here this evening, in reference to the speech of the Attorney-General in regard to the cancellation of the proclamation for the redistribution of seats, that he had given certain undertakings. The report of these undertakings was taken from *Hansard* and was to the effect that the onus would be on the Government to carry out a redistribution if the subsequent amending legislation was not agreed to by Parliament. Later on, the Attorney-General, as reported in *Hansard* on page 57, had the following to say—

So far as I am concerned the Government is going to do its best to present to Parliament a proposition that will be reasonable and fair to the electors of Western Australia. We ask that members of Parliament agree to that proposition. If they do not agree, I have already said in my opening speech that it will be obvious that the provisions of the existing Act will continue and must be brought into operation at an appropriate time.

That speech was in addition to the undertaking he gave earlier. Therefore, in conclusion, in supporting this amendment, might I remind the Attorney-General, who happens to be absent at the moment—and also his colleagues—that there was an assurance and undertaking given by him and his colleagues that if the Bill which was later to be presented to Parliament to amend the Electoral Districts Act was not acceptable and was defeated, the Government would honour the obligation and

carry out the redistribution. If that undertaking and those assurances had not been given, the measure cancelling the proclamation would never have passed this Chamber. I would remind the Government of that fact.

Mr. Roberts: Where did you vote?

Mr. Graham: With the Government unfortunately. He did not know what would happen.

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

MR. HEAL (West Perth—on amendment) [10.0]: I desire to touch on another part of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, and that is in relation to the recent increase in water rates, mainly in the metropolitan area. I think the House, and particularly the Premier, should be reminded that during the election campaign he told the people, among other things, that if his party were returned to power he would do something in the way of helping people who saw fit to sink bores on their own properties, at their own expense, because it would be a saving to the Water Supply Department. He promised the people that, as he did many other things. Let us see how he and the Minister for Water Supplies have helped the people, especially in the metropolitan area.

Let us take the example I have before me. I would remind the Premier that in 1959 the rate in the £ was 1s. 6d., and the rebate price for water was 1s. 9d.; and let us take this example as being for a property with a valuation of £100. In this instance the water rates would be £7 10s., thus allowing the person concerned 85,700 gallons of water before excess water charges were made. It is obvious that where a person sinks his own bore, and reticulates his own property, he would not use an allowance of 85,700 gallons. No doubt people in those circumstances thought, when the Premier made his statement to the people of Western Australia, that those who sank their own bores would get some relief—they would be given a reduction in water rates. But what do we find?

Under the new system the present Government has introduced, through the Minister for Water Supplies, water rates have been increased to the tune of 25 per cent. where people are using it for domestic purposes. Once again the Government has left its friends—the big business people and the big business concerns, mainly in the city areas—free of any increase. In 1960, with the new rates, people who have had the foresight to install bores and reticulate their own properties have been penalised. Let us take the same example I used a few moments ago and apply the new 1960 rates. The rate in the £ is 1s. 6d. and the rebate price is 2s.; but with an increase of 25 per cent. the valuation is

increased to £125. Therefore the annual rates payable are now in the vicinity of £9 7s. 6d., giving the person concerned an allowance of 94,000 gallons of water.

People with wells, whether they are allowed 84,000 or 94,000 gallons of water per annum, will not use anywhere near that amount; therefore the promise made by the Premier that the people in that category would be helped has not been honoured. In the case I quoted the increase in water rates was approximately £2 per annum; and I imagine the people concerned are terribly disgusted with these new increases. I cannot blame them for it and I do not wonder if they condemn the Treasurer and the Minister for Water Supplies for these recent increases.

When the Minister for Water Supplies was replying to some of the assertions made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, he more or less made the excuse that the present increase in water rates was only in line with and carrying on the policy followed by the previous Government, and was what it would have done had it remained in office. He indicated that the previous Minister for Works had overcome some anomalies in the rating system applied to properties in the metropolitan area; and stated that it was the intention of the previous Minister to carry on with this policy and increase the domestic rate for water, as the present Minister has done in the last month or two.

That is a complete untruth, because the anomalies were overcome by his predecessor in the main, because, of investigations made by some metropolitan members of Parliament. They advised the Minister that water rates were based on the local authority rating or valuation; and that, in the main, people living in the Perth City Council area found that their water rates were increasing year by year because the Perth City Council was revaluing their properties year by year. Under that system the people living in West Perth, North Perth, Mt. Hawthorn, Wembley, Floreat Park, and Leederville, found that their water rates were far greater than those of people living in Subiaco, Nedlands, and Cottesloe. That is why the previous Minister for Works introduced the idea of departmental men going throughout the metropolitan area revaluing properties for Water Supply Department purposes.

So for the present Minister for Works to rise in his seat and say that he was just carrying on the previous Minister's policy to overcome anomalies is utter rot; and the Minister knows it. I am sure that when people realise their water rates are increased by 25 per cent. they will be hostile to the present Government's action.

Mr. Tonkin: I saw a case today where, in Subiaco, the increase was 86 per cent.

Mr. HEAL: That is so. Probably those people have been most fortunate because their properties have not been revalued

for a number of years. Under this new system, brought in by the present Government, many persons, such as the one mentioned by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, will find that their rates have been increased not by 25 per cent. but by 86 per cent. and, in some cases, by over 100 per cent. I am sure that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will not be very happy when some of your electors, who live in the vicinity of Claremont, complain to you about these steep increases. I am sure that the member for Subiaco, who must have seen the statement in this morning's paper, will be asked to try to do something to relieve the position for these people. However, I know that whatever action the Government takes, private members sitting behind it will just follow and give the Government their support.

In relation to the inflationary spiral which has hit Western Australia, the Premier said that in his opinion price control is not necessary because it cannot curb inflation. Yet a Liberal-Country Party Government has been in power in the Federal sphere for a number of years now; and, for the past 12 years, prices have been rising year by year, or even quarter by quarter, and that Government has done nothing to curb them. Since price control has been abolished in Western Australia the amount of the quarterly adjustments of the basic wage has been increasing each quarter. Yet in other States such as Queensland and South Australia, and in New South Wales to a certain extent, where they have a certain degree of price control, the basic wage and the prices of certain household commodities are far lower than they are in States where there is no price control.

The Premier and members of his Government believe that their policy of free enterprise will curb inflation in the long run. That policy has been severely tested over the past years; and, unfortunately for the people of Australia, it has not been successful. What is free enterprise? I have asked that question of the Premier before. I have asked the Minister for Railways for an interpretation of the words "free enterprise"; but members of the Government seem to be silent in indicating to members of the Opposition what is meant by the phrase. To my way of thinking, free enterprise means that a person, if he so desires, can engage in business, purchase a certain type of goods, and sell them at the price he deems fit for retailing to the public. If that be so, I consider that it may have some effect on the inflationary spiral. The Minister for Railways knows, as well as I do, that when we were both members of a Royal Commission two or three years ago, a great deal of information was supplied to us by various associations operating in Western Australia. We found that in the glass industry, for instance, unless a person was

a member of the Glass Association it was practically impossible for him to purchase glass supplies in Western Australia.

It was also discovered that unless the association admitted such a person as a member he could not possibly purchase those supplies from any other source. Also, when such a person made application to become a member of the association, the majority of members already belonging to that body would not approve of his application. As a result, that person was penalised because he was unable to enter into the business of his choice. From this evidence we found that these associations were imposing their own price control in Western Australia. I do not think the Minister for Railways will deny that statement.

Further, it was also discovered that if any member of an association committed a breach of its rules in regard to the price control exercised by the association, he would be fined and his supplies could be stopped. It would take a great deal to convince me that that is true free enterprise. The way these associations are constituted, free enterprise cannot possibly prosper in Western Australia. During the last session of Parliament the Attorney-General introduced a Bill to effect some form of control to prevent monopolies, but its provisions have not prevented the happenings which I have enumerated from continuing. That legislation is not worth the paper it is written on.

The legislation that was introduced and enacted by the Labor Government did have some power to prevent profiteering and monopolistic tendencies. Until some proper form of price control is reintroduced into Western Australia, I am of the opinion that the inflationary trend will continue, not only from year to year, but from quarter to quarter.

I feel sure that the Minister for Railways is sick and tired about what has been thrown at him this evening, but I would like to point out that recently I was a member of a party of Labour members who visited the Midland Junction Workshops. I understand that a party of Liberal members also made a similar inspection. It was pitiful to see many thousands of pounds worth of machinery lying idle, covered up with dust sheets. The McLarty-Watts Government must be congratulated on spending approximately £2,000,000 on the refitting of those workshops, making it one of the most efficient and best-equipped in Australia, and it is a shame that that amount of money which has been invested in the workshops is going to waste. After all, it is the taxpayers' money; and, in my opinion, it is surprising that the present Government, which is of the same colour as the McLarty-Watts Government, is not continuing the policy laid down by that Administration.

This evening, the Minister for Railways has informed the House that he has worked out a balanced programme for the year. But what is going to happen in the following year? I am sure he is not happy about the equipment that is lying idle in the Midland Junction Workshops which must, of necessity, create uncertainty and a feeling of discontent among the men who are working there. When the Attorney-General opened his remarks he indicated that the people of Western Australia, as a result of the Leader of the Opposition moving the amendment to the Address-in-Reply, had had fear and anxiety brought into their homes. If ever there was an assertion made that contained no meaning, then that is one. The way the Leader of the Opposition introduced the amendment to this House would bring it to the knowledge of only a small percentage of the people of this State. Unfortunately, we cannot give full publicity to what the Government is doing to the people.

The fear that has been brought about in the homes of many people has been as a result of many men being retrenched from various Government undertakings as a result of the policy followed by the Government. When he was making his policy speech the Premier said that his Government would fire nobody, and he has not denied that statement when he has answered many questions that have been asked of him over the past 12 or 18 months.

Within a few months of his Government assuming office, it was found that not only was the day-labour force of the Public Works Department retrenched, but over 1,000 people were fired. How would Government members feel if they found in their pay envelopes, which they took home to their wives unopened, a note informing them they had been given 14 days' notice of their cessation of employment? Surely such an intimation would bring fear and anxiety into the homes of any workmen receiving it and create uncertainty in the minds of the families that they have reared!

By having a job in the Public Works Department or other Government undertaking, those men considered that they would have some security for many years to come. However, since this Government has been in office it has dismissed over 1,200 men. The Minister for Works has stated that many of those men have obtained employment in private enterprise, but that is not so. I have many of those people living in my electorate, and they are between the ages of 45 and 55. If any of the Ministers on the front bench can help me to find employment for those people I would be glad of their assistance.

Mr. Tonkin: I suggest that you submit a list of their names to the Premier.

Mr. HEAL: I would be better pleased if the Minister would allow me to bring them to his office and let him see the people who have been sacked by his Government. The only way these people can find work is to migrate to the Eastern States. Many other tradesmen have had to join the Police Force because they are unable to secure employment in their own trade. This is a terrible state of affairs when one considers that a tradesman has had to serve five years' apprenticeship to learn his trade, following which he has probably served another 10 years in practising his trade and then finds that he is sacked; and because of being unable to obtain work in his own trade in private enterprise, he seeks to join the Police Force. I do not know what the State is coming to.

Surely the work force which existed when the previous Government was in office, and which was capable of building hospitals, schools, and many other large Government undertakings could have been continued in employment under this Government! Why could not the present Government have carried on the policy of the previous Administration? All that it had to do was to keep those people happy, and it would have been assured of a further three years on the Government benches. I can assure you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that although you are in a fairly safe seat, despite the fact that the 77 Sunset Strip in Claremont is giving you a headache at the present time, you will find difficulty in retaining your seat at the next election.

As far as the redistribution of seats is concerned, as it affects me and all other members on this side of the House, when the Attorney-General was introducing the Electoral Districts Bill into this House last year and he thought that he would have an absolute majority to pass that legislation, he said that if the Bill were defeated he would permit the provisions of the existing Act to come into operation. In other words, he would allow the redistribution of seats legislation, which the McLarty-Watts Government introduced, to be effective before the next election. But apparently that is not to be the case. The assertions he made in this House clearly indicated to me that unless this Government is forced to do something about it, it will permit the election to be held without bringing the Act into operation.

Mr. Hawke: They will break the promise they gave to Parliament.

Mr. HEAL: Not only will they break the promise they gave to Parliament; they will also ignore the Act that has been placed on the statute book. It will not be carried out. Whether or not the Governor, in his capacity as Governor of this State, has the power to instruct the Government to carry out its obligation I do not know. It

is possible he may have two or three members of Parliament calling on him as did Mr. Sleeman, the previous member for Fremantle, many years ago.

In this morning's paper there was an interesting leading article which, no doubt, was read by members of this Chamber. I would like to read some portion of that article; because it seems very strange to me that a paper like *The West Australian*—which is normally behind the Government in most of what it does—should come out with a leading article of this nature. The article is headed, "Redistribution of Seats is an Obligation," and the part I wish to quote reads as follows:—

The Government has been evasive about the Opposition demand for a redistribution of Legislative Assembly seats under the McLarty-Watts Electoral Districts Act of 1947.

Since the Country Party's election policy included amendment of the Act, the Government had good reason for delay after it came to power, and for revoking the redistribution proclamation which the Hawke Government unjustifiably issued after its defeat. But that reason is no longer valid because Mr. Oldfield's switch to Labor has deprived the Government of any foreseeable chance of mustering the required absolute majority in the Assembly.

It therefore has a duty to comply with the existing law, whether or not the Liberal-Country Party coalition likes the prospect that it may mean another seat for the metropolitan area at the expense of the country. *Hansard* reports of the speeches on the 1947 Act show that redistribution was intended to be automatic, as section 12 plainly suggests.

I would like to repeat that—

Hansard reports of the speeches on the 1947 Act show that redistribution was intended to be automatic, as section 12 plainly suggests.

The article continues—

Assuming that there is a loop-hole because there is no specified timetable for issuing a proclamation, it exists only because of legal quibbling. Instead of sparring with the Opposition the Government should say what it is going to do and clear itself of imputations of deceit. For practical reasons it has only about six months left in which to set the redistribution machinery at work. If it went to the next election knowing that the electoral boundaries did not conform to the law it would be guilty of evading its obligations and gerrymandering by default through a stratagem as indefensible as the Hawke Government's sharp practice in the dying hours of its term.

Mr. Bovell: I understood you discredited the opinion of *The West Australian*.

Mr. HEAL: Has the Minister for Lands ever heard me say that I discredit the opinion of *The West Australian*?

Mr. Tonkin: When they start to take the Government to task you can bet there is something seriously wrong.

Mr. HEAL: The Minister for Lands has been a Minister for some time now; and I suppose that of all the Ministers he has had the least to say. But when he does say anything, 99 per cent. of the time he is not on the ball. I would like to say that two of the Ministers in office are the greatest rubber-stamp Ministers I have known. I refer not only to the Minister for Lands, but also to the Minister for Transport. No matter what problems may be taken to the Minister, he does nothing about them at all. Whatever his department advises, he carries out to the letter; he dots every "i" and crosses every "t".

Mr. Bovell: Little boy, you know not what you say.

Mr. HEAL: The Minister for Lands should make sure of what he says. In conclusion, I hope and trust that the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition will be carried; that the Government will see its way clear to have a redistribution of seats; and that it will do all in its power to ensure that conditions settle down in the Midland Junction Workshops. Apart from this, I trust that action will be taken to curb to some extent the inflationary spiral which has been so evident in this State.

MR. TOMS (Maylands—on amendment) [10.25]: I do not propose to cast a silent vote on this amendment which has been moved to the debate on the Address-in-Reply. I would like to state at the outset that when I came to this Parliament some four years ago I never thought I would reach the stage when perhaps I would regret having entered its portals. Tonight, unfortunately, that is how I feel. When I came in as a member of Parliament I believed I would associate with a body of men whose word was their bond.

Mr. Hawke: Hear, hear! Give it to them!

Mr. TOMS: During the presentation in the last session by the Attorney-General of the amendment to the Electoral Districts Act, I was given to understand—and I believe every other member understood—that should the Act not be amended, there would be an obligation on the Government to carry out, in the shortest possible time, the law of the land as it stood.

Mr. Hawke: That was the clear-cut assurance given to Parliament by the Government.

Mr. TOMS: I have not had any great University education.

Mr. J. Hegney: Universities lie.

Mr. TOMS: But I have been through the mill and mixed with many men. Until tonight I had the highest regard for the Attorney-General, but I must say he has let me down badly, because I was waiting to hear him speak to find out if there was some spark of honesty or decency still left in the Government.

As I said earlier, I came here as an honest man hoping to be embraced by and to associate with honest men; and to find them acting in that capacity. Never have I been more disillusioned. Speaker after speaker on the Government side, in opposition to this motion, has put up the weakest case that I have ever listened to. Indeed I have never heard a Premier give a weaker reply than was given by the present Premier when he spoke to the motion.

Mr. Hawke: It was pathetic.

Mr. TOMS: Even though I am not an orator myself, I am sorry to say that the manner in which members opposite discussed this matter was regrettable in the extreme. I only hope at this late stage that there may be, on the Government bench, some individual with a spark of decency and honesty who will do all in his power to see that the Government will carry out its undertaking in relation to the Electoral Districts Act. As a matter of fact I believe that the time probably has arrived for a little heart-to-heart speaking with regard to the legislation put forward last session.

I begin to wonder whether the members of the Liberal Party were not very pleased when it became apparent that the Government did not have the constitutional majority to proceed with the Bill it desired to pass. I believe they now see the possibility—the probability existed then—that the Country Party could and would have been the major party in the Government. That possibility existed had the Government been fortunate—and unfortunate for those Liberal members—to have carried the amending Bill. I am convinced there are some members in the Liberal Party who were particularly pleased that the Government did not have the constitutional majority at the time.

I would advise them to study the Bill carefully when they have the time, and I urge them not to listen to what they have been told. They should find out what the Bill contains. The introduction of the Bill could have resulted from ambition on the part of some Liberal members who wanted to gerrymander the seats in such a manner that they themselves could retain power. I do not know exactly, but that appears to be the position.

I have heard the word "hypocrisy" referred to so much in this debate and bandied around that I begin to wonder whether some members who used it know

its real meaning. I say they practise hypocrisy very much without wanting to appear that way.

Another point in the amendment I want to touch on is contained in the second paragraph, which deals with the strong protests raised against the Government's policy of undermining the future of the railway workshops at Midland Junction, by refusing even the management the right to tender in competition with private firms for largescale manufacturing jobs. I have always understood that it was the responsibility of the Government to spend the taxpayers' money wisely and well. The policy of the present Government is so much concerned with the giving of what it can to private, or so-called free, enterprise, that it loses sight of the Government's responsibility to spend public funds wisely. An example has been given of the tremendous amount of unnecessary wastage of expenditure by purchasing articles outside of the workshops which can be produced more cheaply in the workshops.

I was privileged to be a member of a party which visited the workshops. I believe a group from the Country Party also went through, as did another group from the Liberal Party. Perhaps I saw things from a different angle, as compared with them. I was able to observe the attitude of the men towards their work. Perhaps members opposite might have seen the same as I did but did not want to recognise the facts. I was satisfied the men were doing their job. At various parts of the workshops we were shown machines which had been produced by the men so that they could achieve more accuracy and precision in their work. These were not made in order to protract their work, but for the purpose of giving better performance.

Despite what the members of the Government have said about the Labour Party being fomenters of trouble, I give lie to to the assertion. These protests have arisen from the appeals of the employees in the workshops who were able to see what happened and what could happen from the present Government's policy. These men have not decided to make the railways their careers for nothing. They did so because they thought they were doing a service to the State. We have been told that the only way the staff will be reduced will be through normal wastage, and that there will be no retrenchments or sackings. I say with the instability which has been created in industry, and particularly in the workshops and Government departments, that men are not waiting to be told "Now is your turn".

Two brilliant young men who lived in my district and worked in the clerical section of the workshops have left. I have only one part of the State to worry about, and I presume these remarks apply to the

other portions of the State. These men did not belong to the Government or my political faith. They resigned from the workshops. They told me the reason was the instability of employment. They took other jobs. One of them has been lost to the State. There are other tradesmen who are not continuing their calling in Western Australia. They are also leaving the State.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Crommelin): Standing Order 144 suggests that a member should not indulge in the same arguments which have been used by previous speakers. The honourable member should endeavour to bring up fresh subjects.

Mr. TOMS: In deference to your ruling, I find that in debate it is sometimes necessary to repeat a portion of what other speakers have brought up, in order to introduce further points. That is what I am aiming to do. I hope you will permit me to do that. As a State, we are losing these people. Our employment position, our security and our economy as a State will be seriously affected.

The amendment to the Address-in-Reply can be taken as a whole, with one exception; that is, the Government's mishandling of the finances of the Water Supply Department. The implementation of the Government's policy can result in a danger to this State in not many years to come. This is the place, in the Parliament of this State, to bring up the question of the retention of tradesmen, or the maintenance of a balanced work force as often mentioned by the Minister for Industrial Development, to meet the State's requirements. The real interests of Western Australia are not preserved by the policy of the present Government.

The Empire Games are scheduled for this State in 1962, but we will not have sufficient tradesmen to provide the necessary work force. Many are leaving the State because of insecurity and sackings, despite the pledge given by the Premier that his Government will not sack anyone, although the Government does not consider that a note to terminate services, placed in the pay envelope, constitutes sacking. To me it is the same.

The policy of the present Government in abolishing the day-labour organisation of the Public Works Department concerns me greatly. By November that force will be reduced to 300. If tradesmen were in sufficient numbers in this State, or they were being gainfully employed, I would have no quarrel. That was the assurance we were given by the Minister for Works when he started with his deliberate policy of breaking up the Public Works organisation.

He said that these men would be absorbed by private industry. However, they are not being absorbed by private industry at

all. The member for West Perth stated tonight that carpenters are joining the Police Force. Yet the Minister had the audacity to say that if this end was not being achieved and private builders were not co-operating with the Government, the Government would need to have a look at it to find out what was going on.

The Minister for Lands made great play with his interjections to the effect that there are 3,000 more people in employment this year. After they left school last year, 11,000 children were looking for work. What has happened to the other 8,000?

Mr. Bovell: There are no young people out of employment.

Mr. TOMS: Of course the Minister would know.

Mr. Bovell: I do know.

Mr. TOMS: The Minister should ask the Minister for Child Welfare and Social Services just what the position is. The thing that astounds me is that whenever the Labor Party does make a progressive move to support the working people, the Federal Government and the State Government successfully conduct a smear campaign and say that it is Communist-influenced. The very ground for Communism is being fertilised by members occupying the benches opposite. No good Labor man has any desire to have a foreign doctrine in this country; but at the least talk of trouble, we are branded Communists.

I would like to close on this note: In my opening remarks I indicated that I hoped, when I entered these portals, I would be among honest men. It is still not too late for the Government to prove itself; and I trust it will do away with political expediency and return to a little bit of sane Government.

MR. ROWBERRY (Warren—on amendment) [10.43]: I feel I must add my voice—or what is left of it—in protest against the Government along the lines of the amendment as moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I well remember, shortly after I was elected to Parliament, the member for Vasse—now Minister for Lands—gratuitously offering me advice by way of interjection. He said I represented the whole of the people in my electorate and not only those who voted for me. How I was going to discover those who voted for me and those who did not I leave to the member for Vasse. But if that advice is true of a member on this side of the House, it is equally true of a member on the other side of the House; and I am disappointed that more members behind the Government have not added their protest to something which is going to affect a great many people in their electorates and a great many people in this State.

I was interested to hear Ministers replying to the debate; and I was particularly interested in listening to the quibbling—if I may use that word—of the Attorney-General. He has admitted that the onus of issuing a proclamation would rest upon the Government. During the tea suspension I took the opportunity of looking up the meaning of the word "onus." It is as follows:—

"Onus" is burden, charge, responsibility, or duty.

In the political implication of the word it says this—and this is very funny in this particular instance—

Where an onus or responsibility rests there is security.

I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the words of the member who has just resumed his seat, what security can there be if members of the Government are going to disregard their solemn obligations because of a matter of political expediency? In his opening remarks, the Attorney-General said that nothing would be done to prejudice employment; then he went on to say or imply that nothing had been done to prejudice employment and that he did not know the percentage of persons who had not been absorbed.

I should imagine that a member of the legal profession—as the Attorney-General has been—would try to get his facts right before he made statements; and I should think he would have found out what percentage of unemployment had not been absorbed into industry because of the actions of his Government before he made the statement that nothing had been done to prejudice employment.

By way of interjection I asked the Attorney-General, "Why would it not be possible for the Government, or any Government, to go to a bank and float a loan or an overdraft on its assets, just the same as an ordinary person who had an asset to monetize can do? Why should it be necessary to sell State instrumentalities in order to get money to build schools?" If a farmer wanted to get a loan from his bank in order to develop part of his land, would he sell another portion? Of course not. He would go to the bank and get a loan upon his assets.

I submit that we could do it in exactly the same way with State finance without any trouble at all. If it is possible for an ordinary individual to go to a bank and monetize on his assets it should be possible for a Government to do the same, because it has the welfare of the people in its charge.

Mr. Watts: Read section 105 of the Australian Constitution and see what you will find there.

Mr. ROWBERRY: It should be more than possible.

Mr. Watts: It should be, but it is not.

Mr. ROWBERRY: The assets of the Rural and Industries Bank have grown in the last few years to the extent of £25,000,000. I submit that in regard to the selling of State instrumentalities this Government has not only disappointed this side of the House and the people it represents, but it has disappointed its own friends.

The member for West Perth has already quoted in the House a leading article from *The West Australian* of today; and it is not my desire to repeat it except for one sentence, which is as follows:—

Instead of sparring with the Opposition the Government should say what it is going to do and clear itself of imputations of deceit.

I was disappointed in the speech of the Attorney-General.

Mr. W. Hegney: You were not the only one.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I did think at the outset that he indicated he intended to tell us exactly what the Government was going to do in regard to the issue of a proclamation under the Electoral Districts Act of 1947; but he got so mixed up with his own quibbling, that he forgot what he set out to do, unless it was to confuse the issue and to justify himself in the eyes of the Government. He acts as the Government's legal adviser, and that is possibly why *The West Australian* newspaper is getting concerned about this coalition Government and who is controlling it. I would again suggest to the Government that it stop sparring and, as the member who just resumed his seat said, try a little bit of honesty.

I am particularly interested in the imputation from members of the Government, and particularly the Ministers, that all this trouble has been caused by agitation—by Communist agitation. I resent that imputation—and resent it severely. If there have been any great measures taken to prevent Communism becoming a force in this State they have come from the Labor Party, and the Labor Party alone. That is one of the reasons why I adhere to its principles. Should the members of the Government, in upholding private enterprise, get their way, they would prepare the ground for Communism in this country, and we would soon have our people so disgusted and full of fear and apprehension that they would turn to anything for their bread and butter.

I was interested to hear the Minister for Railways in his very plausible explanation state that no-one would be disturbed or lose his job under this Government. He also said that we were completely out of touch with the rank and file. Since the advertisement in *The West Australian* some time ago indicated the Government's intention to dispose of State instrumentalities by calling tenders, great fear, apprehension, and doubt have

existed in the minds of men in many of the towns in my electorate, especially those men who are employed in the State Sawmills. It is on their behalf that I raise my voice in support of this amendment.

It has been said that there is no intention on the part of the Government to dispose of anyone. As a matter of fact, last year I asked a series of questions of the Minister for Railways in regard to a guarantee that the same state of employment at the sawmills would prevail after their sale as before, and he gave me some assurance that no-one would be sacked or put off. This evening I asked the Premier a question in regard to this matter and he gave this answer—

The Pemberton State sawmill is a trading concern as part of the overall State Building Supplies operations and no undertaking that the number of men employed at Pemberton will not be reduced can or should be given.

That is in direct contrast to the assurance that was given in answer to my previous question. How can we trust members of the Government who say one thing one day and another thing the next, and then blame the Opposition for causing fear and apprehension in these people's minds? The Government has created this fear and apprehension not only in the minds of the working people but also in the minds of their own friends and supporters who are employed in these State trading concerns. I have heard of this fear from the executive staff, from managers, and from all ranks; and these people ask if I can give them any idea as to whether the Government intends to dispose of these State instrumentalities and when they might be disposed of.

Members will recall the day after the last elections in March of 1959, and all will remember the Ides of March. Talking of Shakespeare, some of us learned Shakespeare because we loved the language, and because we took the opportunity of improving ourselves in the dark and silent hours by burning the candle at both ends, in contrast to some of the members of the Government who were set Shakespeare to learn as a task and who have hated it ever since. Some members will remember the play which refers to the Ides of March when Mark Antony—who could be called an agitator and who would probably be branded as a Communist in these days—stirred up the populace by his speech in which he told them of the circumstances of the death of Caesar. He then went on to tell them the consequences of the death of Caesar "when you and I and all of us fall down by this bloody treason flourished over us"; and that is just about the situation today.

I was going to mention that the Minister for Railways, in his plausible way, stated that we were responsible for stirring up fears and apprehensions; that we were responsible for the advertisement for the

sale of the State instrumentalities; that we were responsible for depriving the workers at Midland Junction of the work which they should logically have had; and that we were responsible for all the shortcomings of this Government. He also said that there should be no fear at all in the minds of the people at Pemberton. That has also been repeated in another place. It was stated that this is just a Communist conception.

I quote from a letter written by the Minister for Railways. Among other things, he said in reply to a letter written to him by the secretary of a committee set up in Pemberton to try to persuade the Government not to reduce the work force and earning capacity of the mill at Pemberton—

It is regretted that one organisation within your committee has seen fit to approach the matter on a purely political basis.

How silly can one get? If this is not a political issue, I would like to know exactly what it is. What are we talking about it for? Why do we bring it to Parliament? What are politics and what are the political aspects, in any case? To continue the letter—

This certainly does not assist the committee in its efforts at a time when it will be desirous of keeping as close as possible to the Government to assist in ensuring that when a sale is finally negotiated, it is negotiated on a basis calculated to achieve the greatest long term good for Pemberton.

Members can see the implication. "Unless you do as the Minister tells you; unless you bow the knee to the Minister; or if you say one wrong word against the Minister, then the terms of the sale will be detrimental to Pemberton." That is implied in every word of the letter.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Mr. Court: That is not so.

Mr. ROWBERRY: The letter goes on—

Be this as it may, the Government can be relied upon to have full regard for the significance of the present township development and its dependence on sawmilling activities.

Then—

Regardless of whether the mill continues in private or State ownership, an early decision will have to be made regarding the present uneconomical double shift.

Yet we had an assurance this very night that nothing will be done to dispose of this double shift. Is the Minister in touch with Cabinet? Does Cabinet know what the Minister is writing? How can the Minister stand up in this House and accuse members on this side of stirring up fear and apprehension in the minds of the

people, when he writes things like this to a public committee—that the shift will be disposed of? What will happen if the shift is disposed of? Approximately 120 men will get the sack.

Mr. Court: I did not say the shift would be disposed of.

Mr. ROWBERRY: But the Minister implied it by the words "uneconomical double shift." Why mention it at all?

Mr. Court: Well, it is uneconomical.

Mr. ROWBERRY: If the Minister does not want to stir up fear, resentment, and apprehension, why mention it at this juncture? Why be so indignant about members on this side of the House, and accuse them of stirring up fear, resentment, and apprehension, and yet put things like that in a letter which becomes public immediately?

Mr. Court: It was a public letter.

Mr. ROWBERRY: No; it was not.

Mr. Court: It was to a public committee.

Mr. ROWBERRY: The Minister probably did not know, when he made the accusation that we were in touch with the common people; and that immediately the advertisement appeared in the paper meetings were called throughout the district and I was invited to go and address them. They were not called at my instigation. As a matter of fact, some people say that when members of Parliament come down here they sit in easy seats, become complacent, and forget all about the people who put them there, and the interests of their districts. That is in direct contrast to the allegation made by the Minister for Railways.

In dealing with this subject I am liable to allow my feelings to run away with me; but I think that is permissible and forgivable, for, after all, when the Government deprives people of their livelihood—and it is possible that this can be done; and in the letter it is implied that it will be done because a decision will be made on the "uneconomical" double shift—one becomes concerned about it. However, I do not believe that the double shift is uneconomical. As far as costs are concerned, if a mill were worked for 24 hours of the day the over-all cost would be less than if it were worked for one shift. By the same process of reasoning it is more economical to work a double shift in one mill than it is to work one shift. With one shift the machinery is worked for eight hours, and then it stands idle, rests, and wastes away for the other 16. Probably the Minister is not aware of that.

All he does is look at costs, and the costs and the losses of the mill at Pemberton have been reflected in the town. It is not only the working people who are concerned about this; everybody is concerned. The

feeling is general; the feeling of disgust and disappointment in respect of this Government is general and well-founded. I cannot say any more. If the Minister still intends to stick to his attitude that this fear and resentment is being stirred up by Communists or fellow travellers on this side of the House, I say this to him: The reply will come in approximately 18 months' time when I believe the people will have become so disgusted with the activities, or the lack of activities of this Government while in office, that there will be a deluge and a sweep to the other side. Then a Labor Government will be returned to office.

Also, I think it should be understood—in fact, it should be implied in the contract of sale—that if these State trading concerns are sold we on this side are pledged to return them to State ownership, and it would be an act of insincerity, to say the least, if the Government did not make that point known to prospective buyers. The policy of the Government with regard to the disposal of State trading concerns and instrumentalities, to my mind, shows a complete lack of faith in the potentiality of this State. I can well imagine what happened when the Minister for Railways met prospective investors overseas—kindly, courteous, and benevolent gentlemen like Sir Halford Reddish, against whom no-one can say a word in case he does not come here!

Those who come to this State to invest in industry here, or who come here to start industries, do not do so because they like us, or because they are benevolently disposed towards the State; they come here because there is the opportunity of making profits. Those are not my words; they are the words of an eminent American whom I met while he was touring the South-West recently. In the newspaper he was quoted as saying that having seen the North-West he would recommend it to prospective American investors who wanted to invest their money in this State. I posed this question to him: "Having now seen the South-West, would you also make a similar recommendation?" He replied, "It is not a question of liking a country; it is not a question of benevolence; these are hard-headed business men and they look to where they are going to make a profit."

I would remind the Minister of that statement. These people do not come here because they like us; they do not come here because the scenery is good; they do not come here because they are benevolently inclined towards all mankind, and because the milk of human kindness runs through their breasts. Of course not! They come here to make profits and nothing else.

Mr. O'Connor: Do you think we should discourage them from coming here?

Mr. ROWBERRY: I would be the last person to discourage anyone from coming here and investing money in Western Australia, provided that we have as much control over the profits that are made as we have over the basic wage every quarter. We should control profits, because it is in the interests of our economy that profits should be controlled. Too much profit eventually denudes the economy.

It is like the farmer who ploughs back part of his earnings into the land. Unfortunately, private enterprise is not like this. One of the reasons why I am in favour of State enterprises is that the money spent and which is supposed to be lost in private enterprise is circulated throughout the country and stimulates the economy. Where do the profits that are made by private enterprise go? They go into the pockets of the shareholders and are drawn away from the economy. This is one of the principal causes of inflation, about which I will have something to say on the Address-in-Reply just in case you are going to stop me, Mr. Speaker, and ask me to keep to the amendment.

The SPEAKER: I was on the point of doing that, because the honourable member's remarks do not seem to have much point as far as the amendment is concerned.

Mr. ROWBERRY: I can appreciate your attitude, Mr. Speaker, and the attitude of members on the other side of the Chamber. However, as I will have an opportunity later to have something to say on that, I wish to conclude by stating that no matter whether an enterprise makes a loss or a profit the same people have to pay for it; whether they are called taxpayers or consumers. It does not matter which; they are still the same people.

The hour is getting late and I know that the Government intends to conclude the debate on the amendment tonight and there are still some speakers on this side of the House. I conclude by reiterating my support of the amendment and uttering my disgust at the action of the Government which has been responsible for it.

MR. J. HEGNEY (Middle Swan—on amendment) [11.12]: I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying something in support of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The first part of the amendment deals with the fact that the Attorney-General, when introducing an amending Bill to the Electoral Districts Act last session made certain statements which, in effect, amounted to an undertaking that if that Bill was not passed the existing law would come into operation. That would mean that under that Act, a proclamation would be issued to effect a redistribution of seats which unquestionably is required in this State,

having regard to the unbalance of the number of electors in several electorates in this State.

The charge against the Government and the Attorney-General is that they have failed to keep faith with Parliament and so far no indication has been given by them that they intend to keep faith. We can therefore come to no other conclusion than that the Government does not intend to issue the proclamation which will enable the existing law to be put into effect.

In the history of Western Australia, so far as the redistribution of seats legislation is concerned, it is a fact that no Labor Government has had any influence on the redistribution of electoral boundaries. Since I have been a member of this House several Labor Governments have submitted amendments to the existing legislation, but unfortunately for them they have failed to obtain the necessary majority to pass those Bills. The provisions of the legislation introduced by the McLarty-Watts Government are the provisions which govern the electoral position of the State today. Therefore, it is a law that has been enacted by a Government of the same political colour as the present Government, but it is failing to give effect to it.

Members know full well that last session the Attorney-General introduced a Bill to amend the Electoral Districts Act because there was criticism levelled at the outgoing Government as a result of issuing a proclamation in its dying hours of office. Therefore, the object of this Government, when it assumed office, was to revoke that proclamation, and it did. On that occasion the Attorney-General indicated to Parliament that if the Government was not successful in having the Act amended there was no doubt that the redistribution of seats legislation would take effect.

The Attorney-General, as the Leader of the Government in this matter, has given no indication, however, that the existing law will be implemented. *The West Australian*, which is the mouthpiece of the present Government; which extols its virtues; which builds it up and issues directions as to what it shall do or shall not do, in today's leading article has expressed the view that notwithstanding what the Labor Government did, the Government of the day should allow the law to take its course. That is the gravamen of the charge laid here tonight. That is one of the reasons for the moving of the amendment.

I now direct my remarks to the other part of the amendment dealing with the Midland Junction Workshops and what has happened there since the present Government assumed office. There is no doubt that the Government has destroyed the goodwill that existed among the

workers in the Midland Junction Workshops. Tonight the Minister for Railways endeavoured to justify his attitude by pointing out that members on this side of the House had stimulated propaganda to create dissatisfaction in the minds of the workers employed at the workshops. That is not so. I have a brother who works there and also several nephews who are apprentices at the workshops. I have therefore close contact with the workers at Midland Junction, and I know that this propaganda which the Minister has accused us of stimulating has not emanated from us, but from the men themselves.

I attend a meeting at Midland Junction once a fortnight; and, for the most part, railway workers are represented at those meetings. I have heard their criticism of the Government and the expression of their feelings in regard to how it is undermining the Midland Junction Workshops. In many ways we seem to be going backwards in this State. The Midland Junction Workshops was the training ground for a great many apprentices in various trades. It is the largest employer of labour in the State, and it has the best engineering workshops in Western Australia. When young men leave the Midland Junction Workshops they are so competent that they are capable of turning their hands to any general type of engineering work, and ultimately they become specialists.

I graduated from the Midland Junction Workshops as a boilermaker. The boiler-making trade is not easy; there is a lot of hard work attached to it. In this State there is, and always has been, a dearth of boilermakers in the workshops and in outside industry. There is always a great deal of concern about being able to obtain a sufficient number of boilermakers when there is any increased activity in the workshops. We cannot afford to have men driven to the Eastern States and to other places away from the Midland Junction Workshops.

We have heard the statement on many occasions that there is a dearth of skilled tradesmen in the State today. If the Government continues with its present policy, we will have the spectacle of the Commonwealth's immigration policy being used to bring allegedly skilled men from other parts of the world for the purpose of supplying the needs of the labour market in this State. We are losing young men who are the best tradesmen we have, and who are our best citizens. These men are gradually drifting away to Eastern Australia. Many of them leave the State, obtain good employment; and, after a few years, in the ordinary course of events they meet a girl, subsequently get married, and stay in Eastern Australia, never returning to this State at all. I know many men who have done that.

As a matter of fact, when I was a young man, a young married fellow who had gone with me to Eastern Australia—we

having left the State to gain further experience—never returned. He was one of the most capable men and had a first-rate education, but he never returned to Western Australia, although his relatives were at Cottesloe. I know others who have drifted away in similar fashion. This is particularly so when there is no opportunity for men to apply themselves to a better type of work, other than purely maintenance work for which many men are available. There are men capable of undertaking higher forms of employment; they prefer to do that type of work because it stimulates their interest and their intelligence.

So far as the men in that industry are concerned, their criticism of the Government is well justified. Over the years, the majority of the men in charge of the workshops have come from the ranks, and many have graduated to become civil engineers. I go back over a long period. Some men graduated from the position of C.M.E. to that of Commissioner of Railways. They had the business at their fingertips.

The undoing of the railways took place when the McLarty-Watts Government had the law amended to provide for three commissioners instead of one. At that stage they brought in men from India and other parts of the world who were used to black labour. From that time on they undermined many of the activities of the workshops. The employees saw men coming from India to occupy higher positions; they felt they were being superseded and kept as understrappers. I mention that because a lot of the difficulties encountered by the railways, particularly at Midland Junction, can be traced back to that fact. We have now reverted to the single commissioner system, and I think the new Commissioner for Railways will be a first-rate man.

In my opinion, the men have a genuine complaint. It has emanated from the men themselves. These uncertain conditions have affected the business interests of Midland Junction, Bassendean, and the surrounding areas. Great concern is expressed at the diminishing number of men employed at the Midland Junction Workshops. The Minister said there would be no retrenchment; that the lack of balance which is stated to exist there would be adjusted by natural wastage; that is, when men retire, or when they leave to go elsewhere. This number can be estimated at about 200 men a year. If this situation continues for a few years, it can well be imagined how soon the work force in the Midland Junction Workshops will become depleted. That will be a very bad thing for the State.

The Midland Junction Workshops have been attacked on the ground that they are a socialistic enterprise. That is all hooey. They do not talk about the General Post Office being a socialistic enterprise; nor

do they attempt to undermine its efficiency. But that is what they propose to do in relation to the Midland Junction Workshops.

There is another State enterprise which the Government proposes to sell, and which has undoubtedly done a good job in the Fremantle area. I refer, of course, to the State Implement Works. In years gone by, there was practically no engineering activity associated with the waterfront, and most of the marine work there was done by the State Implement Works, by qualified men who had permanent jobs in those works. They became most competent in their particular sphere, and carried out repairs on overseas ships, and also on State ships. The ships would arrive requiring immediate attention, and the State Implement Works had the work force to attend to the jobs. Over the years they carried on and did good work.

The State Implement Works came into being at the time of the Scaddan Labour Government to help the farmers obtain cheap ploughs. They set out to benefit the farmers of this country and were in competition with Sunshine Harvesters and Massey Harris, and similar concerns. They have been an excellent industrial concern in Fremantle; and, rather than dispose of them, we should feel proud of them and endeavour to see that they continue to exist to serve the Fremantle area.

Another aspect of this amendment deals with the lack of attempts to control the upward trend in prices throughout the State. There is no doubt that the economic climate of this State, and of Australia generally, is experiencing great difficulty. Because the Commonwealth Arbitration Court granted increased margins to skilled workers engaged in the engineering industries—they were given 28 per cent. increase—industry proceeded to spread that to the consumer; and prices of essential commodities, including food and clothing, commenced to rise.

This is reflected in the "C" series index, which is used to decide what the basic wage for the ensuing term will be. Judges make their determination on the evidence submitted to them. They have recently agreed to a 28 per cent. marginal increase. It was never intended—and I am certain of this fact—that the margins granted to industrial workers should be applied to the top men in the Commonwealth Public Service, as has been done. As members know, there are certain men in the Commonwealth Public Service who are outside the scope of the Commonwealth Arbitrator; and in this instance they received the 28 per cent. marginal increase, which amounted in their case to £900.

There is no doubt the position has got out of hand altogether. Because the artisan proved his case in the court for increased margins, this has had repercussions throughout the economy; and,

consequently, prices have risen and the cost of living seems to be increasing all the time. It is obvious that the Government which occupies the Treasury Bench today is not making any effort to control the spiralling prices. It adopts a laissez faire attitude; that is, that things will take their own course and finally resolve themselves. But I do not know whether they will.

The Federal Leader of the Country Party visited this State recently. His statement to the Country Party conference on the question of increased prices and costs gave their members great concern. He pointed out that the Commonwealth Government disclaimed possession of any power to deal with increases in prices but said the State Governments had the power. What did we find here? In the last session of Parliament the Government repealed the only law which made an attempt to control prices. It got a majority and hurriedly passed a Bill in this House and in another place, repealing the only legislation which could restrain the people who exploited this State. There is considerable exploitation not only of consumers but of the business community generally.

This question of the increase in prices is getting out of hand in Australia, but there is no attempt by the Government to deal with it. Side by side is the question of cartels and combines, which are growing; and more and more wealth is being concentrated in their hands. They are getting control of many producing establishments in this country. In time they will have considerably more power, and that will have a bad effect on the country. The amendment to the Address-in-Reply is well justified. The Government is deserving of censure for not tackling these problems as they should be tackled.

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

Ayes—23.

Mr. Bickerton
Mr. Brady
Mr. Curran
Mr. Evans
Mr. Fletcher
Mr. Graham
Mr. Hall
Mr. Hawke
Mr. Heal
Mr. J. Hegney
Mr. W. Hegney
Mr. Jamieson

Mr. Kelly
Mr. Molr
Mr. Norton
Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Sewell
Mr. Toms
Mr. Tonkin
Mr. May

(Teller.)

Noes—24.

Mr. Bovell
Mr. Brand
Mr. Burt
Mr. Cornell
Mr. Court
Mr. Craig
Mr. Crommelin
Mr. Grayden
Mr. Guthrie
Dr. Henn
Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Lewis

Mr. W. A. Manning
Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Nalder
Mr. Nimmo
Mr. O'Connor
Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Owen
Mr. Perkins
Mr. Roberts
Mr. Watts
Mr. Wild
Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller.)

Pair.

No.

Mr. Andrew

Mr. Mann

Majority against—1.

Amendment thus negatived.

On motion by Mr. Evans, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 11.37 p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, the 10th August, 1960

CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	
Broome Bore Water : Salinity and pumping tests	286
Eastern Goldfields : Miners' rights	288
Garratt Road Bridge : Widening	286
Goldfields Roads : Improvements	287
Guildford Mental Hospital : Commencement of construction	286
Housing at Fremantle : Erection of one-unit flats	285
Inflation : Measures to halt trend	284
Metropolitan Transport Trust : Employees, revenue, and passengers	285
Roads : Improvements between Yalgoo, Mt. Magnet, Meekatharra and Wiluna	287
Sewerage : Extension in Edward Street, Bedford	285
South Kalgoorlie State School : Additional classrooms	285
State Government Insurance Office : Premiums and fire brigade contributions	286
ADDRESS-IN-REPLY : FOURTH DAY—	
Speaker on Address—	
The Hon. N. E. Baxter	288
ADJOURNMENT : SPECIAL	295

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

INFLATION

Measures to Halt Trend

1. The Hon. N. E. BAXTER asked the Minister for Mines:
 - (1) Is the Government concerned about the inflationary trend and its effect upon production costs?
 - (2) Would the Premier be prepared when attending the next Premiers' Conference to raise the question of the inflationary trend and request that all State Premiers and the Prime Minister agree on a policy to introduce complementary measures to endeavour to halt the