

# Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 18th August, 1960

## CONTENTS

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—	Page
Cancer Clinics : Establishment in Western Australia and Eastern States ....	564
Cannington Police Station : Erection ....	562
Collie Coal : Carbonisation ....	566
Dental Clinics—	
Assessment charts ....	563
Payments by pensioners for treatment	563
Kangaroo Meat : Inspection of exports ....	565
Milk : Sampling of producers' deliveries	565
Northampton Police : New quarters, station, and gaol ....	565
Pearl Culture : Issue of licenses ....	564
Railway Freights : Existing rates and proposed changes ....	561
Railway Station Officers : Training ground	562
Railway Traffic Manager's Office : Staff in 1959 and 1960 ....	562
Sales by Auction Act : Proclamation of section 7 ....	564
St. John of God Hospital, Subiaco : Government assistance for expansion ....	562
State Building Supplies : Loan fund allocations ....	562
State Purchase Homes : Arrears in type 79A houses ....	563
Suburban Railway Stations : Reduction of staff ....	562
Understandard Milk : Legislation to protect consumers ....	561
War Service Homes : Treatment for termite infestation ....	563
Water Rates : Uniform assessment basis	565
<b>QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE—</b>	
Water Rates : Method of assessment ....	566
<b>ADDRESS-IN-REPLY : NINTH DAY—</b>	
Speakers on Address as Amended—	
Mr. Toms ....	566
Mr. Bickerton ....	577
Mr. O'Connor ....	584
Mr. Owen ....	586
Speaker on Amendment—	
Mr. Hawke ....	571

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### RAILWAY FREIGHTS

#### Existing Rates and Proposed Changes

1. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) What is the present freight on the following items from Perth to Meekatharra—
  - (a) cement;
  - (b) fencing post (steel) and wire;
  - (c) chaff and hay;
  - (d) groceries?

- (2) What is the present freight per drum of petrol or distillate from Geraldton to Meekatharra?
- (3) What is the present freight per ton Meekatharra to Fremantle on wool?
- (4) What is the present freight rate per bogie truck from Meekatharra to Midland Junction on—
  - (a) cattle;
  - (b) sheep?
- (5) Will he advise the freight which will be charged in all cases referred to in (1), (2), (3), and (4) when new rates come into operation?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Present Freight Rates—
  - (a) 111s. 2d. per ton (wagon-load consignment).
  - (b) 111s. 2d. per ton (wagon-load consignments).
  - (c) (i) Chaff 111s. 2d. per ton (wagon-load consignments).
  - (ii) Hay 148s. 8d. per ton (wagon-load consignments).
  - (d) 347s. 11d. and 271s. 4d. (according to classification).
- (2) Present Freight Rates—
  - 41s. Petrol.
  - 34s. 5d. Distillate.
- (3) Present Freight Rate—
  - 216s. 3d.
- (4) Present Freight Rates—
  - (a) £78 12s. 6d. per TA wagon.
  - (b) £55 11s. 6d. for 2 CX wagons.
- (5) Rates applicable, the 1st September, 1960—
  - (1) (a) 127s. 6d. per ton.
  - (b) 127s. 6d. per ton.
  - (c) (i) 127s. 6d. per ton.
  - (ii) 127s. 6d. per ton.
  - (d) 284s. 6d. per ton (classification grouped).
  - (2) 31s. 2d. (based on 5-ton consignment).
  - 31s. 2d. (based on 5-ton consignment).
  - (3) 233s.
  - (4) (a) £88 14s. per TA wagon.
  - (b) £62 13s. for 2CX wagons.

2. This question was postponed.

### UNDERSTANDARD MILK

#### Legislation to Protect Consumers

3. Mr. ROWBERRY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) In view of the inability of the Milk Board to protect consumers legally from producers who supply whole milk with a solids-not-fat

deficiency, is it the Government's intention to introduce legislation to give the Milk Board this power during this session?

- (2) If so, will he indicate what steps he intends to take to protect the milk consumers of this State?
- (3) Will he consider amending the Health Act to give the Milk Board the status of a local authority with power to make by-laws under the Act?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) and (2) Yes, by measures to ensure that only milk conforming to legal standards under the Health Act is supplied to consumers.
- (3) In view of No. (1) and No. (2), such measures will not be necessary.

### STATE BUILDING SUPPLIES

#### *Loan Fund Allocations*

4. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Treasurer:

- (1) What was the allocation of loan funds to the State Building Supplies for each of the last five financial years?
- (2) What was the interest per cent. paid by the State to the Commonwealth for each of the last five financial years?
- (3) What was the interest per cent. paid by the State Building Supplies to the Treasury for each of the last five financial years?

Mr. WATTS (for Mr. Brand) replied:

Year	£
(1) 1955-1956	130,241
1956-1957	150,000
1957-1958	128,300
1958-1959	135,000
1959-1960	70,000

- (2) The average interest rate over the last five years was—

Year.	Per Cent.
1955-1956	3.629
1956-1957	3.909
1957-1958	4.096
1958-1959	4.170
1959-1960	4.223

- (3) In 1955-56 a rate of 4 per cent. was paid and for each year since 1956-57 the rate has been  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. per annum.

### CANNINGTON POLICE STATION

#### *Erection*

5. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) Is it proposed to build a police station in Cannington this financial year?
- (2) If so, when is it estimated that a start will be made on same?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

- (1) and (2): It is proposed to build a police station at Cannington as soon as loan funds can be made available, but no indication can be given at present as to when this will be.

### RAILWAY TRAFFIC MANAGER'S OFFICE

#### *Staff in 1959 and 1960*

6A. Mr. CURRAN asked the Minister for Railways:

What was the total staff employed in the Chief Traffic Manager's office on the 1st July, 1959, and the 1st July, 1960, and, of these, how many were junior clerks?

Mr. COURT replied:

The 1st July, 1959—total staff 102, including 11 junior clerks.  
The 1st July, 1960—total staff 103, including 12 junior clerks.

### RAILWAY STATION OFFICERS

#### *Training Ground*

6B. Mr. CURRAN asked the Minister for Railways:

Would he agree that the best training ground for future station officers is at the station, and not the head offices?

Mr. COURT replied:

Yes, to the extent that the exigencies of the service will allow having regard for—

- (a) the necessity for education on railway subjects;
- (b) the demand for junior assistance;
- (c) the avoidance as far as possible of requiring juniors to live away from home.

### SUBURBAN RAILWAY STATIONS

#### *Reduction of Staff*

6C. Mr. CURRAN asked the Minister for Railways:

Has he issued any instructions to the commissioner that staff at suburban stations are to be reduced?

Mr. COURT replied:

No.

### ST. JOHN OF GOD HOSPITAL, SUBIACO

#### *Government Assistance for Expansion*

7. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Treasurer:

- (1) Is the Government granting any financial assistance in respect of the extensions being made to St. John of God Hospital, Subiaco?

(2) If so—

- (a) what is the basis of the Government's contribution, and the amount involved;
- (b) when will the payments be made;
- (c) is there a similar policy in respect of all new and extended private hospitals?

Mr. WATTS (for Mr. Brand) replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) (a) The Government will meet interest on money borrowed for the extensions subject to the following limitations:

- (i) Maximum interest to be recouped is 6½ per cent. per annum. Any excess above 6½ per cent. is the responsibility of the hospital.
- (ii) The hospital is required to make annual reductions of principal of £20,000.
- (iii) The maximum period for which interest will be paid is limited to 20 years.
- (iv) Amount involved in interest payments for full term of 20 years is approximately £260,000.
- (b) The first interest payment of £639 15s. 2d. was made during August, 1960.
- (c) A similar policy for approved projects applies for non-governmental hospitals.

This policy was laid down by the previous Government and continued by the present Government.

## STATE PURCHASE HOMES

### *Arrears in Type 79A Houses*

8. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) Referring to the answers to question No. 22 on the 16th August, of the 136 cases where a deposit of less than £50 had been made, how many were in respect of type 79A houses?
- (2) What was the extent of arrears in these cases—
  - (a) under £40;
  - (b) over £40?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to group questions Nos. 8 and 19 together, as they are linked. The matters referred to by the honourable member in question No. 8 are incorporated with, and cover the same subject matter

as question No. 19, also asked by the honourable member. I should like to postpone the answers to both these questions, and they will be given next week.

## WAR SERVICE HOMES

### *Treatment for Termite Infestation*

9. Mr. O'NEIL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What percentage of homes built by or for the War Service Homes Division of the State Housing Commission of Western Australia since 1950 have been treated for termite infestation within two years of construction?
- (2) How does the commission arrange for the treatment of homes so infested?
- (3) How is the treatment financed?
- (4) Has the treatment been entirely satisfactory?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

As the questions concern a matter covered by Commonwealth legislation, in accordance with Commonwealth Government policy answers will be given to the honourable member by letter.

## DENTAL CLINICS

### *Assessment Charts*

10. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has the Dental Hospital an assessment proportion chart for use in the metropolitan and country dental clinics?
- (2) If so, is the assessment proportion chart displayed at clinics or advertised in any way?
- (3) What effect does income have upon families desiring dental treatment at a dental clinic in unit families of one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, or eight?

### *Payments by Pensioners for Treatment*

- (4) What will be the effect on pensioners desiring dental treatment as a result of the increase in the pension rate?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No.
- (3) A family unit value according to the number of dependent members in the family and the weekly income are applied to the chart. This will reveal—
  - (a) Whether the family is eligible for treatment or not.
  - (b) If eligible, what percentage of the hospital's scale of contribution will apply.
- (4) No variation.

## CANCER CLINICS

### *Establishment in Western Australia and Eastern States*

11. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Health:

- (1) What steps are being taken by the Government for the establishing of cancer detection clinics in Western Australia?
- (2) What detection clinics exist in other States of Australia, where are they situated, and in which States?
- (3) Are the established cancer clinics assisted financially by their respective Governments?
- (4) Have approaches been made by organised bodies to the Government for establishment of cancer clinics in this State?
- (5) If so, did such organisations making the approach offer assistance to the Government?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) The main activity in cancer detection undertaken directly by the Government is the compulsory chest X-ray survey which detects lung cancer in addition to tuberculosis and other diseases.
- (2) There are detection clinics in Sydney, Melbourne, and Tasmania.
- (3) Yes. Directly or indirectly.
- (4) and (5) Approaches have not been made to the Government but a unit has been set up in the Royal Perth Hospital by the Obstetrical Division of the Medical School and receives financial support from the Cancer Council. This unit will explore the field of early detection of female genital cancer and if results justify it further development of clinics will be considered.

## SALES BY AUCTION ACT

### *Proclamation of Section 7*

12. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is he aware of that part of section 7 of the Sales by Auction Act wherein it provides that in so far as it relates to wool, it shall not come into force until a day to be fixed by proclamation?
- (2) Will he take steps to have this portion of the Act proclaimed?
- (3) If not, why not?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) and (3) Whilst wool is sold by auction, it is considered desirable to have uniform conditions throughout Australia. The question of selling wool by auction was

raised by me at the meeting of the Agricultural Council last month. Agreement has been reached between buyers', brokers' and growers' organisations for the conduct of auction sales so as to further safeguard growers' interests. These measures will be introduced in Western Australia at the next sales. The effect of those proposals will be watched during the current series of sales, both here and in other States.

## PEARL CULTURE

### *Issue of Licenses*

13. Mr. KELLY asked the Minister for Fisheries:

- (1) Is it the policy of the Government to issue an unlimited number of pearl culture licenses? If so, what factors are taken into consideration to constitute eligibility?
- (2) Has he caused a survey to be taken of the market potential of culture pearls? If so, with what result?
- (3) If not, can he inform the House whether, in fact, a keen demand exists for cultured pearls of the variety produced at Kuri Bay?
- (4) Is it anticipated that production at Exmouth Gulf and King Sound, when fully developed, will approximate in each case, quantities similar to Kuri Bay?
- (5) How many licenses are held by Pearls Proprietary Ltd.?
- (6) Was this firm encouraged to expand its operations?
- (7) What is the estimated annual value of culture pearls produced by Pearls Proprietary Ltd.?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) No. Each application is considered on its merits.
- (2) No survey has been made.
- (3) The information available to me indicates that no difficulty is encountered in disposing of good culture pearls.
- (4) The operations at Exmouth Gulf and King Sound will, at the outset, be largely experimental. The potential of these areas is as yet unknown.
- (5) One.
- (6) Pearls Proprietary Ltd. has not yet reached the limit of expansion at Kuri Bay. No encouragement has been given as suggested.
- (7) No Government finance is involved in this venture, and the Government therefore has no knowledge of the value of the harvest.

**NORTHAMPTON POLICE***New Quarters, Station, and Gaol*

14. Mr. SEWELL asked the Minister for Police:

When will work commence on new police quarters, police station, and gaol at Northampton?

Mr. PERKINS replied:

When loan funds can be made available, but no indication of any date is possible at present.

**MILK***Sampling of Producers' Deliveries*

15. Mr. O'CONNOR asked the Minister for Health:

In view of the small number of samples taken by the Nedlands City Council and the Fremantle City Council, will he give instructions either to the local health authorities or to the Department of Public Health that regular sampling of producers' milk delivered to the milk treatment depots in these cities be carried out?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The local authorities will be approached with a view to obtaining these samples.

**KANGAROO MEAT***Inspection of Exports*

16. Mr. BURT asked the Minister for Health:

In view of a report published in the daily Press recently that kangaroo meat exported from Australia had arrived overseas in a nauseating and spoilt condition, will he take the necessary action to ensure that future consignments of kangaroo meat, intended for human consumption, are adequately inspected to prevent any repetition of such deterioration?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

The examination of meat exported from Australia for human consumption is a function of the Commonwealth Government. So far the Commonwealth Government has not included kangaroo meat in the category of meat inspected for export.

**WATER RATES***Uniform Assessment Basis*

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

- (1) What were the districts which, at the 17th May, 1960, were valued at 75 per cent. of the net rental value the same as all business properties?

- (2) As (according to his statement in reply to questions on Thursday, the 11th August) "It was the accepted policy at the time" to rate residential properties at 60 per cent. of the net rental value, and business premises at 75 per cent. of the net rental value in 1953, how did it occur that there was a departure from the policy with regard to the districts which are the subject of No. (1)?

- (3) Was ministerial approval given for this departure from policy?

- (4) If so, will he table the relevant minute?

- (5) As he has stated that the 17th May, 1960, was the date on which ministerial approval was given to remove the difference in the levels of assessment of valuations as between residential and business premises, how was he able to inform the Legislative Assembly on the 4th August that the previous Minister had done "exactly the same" seven years before?

- (6) If the anomalies referred to in the minute of the 13th August, 1953, which was quoted by him in the Legislative Assembly on the 4th August, 1960, meant the difference in levels of assessment as between residential and business properties, will he explain how such anomalies still existed in 1960 despite a ministerial request to the Under-Secretary in 1953 to speed up the valuations?

- (7) Is it not a fact that subsequent to the ministerial request of the 13th August, 1953, all districts had been revalued at least once before the Brand Government took office?

- (8) If not, which districts had not been revalued?

- (9) If the reply to No. (7) is in the affirmative, how did it occur that the anomalies (which the speeding-up of revaluations was done to remove) were still in existence in May of this year as he avers?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1) Fremantle City Council—City Ward.  
Perth City Council—North Ward, South Ward, East Ward, West Ward, Central Ward.  
Cockburn Road Board.  
Kwinana Road Board.  
North Fremantle Municipality.  
Guildford.  
Swan Road Board.  
Darling Range Road Board.  
Armada.

- (2) Portions of districts taken over from municipalities and the road districts in question were considered to be already on a 75 per cent level on a previous review, and this level was maintained.
- (3) No.
- (4) Answered by No. (3).
- (5) Reference to the quotation in question on page 184 of *Hansard* No. 2 clearly shows that a wrong inference is being placed on the words spoken, and confirmation of this is given by a subsequent statement in a similar strain on the same page.
- (6) During the first cycle of valuation reviews, which commenced in 1952-1953, the situation became further complicated by the lifting of rent restrictions and the undertaking of municipal valuations for departmental purposes. Under these circumstances progress towards uniformity was retarded.
- (7) Yes.
- (8) Answered by No. (7).
- (9) Answered by No. (6).

### COLLIE COAL

#### *Carbonisation*

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

- (1) Has the question of commercial carbonisation of Collie coal been investigated; and if so, what conclusions have been arrived at?
- (2) Will he agree to lay the file dealing with this subject on the Table of the House?
- (3) If no investigations have been made, why not?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) Yes. Lurgi Co. was engaged to investigate the matter. Investigations indicated the proposition was technically sound but commercially dependent on export markets.

The local market could not absorb the product from the smallest economic unit as recommended by the Lurgi Co.

- (2) Yes, for one week. Other files dealing with technical data are at the Government Chemical Laboratories and are in action. The honourable member can inspect these if he so desires.

- (3) Answered by No. (1).  
I would like to make it clear that these papers do not cover the current application from the Griffin Coal Mining Co. to the Mines Department and which is at present before the Treasury

because, for obvious reasons, it is of a confidential nature at this point of time.

Mr. MAY: I did not know the company had made an application.

Mr. COURT: It made a statement in the Press.

*The papers were tabled.*

19. *This question was postponed.*

### QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

#### WATER RATES

##### *Method of Assessment*

Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Did the Government, through the Minister for Water Supplies, appoint a committee to consider the practicability of an alternative method or alternative methods of assessing water charges?
- (2) If so, when is a report likely to be made?
- (3) When the report is made, would he be kind enough to table it for the information of members?

Mr. WILD replied:

- (1), (2), and (3) Yes, a committee was formed. I am expecting to receive its report within the next two or three weeks. When I receive it, I will then consider whether it will be tabled.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

#### *Ninth Day*

Debate resumed from the 17th August.

MR. TOMS (Maylands) [2.33]: In taking this opportunity of speaking to the Address-in-Reply debate, at the outset I want to say that in *The West Australian* of Tuesday, the 19th January, 1960, there was a very interesting article, and I intend to quote the heading of it to the members of this House. It is as follows:—

Business men Told: Develop Killer Instinct

By some unusual twist of fate—because it is most unusual for *The West Australian* to place two such items so close together—in the very next column we read that there are 2,538 unemployed Western Australians. I believe there is a real tie-up in the words used by the Minister in this article and in the column alongside it.

Mr. J. Hegney: Which Minister used the words?

Mr. TOMS: The article goes on to say—

Industrial Development Minister Court yesterday called on the industrialists to develop a killer instinct in business to enable successful competition at home and abroad.

It would appear that the implication in that particular article has been taken very much to heart by all members on the other side of the Chamber. Unfortunately, this is the first time in my experience that I have had knowledge of a Government with such scant regard for ethics and human welfare. The figures which, of course, are quoted alongside in the Canberra statement, represent people who are unemployed. It is indeed a sad state of affairs in a State such as ours that there should be any unemployed. I realise that there are a few people who are unemployable; but in the majority of cases, every working man seeks only the right to live by using his hands or his brains and receiving adequate compensation for so doing.

However, in these days of soaring prices and high costs, even a week out of employment imposes a severe strain on a family man; and also it is most difficult for any single person to exist when he is drawing only £3 5s. a week in unemployment benefits, because this is barely sustenance. However, this is the state of affairs that this Government is hell-bent on creating. Such is its disregard for human welfare that it is prepared to foster and give every benefit to big business in such a way that it totally disregards the families of these unemployed men.

I would now like to speak on a subject that I referred to last year. This concerns the day-labour organisation of the Public Works Department. For many years this organisation has been an established part of this State's development, and rightly so. Indeed, it has become such an integral part of our developmental system that it is difficult to imagine Western Australia being without it. In this regard I believe a very badly-considered policy is being adopted by the present conservative Government by attempting to pass all building work over to private enterprise by way of tender and contract, thus throwing away the only real means of being able to ascertain at any point of time—if I may borrow a phrase from the Minister for Industrial Development—what is reasonable value for the work performed.

Surely we, not only as taxpayers, but also as custodians of the taxpayers' money, are duty bound to ensure that not only quantity but also quality is received for Government money which is spent. Under the contract system, in times of boom prices become exorbitant for all building work. In periods of depression, extreme price-cutting takes place, with the result that work becomes shoddy, the standard of the workers deteriorates, and many of the smaller contractors and builders are forced out of business and often into bankruptcy. However, with the day-labour system and the subcontract system working side by side, prices are keen and quality is maintained. This has been the method used since the last war.

As a matter of fact, it was only the inadequacy and the inability of private enterprise after the conclusion of the last war which brought the day-labour organisation into being, and it was eventually expanded as a necessary consequence in order to cope with the work offering. The Minister for Works, at one time, made the statement that both the day-labour organisation of the Public Works Department and the contract system could work side by side.

I do not know whether big business has had the whip out, but it would appear so; because he has totally disregarded, now, the ideal which he thought was possible then. It is desirable and necessary that the day-labour organisation of the Public Works Department be retained, particularly when we consider the tremendous amount of public works required to be done in this State, such as the building of homes, hospitals, schools, classrooms, and many other important and urgent works.

In the carrying out of these projects, public money is being used. It should be the constant and honest concern of any Government, worthy of the name of Government, to make sure that the best possible use is made of the funds collected from both loan and revenue. During the post-war years, Governments of both political parties built up a day-labour force of which they could be justly proud. Tradesmen belonging to all manner of crafts were called on; and they answered the call, and took on the job of catching up with the lag that had occurred during the war years.

I believe the men employed by the Public Works Department took great pride in their work, and assiduously adapted themselves to carrying out the programme. It has been said that in the early period after the war the men were not earning their money. That, however, was not the fault of the men; but, as has been pointed out by the member for Warren, it was the fault of management.

I remember the time when men on the job were waiting for the truck to pull up in order that they might grab a stick of timber to give themselves something to do. That was the state of affairs in those days. But, of course, with materials and supplies becoming more adequately available we found that the private builder was picking the eyes out of the work; and, finding tradesmen difficult to obtain, he approached various men in Government departments offering them what justly could be called a bribe, to leave the department in which they were working for the sake of an extra £2 or £3 a week, over and above what they were getting. They were offered this extra amount without being asked what they were getting. It was, of course, well known that the extra £2 or £3 could be picked up quite easily in those days.

As I have already indicated in this House, when I was in charge of the joinery shop in State Building Supplies, I had several offers made to me by private builders asking me to leave my job and go out with them for the purpose of taking out quantities, etc. Like other men, I resisted these approaches because we knew that the result could only be a forcing up of prices in the building industry. Surely no member in this House would be foolish enough to believe that today young couples have a bright future in front of them. This is particularly so when one considers the cost of land. Even in the outer suburban areas it is difficult to obtain a block of land for less than £500; and if we add to that an amount of £2,500 or £3,000 which would be the cost of a modest cottage these days; and take into account the price for furnishings, we will have some idea of just what these young people are up against.

A young couple on £20 a week, let alone the basic wage, would have a job ahead of them to meet these costs, even if they could get money loaned them at 5½ per cent. interest. But what of the future? Despite an increase in the population, the work force in the building industry is steadily decreasing. A number of factors may be contributing to this, the chief among which is subcontracting, and particularly the policy being pursued by the present Government in disbanding the Public Works Department day-labour system.

This is creating a degree of insecurity and instability in the building industry. It is creating a feeling of unrest, and is forcing tradesmen to seek other avenues of employment, even if it means their going outside the State. I know the Minister has ridiculed, from time to time, statements to the effect that tradesmen are leaving Western Australia. I believe, however, he is talking with his tongue in his cheek; because people who are closely associated with the trade union movement and with the membership consistent with that movement, know very well that we are losing tradesmen to the Eastern States. When speaking to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply last year, I issued a note of warning to the Government that the policy it was adopting could do only one thing; namely, leave the State short of tradesmen.

Mr. Court: How do you account for the fact that we have a record level of employment in this State?

Mr. TOMS: That is possibly due to the fact that 11,000 school children come out each year to be employed.

Mr. Court: The fact is we have a record number of people employed in this State.

Mr. TOMS: I daresay that children could be considered as people.

Mr. Court: The drift of tradesmen to the Eastern States has been stopped.

Mr. Hawke: When?

Mr. Nimmo: Yesterday.

Mr. Hawke: That is strange, coming from the member for Wembley Beaches.

Mr. TOMS: In the *Daily News* of the 1st April, 1960, we find the following:—

Western Australia Needs 1210 extra tradesmen.

I believe the member for Vasse would be interested in that aspect. Right alongside that, in the same edition, we find the following heading:—

Victorian Railways Applying for Personnel.

Mr. Court: So are New South Wales and most other States.

Mr. TOMS: And they are getting them; and getting them from Western Australia.

Mr. Court: How do you account for the fact that we have more employment today, and so many projects ahead of us that we are looking for migrants?

Mr. TOMS: The Minister would not find those particulars in St. George's Terrace or Dalkeith. The note of warning I issued last session is recorded in *Hansard*, Vol 1. I said that even though a prophet was not without honour save in his own country, I ventured to predict that there would be a lack of building tradesmen in this State. In the *Daily News* of Friday, the 12th August, we find under the following heading, "Building Boom—but Labour Problem":—

Perth is on the threshold of the greatest building boom in its history, but it has no available work force.

Employers have begun a concerted drive for skilled and unskilled labour from the Eastern States.

I would like to interpose here and say that I think they are only wasting their time; because some of our tradesmen who have been over East, and come back here, indicated to me they had no intention of returning to Western Australia with things as they are at present. Conditions are much better in the States to which they have gone. There they do not find the instability and insecurity which they experienced here. Wages and living conditions are much better over there. The article goes on to say—

But today, union leaders warned of a pending severe shortage of skilled labour for the multi-million building programme for the next two years.

They say there is no possible chance of finding, within Western Australia, anywhere near enough men for the work ahead.

But Employers' Federation director F. Cross said: "We'll get them, don't worry. They said we wouldn't get them for Kwinana, too."



I doubt the truth of the last portion of this article. What they said in respect of the Kwinana project was that we could not get tradesmen to do the work. The Kellogg Company was very satisfied with the class of work performed in the construction of the Kwinana project, and at the end of the job the company was agreeably surprised at the skill and ability of the local men who carried out that undertaking.

Yet here we have the *Daily News* coming out with this particular item to which I have referred, in which the Employers' Federation representative said, "We will get the tradesmen." We will have a recurrence of what happened in the building industry after the last war, when building costs rocketed. The same thing will happen again. We will reach the situation where there is a grave shortage of tradesmen, and the employer will then be exploited, for a change, by the worker. But in times of depression and in periods of slight recession, the worker is exploited by the employer. I know that what I have pointed out will have no effect on members of the Government. They have set their course. I suppose, when the ship is finally wrecked, they will scurry around to find out who was at the helm at the time.

In an election promise made on the 13th March, 1959, as reported in *The West Australian* under the heading of "Election Points," the present Premier said, "We will fire nobody, nor close any concern. There are 6,300 personnel remaining in their jobs, as far as this Government would be concerned." That promise was merely words, words, and words—idle words which members of the Government knew they could not put into effect. They had no intention of implementing their promise; nor would they be able to.

Despite that promise, the Government embarked on a ruthless policy of dispensing with tradesmen who had faithfully served this State in times of real need. Even now they will continue to serve the State, and restrain the rising costs of building schools, homes, hospitals, etc., if they are permitted to carry on.

Of course, the efficiency of private enterprise—and this may interest new members, and perhaps also some of the senior members on the Government side who require additional schoolrooms and similar projects in their electorates—was amply illustrated in the construction of the Tuart Hill High School. This incident may be past history. After the job had been commenced by the private contractors who were successful in obtaining the contract, they discovered a mistake had been made in the estimate. When the Public Works Department was not prepared to adjust the price, they asked to be relieved of the contract. That resulted in the Public Works Department day-labour force taking over the job and

building the school. The department was able to build it for £5,000 less than the tendered price.

This saving may not mean anything to some members opposite; but to others who are pressing for additional classrooms in their electorates, it will mean an additional classroom or two, because the saving of £5,000 will enable these to be provided. Savings of this kind could have been effected over and over again by using the Public Works Department day-labour force, and so providing many needed classrooms, or septic systems in schools.

Tradesmen cannot be produced overnight. Because of the present practice of subcontracting in the building industry, and because of the Government's policy of dispensing with the day-labour force, the work force in the building industry is rapidly decreasing. It is well known that the apprenticeship intake is causing great concern to many trade unions. The main ground for the training of building trade apprentices has been the Public Works Department. In former times, when building contractors played the game and did not resort to subcontracting, they employed teams of men, and they took on apprentices and taught them their trade. That position does not apply today, and few private building contractors now take on apprentices. Under the present policy of the Government for the intake of apprentices in the Public Works Department, there will be a lack of tradesmen in a few years.

The position in the building industry is becoming chaotic. There is no stability, and building tradesmen are being forced to seek work in other avenues. It was indicated the other evening that building tradesmen were joining the Police Force, but this is not the only channel of employment into which they are going. Others are going out of the building trades altogether.

The stability in the building trade has gone. The security which the men had previously has been shaken. I do hope that, before it is too late, this Government will take heed of what it is doing—not that I expect it will—come to realise the error of its ways, and cease pursuing its present ruthless policy.

I want to speak briefly on matters concerning my electorate. I am pleased to note, in reply to a question asked in another place, that the widening of Garratt Road bridge will be undertaken and that a start will be made on the work in December of this year. This job has been outstanding for quite a long time. It is gratifying to learn that at last it is to be carried out.

One of the most pressing needs in the Maylands electorate at present—it affects not only the Perth Road Board section of Maylands, but also the Bayswater Road Board section—is the implementing of

the Caledonian Avenue drainage scheme. For a considerable time a request had been made to construct this drainage system. Originally the cost was estimated to be £30,000; what the cost is now is anybody's guess. The Caledonian Avenue drainage scheme is the only drainage scheme in a basin which covers a considerable area, and in which is situated the East Maylands State School. I informed this House last year that at the back of this school was a swamp which was considered to be a menace to the schoolchildren. That swamp can be drained only when the Caledonian Avenue drainage scheme is put into operation. Therefore, I trust that the Minister for Works will have a look at this project and, if possible, find the money necessary to at least get the job started.

Another matter which concerns the residents in Maylands, particularly those with children going to the Maylands School, is the position of the crosswalks. In the course of their speeches, a number of members have indicated that crosswalks are a problem in their electorates. Just recently, a conference was held in Maylands which was attended by members of associations interested in the crosswalks. I do not think there are many members who do not know the position at Maylands; but for the benefit of those who do not, the blind school at Maylands is directly opposite the Maylands State School at Sixth Avenue, and the crosswalk is situated on the crest of the hill. Because of this, it is impossible for motorists approaching in either direction to see this crosswalk. It is also situated between the senior school and the infants' school at Maylands and is considered to be the logical crossing for the children.

There is another crosswalk at Seventh Avenue, which is patrolled by a policeman. Several letters have been written to me by the parents and citizens' association, and I have taken the matter up with the Minister. I will read the reply which I received from the Minister, and which is dated the 2nd May, 1960—

With further reference to your letter of the 10th February—  
Note the date of the letter, because I received the reply on the 2nd May. To continue—

—I have to advise that a recent pedestrian-vehicular conflict survey undertaken by the Main Roads Department over Guildford Road at both Seventh Avenue and Eighth Avenue showed that although the number of adult pedestrians at both locations during the day was comparable, the number of school children using the Seventh Avenue location was almost seven times the number using the Eighth Avenue location.

Investigations by officers of the Traffic Branch reveal that the Maylands Seventh Avenue pedestrian

crossing is used much more than the Sixth Avenue crossing, both by adults and children.

Under the circumstances it is considered advisable to retain the Seventh Avenue pedestrian crosswalk under the supervision of a police officer during peak hours.

It may be that the Seventh Avenue crosswalk is being used more at the present time, but I do not think an investigation was made as to why. The reason is that the children at the schools have been told to use the crossing being patrolled by the policeman. However, if a policeman were stationed at Sixth Avenue, the children would be directed there—and that is the logical place.

On the 29th July, I wrote to the Minister suggesting that he should, in company with his officers, inspect the site. However, up to the present time, I have received no acknowledgment of that correspondence. I am beginning to wonder whether the letter reached the Minister or not. Various members have indicated that there has been very little co-operation by the Government with members on this side of the House. Often a thing is accomplished before a member is aware of it—he is the last to be notified—even though he may have brought the matter before the notice of the Minister in the first place.

As a member of the Opposition I take a very dim view of this, because I believe that the ethics adopted in this House, for many years, are dropping back—and dropping back horribly. Some of the attitudes adopted by the Government are almost despicable, particularly when we consider the promises that have been made, and how lightly they have been brushed aside for reasons of expediency. I am beginning to feel that members of the public are being influenced in their outlook towards members of Parliament by this behaviour on the part of the Government. The prestige of Parliament is not being built up by any means. I hope the times when ethics were considered and observed will soon return to this Chamber.

Mr. Norton: There is only one Minister interested.

Mr. TOMS: In conclusion, I would like to say that I was aware that the Minister for Railways, who is also the Minister for Industrial Development, played a cornet. However, I was not aware, until recently, that the coalition Government had formed a band and had apparently placed the Deputy Premier at the head of that band. I have never known such boasting and bragging by a Government about things it has not done, and about things which were started by the previous Government and opened by the present Government, as has taken place during the time this Government has been in office.

Only last night we had the fiasco—one might call it that—of the Deputy Premier moving an amendment to the amendment moved by the member for Boulder, in order to give the Government, as it were, another pat on the back. Brass bands were playing loudly. It appears to me that the Minister for Industrial Development must be the conductor.

Mr. W. Hegney: He drums them all the time.

Mr. TOMS: For the reasons I have stated, and because of the resentment I feel at the attitude of the Government in attempting to hoodwink the public by amending the amendment moved by the member for Boulder, I cannot let the matter pass. Therefore, I move—

That the Address-in-Reply, as amended, be amended by adding the following words:—

Notwithstanding the foregoing, we trust your Excellency will not be misled by the claim that the proposed increase of over £1,000,000 per annum in railway freights is "a very moderate increase," because the proposed increases when applied will increase seriously the costs of production in primary and other industries in country districts.

MR. HAWKE (Northam—on amendment) [3.9]: In view of what was agreed to here last night, I think it is necessary that we convey to the Governor the truth of the situation. Undoubtedly, the amendment carried last night is misleading in at least the particular which is emphasised by the amendment now moved by the member for Maylands. There would surely be no excuse for sending, in a message to the Governor, information that is misleading.

#### *Point of Order*

Mr. WATTS: On a point of order in regard to which I would like your ruling, Sir, is this amendment in order? On a cursory examination of the Standing Orders, I find No. 181 is as follows:—

No question shall be proposed which is the same in substance as any question which, during the same session, has been resolved in the affirmative or negative.

In the same session, which was no longer ago than yesterday, the House resolved that the increase was a very moderate one, and I submit that in other words only and only to that extent, this is the same question.

Mr. HAWKE: Mr. Speaker—

#### *Speaker's Ruling*

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has raised a point of order as to whether or not the amendment is in order having regard to Standing Order No. 181.

Mr. Hawke: I was going to discuss the point of order.

The SPEAKER: I cannot allow that until I have given a ruling. The Leader of the Opposition may then discuss my ruling.

Mr. Hawke: I was going to help you develop a ruling.

The SPEAKER: I think last night that the House agreed that the increase was a very reasonable one.

Mr. Watts: The word "moderate" was used.

The SPEAKER: Yes. I think the substance of the amendment is really to try to convey to the Governor the fact that the amendment which was passed last night was misleading. Therefore, it appears to me that this amendment is a contradiction. Last night we agreed that the increase was very moderate; yet this amendment seems to imply that it is a very serious matter and that the word "moderate," which is in italics, is misleading. In other words, it is implying that the amendment was incorrect; and on that ground, I think I will have to rule that it is out of order, because the question as to whether or not the increase was a reasonable one was determined last night.

Mr. Hawke: Would you indicate the Standing Order on which you rely?

The SPEAKER: I think the question was resolved last night, as it was decided then that the increase was a moderate one.

Mr. Hawke: Will you indicate the number of the Standing Order, please?

The SPEAKER: No. 181.

#### *Dissent from Speaker's Ruling*

Mr. HAWKE: I move—

That the House dissent from the Speaker's ruling.

I do this because the amendment which the member for Maylands submitted is an amendment which is based on fact. It does not seek to wipe out any part of the amendment which was carried last night; nor does it seek in any way to delete any word from that amendment. It seeks only to indicate to the Governor that a portion of what was contained in that amendment was misleading; and that, I think, is the vital consideration.

Surely the House is entitled to interpret something which has already been carried, and to convey that interpretation to the Governor! I think your ruling, Sir, would be quite correct, provided this amendment was seeking to delete something which had already been decided upon; but the amendment in no way attempts to do that. The amendment word by word, as it was approved last night, will still remain in the motion when finally decided by this House. So, clearly,

there is no attempt by the member for Maylands to amend last night's amendment. It is not to be altered in any shape or form, not even to the extent of one word, a full stop, or even a comma.

The honourable member's present amendment seeks only to interpret a portion of last night's amendment and to express an opinion about it. Surely the House is entitled to do that, should the majority of members decide that it should be done! There cannot, in my opinion, be any logical ruling which would say that the amendment moved by the member for Maylands undoes something which was done last night. It does not do that at all. All the wording that was approved of last night will go to the Governor in due course and be presented to him without the slightest alteration.

However, this amendment by the member for Maylands, if it goes into the message and goes to the Governor for his perusal, will indicate to him the House's interpretation of a portion of the amendment carried last night. Surely the House cannot be restricted to the point that it cannot interpret something which it decided upon last night.

If the majority of the members of the House are still of the opinion today that the increases described last night as moderate are moderate, well and good; then this proposed interpretation of that part of last night's amendment will not be approved by the House, and will not consequently go to the Governor. However, in the interests of accuracy and truth, this amendment should certainly go to the Governor to interpret correctly the wording which was decided upon last night.

On the ground that the amendment does not breach Standing Order No. 181, or any other Standing Order, but merely interprets a portion of the amendment carried by the House last night, I have no option but to move that your ruling be disagreed with.

Mr. BRADY: I want to support the Leader of the Opposition in the protest he has lodged against your ruling, Sir, in regard to this matter. A study of Standing Order No. 190 will indicate clearly that any member can move an additional amendment to something which has been discussed in the House, provided he does not try to alter the amendment.

This proposal by the member for Maylands does not do that; therefore, I say that in the order of precedence, Standing Order No. 190 would take priority over Standing Order No. 181. I feel the member for Maylands is well within his rights in endeavouring to further amend the question before the House, and I feel that if you, Sir, have regard to Standing Orders Nos. 190, 191, 192, and 193, you cannot come to any other decision than to allow the amendment as moved by the member for Maylands. I therefore hope you will

not stand by your earlier interpretation of Standing Order No. 181, because I believe it is an entirely different question.

Mr. WATTS: I think that in every deliberative body the rules of debate are always to the effect that one does not continually debate the same question after a decision has been reached on it, except in special circumstances where, after due delay, a notice of rescission, or something of that kind, can be given. This is a deliberate attempt to enforce upon this House the position that it has to debate again a matter which it debated for approximately 12 hours yesterday and the day before.

Mr. Hawke: That is not true.

Mr. WATTS: If this situation is allowed to proceed by disagreement with your ruling, Mr. Speaker, the debates which we had yesterday and the day before on this subject of railways freights will start off afresh and continue on exactly the same lines to that period of approximately 12 hours. If we carried that to its final conclusion, then all we would have to do over a period of weeks would be to continue to move variations of this amendment, to add to the amendment that was adopted by this House last evening, and members could continue until further orders debating the same subject that is contained in the amendment moved this afternoon which has already been decided after full debates by this House.

Obviously, it was to prevent that—as indeed it is intended, as far as I know, in all deliberative bodies to prevent that sort of thing—that Standing Order No. 181 is here. It reads as follows:—

No question shall be proposed which is the same in substance as any question which, during the same session, has been resolved in the affirmative or negative.

This House not only carried the amendment I moved, but it rejected, last night, the amendment which was moved by the member for Boulder. Therefore, one of them has been resolved in the negative and the other in the affirmative. They both deal from different angles with substantially the same subject; and to allow the terms of this amendment, now before the House, to be debated again would simply be to debate the subject matter of them both over again; which, Sir, is obviously not intended and obviously quite outside the realm of the methods of debate of any deliberative body worth knowing about. This amendment says—

We trust Your Excellency will not be misled by the claim that the proposed increase on freights is a very moderate increase.

This House has said that it was a very moderate increase; and is this House to be told by another amendment that is going to be debated—quite apart from the

reason I have given for objecting to it already—that what it did last night misled the Governor?

Mr. Hawke: It would.

Mr. WATTS: I suggest that this House has reached a decision on a certain point. It has made that decision, and it is not within the right of anybody to say that the House misled itself, which is the only conclusion one can come to on this proposition. The new amendment says the proposed increase, when applied, will seriously increase the cost of production in primary and other industries in country districts. This was put in a slightly different wording in the original amendment moved by the member for Boulder. It reads as follows:—

The burdens of additional cost which increased railway freights will soon place upon country people and rural industries.

There is no question in my mind that this subject has already been debated, whichever way members like to look at it—from the point of view of the member for Boulder's amendment resolved in the negative, or from the point of view of the amendment upon that amendment resolved by this House in the affirmative. I have therefore much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting your ruling.

Mr. TONKIN: This very subject arose last session. You, Sir, gave a ruling on which I remarked that it would be very interesting to see what happened in the future. The occasion has occurred much earlier than I anticipated.

You passed your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on Standing Order No. 181. If I may say so, with all respect, the reasons you gave were most remarkable; because you said that the amendment which was moved, and which you ruled out of order, is a contradiction of something that has already been carried; and because you said it is a contradiction, you ruled it out of order. Standing Order No. 181 says nothing about contradictions; it refers only to things which are the same, not different. I shall read the Standing Order.

Mr. Hawke: Be careful; the Minister for Health is about to have a fit.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The position is completely childish. What sort of leaders are they over there? It is absolutely shocking; disgraceful.

Mr. Hawke: I thought I was right!

Mr. TONKIN: I read as follows:—

No question shall be proposed which is the same in substance as any question which, during the same session, has been resolved in the affirmative or negative.

I would draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that this Standing Order is aimed at preventing a repetition of discussion with regard to a subject which

is the same in substance. You, Sir, said you were ruling it out of order because it was a contradiction of what had already been done. I would draw your attention—and I interpolate here that Speakers usually rely a good deal on what precedent is set—to the fact that last session a Bill was introduced by the Minister for Transport which came up for determination in this way. In moving the second reading of this Bill, which was a second Bill of the same kind, the Minister said this—

I am very sorry to have to worry the House with this Bill once again. As members will note, it is almost identical with the original Town Planning Bill that I introduced to this Chamber a week or two ago and which was eventually passed after a good deal of debate.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that despite what the Deputy Premier has said about hearing the same argument over again, that is precisely what happened with regard to this Bill; because after having been fully debated in this House, it went to another place and was defeated. Subsequently, the Minister brought in another Bill which he informed this House was almost identical with the one which had previously been discussed by this House; and, under Standing Order No. 181, you, Sir, ruled it in order.

Now we have a proposition which is not the same in substance, and therefore is not covered by Standing Order No. 181 in the slightest degree. It is a different proposition that has been put before the House, and would have to be argued on a different basis from the arguments which were adduced in support of the proposition which the House carried.

How anybody can stand up and claim that Standing Order No. 181 covers this situation, in view of your ruling last session, Sir, I cannot understand. Surely we are not going to do what I said last session—that is, drive a coach-and-four through the Standing Orders when it suits us; if so, we may as well scrap them immediately and let Rafferty rule. If we are going to have rules, let us interpret them to the best of our ability and be consistent with the interpretation; but do not let us decide one session that we can do something and next session say we cannot do the same thing.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you ought to have another look at this, not only for the proper guidance of the House, but also for the prestige of the Speaker. I will admit that it is possible for persons to make wrong interpretations of statutes, Standing Orders, or rules; but surely there are some guiding basic principles which will enable them to be consistent in their interpretations. How, under Standing Order No. 181, you can rule out of order an

amendment because it contradicts something which has been decided, when Standing Order No. 181 refers only to questions which are the same in substance as those which have previously been decided, I do not know. You cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker; if this is the same in substance as something already decided, it is not a contradiction—in other words, it cannot be the same if it is different. And I submit it is different; you said so yourself, Sir.

If it is different, it is not covered by Standing Order No. 181. Members will recall that last year we had a discussion a second time in this House on a Bill which the Minister admits was identical—with one which had been fully discussed some days before in this House; and, despite Standing Order No. 181, you, Sir, ruled it in order. Now, on this amendment, you place a different interpretation. I submit with respect that you used one Standing Order and gave a reason which has nothing to do with the question. I can appreciate your difficulty because, so far as I have been able to ascertain up to now, there is no Standing Order which covers the position which you stated was your reason. Standing Order No. 190 reads—

No amendment shall be proposed to be made to any words which the House has resolved shall stand part of the question, except it be the addition of other words thereto.

I suggest that the amendment moved, and which you ruled out of order, comes within that Standing Order because it is an addition.

Mr. Watts: But surely not a day later! That covers the position if it is done on the same day; then you can do it.

Mr. TONKIN: One can do it if the Government does not adjourn the House before one has an opportunity to do something. The Minister used the gag—do not overlook the fact—otherwise it would have been done on the same day.

Mr. Hawke: Real Al Capone rule.

Mr. TONKIN: As a matter of fact, if the Minister will reflect, this is being done on the same day.

Mr. Watts: Not the same sitting day; it is the next day of sitting.

Mr. TONKIN: So the objection of the Attorney-General disappears.

Mr. Watts: Only in your mind.

Mr. TONKIN: It is being done on the same day.

Mr. Watts: But not the same sitting day.

Mr. TONKIN: Now we have another reason why it cannot be done.

Mr. Roberts: It is not the same sitting day.

Mr. Hawke: Now we have the member for Gag butting in.

Mr. TONKIN: Any reason is good enough if one has the numbers, and can use the numbers, whether one is right or wrong. The Attorney-General made some reference to the fact that if we carried this it would mislead the Governor; but the Attorney-General has already done that he is already misleading the Governor and is still doing so with regard to the proclamation. So he should not be unduly worried about that.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that unless your Standing Orders are to be a complete farce, and we are not to know what the interpretation of them is to be from day to day, the House should disagree with your ruling to enable us to extricate the House from the position in which it will be placed if your ruling is upheld. Surely despite party affiliations or anything else and having regard for a commonsense interpretation of the rules, we have to be consistent; and that is all I am suggesting we do here—let us be consistent with our interpretations.

Sir, I was of the opinion that your decision on the Metropolitan Town Planning Bill was an incorrect one; but the House upheld you. I suggest, in view of that decision, it cannot uphold you on this question when you say your reason for ruling it out of order under Standing Order No. 181 is that the proposal is a contradiction of something already determined, and not that it is the same in substance at all.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I propose to support the motion to disagree with your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I do not think any member of this House is enthusiastic about objecting to Speakers' rulings, but there are times when it is incumbent upon members to retain their rights and to endeavour to put the right interpretation on the Standing Orders, although they may disagree with the Speaker's view.

Like the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I have a vivid recollection of what happened during the last session of Parliament with respect to the town-planning legislation. I shall not quote extensively from *Hansard* of last session; suffice it to say that the Minister for Transport, in the first instance, introduced a Bill in connection with town planning; and one of the provisions of that Bill was that an authority would be set up, and reference was made to members of the Legislative Council and members of the Legislative Assembly. In that Bill there was also a provision for certain expenses or allowances to be paid to members of the authority.

I took the point, rightly or wrongly, that the Bill transgressed the Constitution; but you, Mr. Speaker, thought otherwise. However, when the Bill went to another

place it was ruled not to be properly before the Legislative Council. The Minister for Transport introduced a second Bill—and I have it here in Vol. 2 of *Hansard* of last year. It was the same in all respects, as far as I can recollect, except for the deletion of the reference I have just made concerning members of Parliament.

During the debate, you, Mr. Speaker, were asked to determine whether the second Bill was rightly before this Chamber or not. But I think I took the point that, as a Bill, it had already been introduced in this Chamber and it was decided here that it was in order. You determined the first Bill was in order; and you ruled that the second one, which was practically identical, was out of order.

The Minister for Police, through the bungling of the Government—it was not the first time, of course, that it had bungled—introduced a third measure. I took the point again that the Bill was not properly before the House; and, in due course, you ruled that it was.

I propose to quote briefly now from page 2546 of the 1959 *Parliamentary Debates* of the 28th October. The Minister for Police was the one in charge of the Bill. I was quoting the Minister's remarks which he made on introducing the second Bill on the 22nd of September, 1959; and in the course of those remarks, Mr. Nulsen interjected—

The Bill will be substantially the same with the exception of those deletions.

He was referring to a comparatively few minor details. Mr. Perkins replied—

That is so. If members look at page 11 of the new Bill, they will notice that there are two paragraphs instead of three; and that paragraph (a) of the present Bill deals with a council or municipality, and paragraph (b) with a road district under the Road Districts Act. They will also notice that paragraph (a) of the original Bill has been entirely deleted.

That is the only substantial difference in the two Bills.

That is what Mr. Perkins said. When the point was raised on whether the third Bill was in order you, Mr. Speaker, gave your ruling, quoted Standing Order No. 181, and also said—

In other words, what I am asked to do is to confirm whether the proposition contained in the Bill introduced by the Minister for Transport last evening is the same in substance as the one previously introduced by him, and which I ruled out of order on the 29th September.

Admittedly the Bill now before us deals with the same general subject; but I think the approach is different

in that the proposal for the appointment of the proposed authority and the method of constitution are different. That means it is a different proposition. Furthermore, there is a time limit in the Bill before us, and that limitation was not included in the Bill introduced previously. That makes it substantially different. For that reason I rule that the Bill is in order.

The Minister himself said that the Bill was substantially the same. I am not going to weary members of this House by quoting, clause by clause, the three Bills that were introduced. I have referred members to some of the remarks that were made in the *Parliamentary Debates* of last year; and if you, Mr. Speaker, will reconsider your ruling and study the debate which took place at that time, it will be noticed that the major clauses of the three Bills and the verbiage used was the same. The constitution of the board, the method of levying the tax, and all the vital points in the three Bills were substantially the same; and you ruled that the matter was out of order.

I now come to the position we have reached in regard to this amendment and I am subject to correction in what I am about to say. I understand the position to be this: The member for Canning, in a very able—although short—speech, moved the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply; and, as is usual, that motion was printed in *Hansard*. In due course, an amendment was moved to the motion by the member for Boulder.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.4 p.m.*

Mr. W. HEGNEY: During the debate on the amendment moved by the member for Boulder, the Acting Premier drafted a further amendment which he foreshadowed. After he foreshadowed the amendment he promptly moved that he be allowed to continue his remarks at a later sitting; which he did. Debate ensued from a previous sitting of this House and the amendment moved by the member for Boulder was defeated. The further amendment which was moved by the Acting Premier was agreed to by a majority on a division.

As I see the position, the member for Canning moved the original motion. The amendment moved by the Acting Premier has been connected to the motion. Now, the Address-in-Reply, as amended, consists of the motion moved by the member for Canning and the amendment agreed to by the House, as moved by the Acting Premier. Standing Order No. 190 has been mentioned; and, as it is only a short one, I will read it again. It says very clearly—

No amendment shall be proposed to be made to any words which the House has resolved shall stand part of the question, except it be the addition of other words thereto.

As I see the position now, the member for Maylands seeks to add his further amendment to the amended motion. This complies with Standing Order No. 190. If we turn to Standing Order No. 181, we will see that the position now is certainly not in line with the provisions of that Standing Order which reads—

No question shall be proposed which is the same in substance as any question which, during the same session, has been resolved in the affirmative or negative.

If what the member for Maylands proposed was the same in substance as that adopted by the House and moved by the Deputy Premier, this Government would be in agreement with it. If it is not the same in substance, then there must be a substantial difference.

Mr. Watts: You forgot the one which was negatived.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I am not going to be put off by the Deputy Premier, because he is on very weak ground. I will only mention for the edification of the Deputy Premier that the member for Maylands has sought to do something to the motion as amended. It is not the same in substance as the proposition already agreed to; and, therefore, there must be some substantial difference.

Even though there may be a contradiction between what the House agreed to yesterday, and what the member for Maylands now suggests, it is not for you, Mr. Speaker—and I say this with all due respect—to determine, and say, there is a contradiction between the terms, and accordingly rule the amendment out of order; it is for the House to determine whether or not the amendment is in order.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that you based your ruling on Standing Order No. 181. I know you have not had much time to study the amendment moved by the Deputy Premier, and passed by this House. But do you mean to tell me, in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, that it is the same in substance? Because there is a certain contradiction. The amendment says—

We wish to assure Your Excellency that this House appreciates the reason which rendered it necessary for the Government to make a very moderate increase in the railway freights . . .

It then goes on. At the end, the member for Maylands proposes to add the following to the motion as amended, in accordance with Standing Order 190—

Notwithstanding the foregoing, we trust Your Excellency will not be misled by the claim that the proposed increase of over £1,000,000 per annum in railway freights is a very moderate increase, because the proposed increase, when applied, will increase

seriously the cost of production in primary and other industries in country districts.

The honourable member proposes to add those words to the Address-in-Reply, in accordance with Standing Order No. 190. He has therefore complied with that Standing Order. Standing Order No. 181 does not apply, because the proposition before us is not the same as that already adopted by this House.

In view of your ruling last year on the Town Planning and Development Bill, to be consistent your present ruling should be reconsidered and an amended ruling given to comply with the Standing Orders. I draw attention to Standing Order No. 35 which states—

Such Address having been adopted by the House, with or without amendments, shall be presented to the Governor by the Speaker, accompanied by the mover and seconder and such members of the House as shall think fit to attend.

If you rely on Standing Order No. 181, you will be on quicksand. It is not a firm basis, because the proposition of the member for Maylands is not the same in substance as the amendment already agreed to. Therefore, in view of your ruling in the last session, you should reconsider your present ruling, and give an amended one in due course.

Mr. COURT: I support the arguments which have been put forward by the Deputy Premier. We would reach a farcical state of affairs if the words contained in the amendment on the amendment are added to the reply to the Governor's Speech. I refer particularly to Standing Order 129, which says—

No member shall reflect upon any vote of the House, except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.

Any member moving to add the words that are proposed by the member for Maylands must reflect on the vote of the House, because, in effect, he is saying the words which the House has agreed to are misleading. If that is not a reflection on the vote of the House, I do not know what is.

If we read the words which have been included in the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, it becomes very apparent how the conflict occurs and how a reflection would be made on the vote of the House, because the words added last night were as follows:—

To assure Your Excellency that this House appreciates the reasons which rendered it necessary for the Government to make a very moderate increase in railway freights, such increase being considerably less than one-half that needed to compensate



for increased railway wages and salary costs of approximately £2,700,000.

The words now proposed to be added are—

Notwithstanding the foregoing, we trust Your Excellency will not be misled by the claim that the proposed increase of over £1,000,000 per annum in railway freights is a very moderate increase, because the proposed increases, when applied, will increase seriously the cost of production in primary and other industries in country districts.

Mr. Toms: That is only a qualification.

Mr. COURT: The honourable member says it is only a qualification. I say it is a straight-out criticism and a reflection on the vote of the House; in other words, he says the House did not know what it was doing when it agreed to the amendment last night.

Mr. Tonkin: It did not, either.

Mr. COURT: By a simple process of logic it can be seen how those words do just that; they reflect on the vote of the House. They say that the House did not know what it was doing last night. For that reason the amendment should be ruled out of order. I give that as a further reason why the amendment before us is out of order and why your ruling, Mr. Speaker, should be agreed with.

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

Ayes—22.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Jamieson
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Brady	Mr. Molr
Mr. Evans	Mr. Nuisen
Mr. Fletcher	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hall	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Heal	Mr. Toms
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Noes—24.

Mr. Bovell	Mr. W. A. Manning
Mr. Burt	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Court	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Craig	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Crommelin	Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Owen
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Perkins
Dr. Henn	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Watts
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. I. W. Manning

(Teller.)

Pair.

Aye	No.
Mr. Norton	Mr. Brand

Majority against—2.

Motion thus negatived.

Debate Resumed

MR. BICKERTON (Pilbara) [4.19]: I appreciate the privilege that is accorded to ordinary members on the occasion of the Address-in-Reply debate for discussing matters which affect their electorates

and the State generally. I realise that, apart from the discussion of the Estimates, this is about the only opportunity we have to bring our complaints before the Ministry. I do not think it matters very much whether or not one is listened to; but at least one can derive some satisfaction out of the fact that certain matters have been mentioned—matters which a member considers are vital to his electorate, and ones which should be attended to by the Government in power.

I have noticed on the occasion of this Address-in-Reply the absence of speakers from the Government side. I sincerely hope that it is not a procedure of the Government—this Government or any future one—to prevent back-benchers from speaking on these occasions. I have looked through *Hansard* and noticed that some 14 members who supported the Hawke Government spoke on the Address-in-Reply. Some of the matters brought forward in their speeches were not complimentary to the Government which they supported, although other matters were. However, this showed that those members had the privilege of expressing their opinions; and I hope members of this House will never lose that privilege.

I also noticed by looking at *Hansard* that the members of the Government who are now Ministers were very verbose when they sat behind Governments. Therefore, as I said before, I sincerely hope that this is not a system which is being adopted by the present Government to prevent ordinary members from expressing their opinions.

One of the first matters I wish to deal with in connection with my electorate is the very important one of airstrips. These may not concern many members of this Assembly, but I can assure the House that in the north we rely on airstrips and air services just as much as the people elsewhere in the State rely on rail services or bus services. Sometime ago we experienced heavy rain in the North-West; and, at that stage, letters were flying backwards and forwards between local members and Government officials and Ministers about making these airstrips all-weather airstrips. That situation has died down somewhat because of the fact that since that time the airstrips have dried out and are once again serviceable.

However, that situation will occur again; and I think, at this stage, some steps should be taken to rectify the difficulties which were experienced during that period. Earlier this session I asked the following question of 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 as follows:—

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.

The airstrips in the North-West have been there for many years and they have not altered greatly. It is surprising how every time some emergency occurs we have to go through the business of obtaining reports and collating information to balance this, that, and the other thing. One would think that the engineers and technical officers who had been instrumental in putting down these airstrips and maintaining them ever since would have sufficient information in the files without the necessity of their having to obtain further reports and cause investigations to be made before anything definite can be done.

One is led to believe that is so much poppycock or a move, maybe, to put the member for a particular district off the scent, so that the matter may die down. You can imagine, Mr. Speaker, the chaotic state that would apply in Perth if all means of transport, at any particular stage, came to a standstill. If rail transport, bus services, private cars, and deliveries of every type of commodity were to cease the position would be, to say the least, chaotic.

That is precisely what can happen in a North-West town in the case of heavy rain. It is reasonable to assume that the rain which puts out of action the road leading into the town, also puts out of action the airstrip. So, literally, there is no means of getting into or out of these towns while the airstrip is out of action. That possible situation alone is enough to warrant the airstrips being put into such a stage that at least emergency landings can take place at all times.

I realise that to try and bituminise all of the roads that lead into the North-West towns, and to bridge all river crossings to the extent that they could be used during wet periods would, to say the least, be a vast job and extremely expensive. Possibly, some people would say that it was financially impossible. But surely it is not financially beyond the Federal Government to at least seal all airstrips so

that landings can be made on them during adverse weather. I cannot believe that that would be beyond the Commonwealth Treasury.

There is another way in which these matters may be shelved: It is said that it is a Commonwealth responsibility. I do not believe that this is a Commonwealth responsibility at all—it is just as equally a State matter. These airstrips are in Western Australia and the people who use them are Western Australians. The company which operates the service is a Western Australian company, and I think it is the State's responsibility to see that, at all times within reason, these strips can be used.

Mr. Court: How did you get on with your representations to the previous Government on that basis? Did it accept that proposition?

Mr. BICKERTON: Here we go again! I probably have a fairly good excuse in that connection, because I was a member in this House for only one year during the term of the previous Government. However, no matter what is brought up in this House, it is always said, "What did the previous Government do about it?" It is reasonable to assume that any previous Government—whatever its political colour—would leave something for the next Government to do.

Mr. Tonkin: Or undo!

Mr. BICKERTON: Yes, or undo; but I do not think any Government can shelve its responsibility by simply saying "What did the previous Government do?" I sincerely hope that the Minister for the North-West will see that something is done about making these airstrips serviceable in wet weather. I understand also that even if they were bituminised it is possible that with low cloud one still could not land on those strips. But as soon as the clouds lifted, planes could come in because the surface would not be affected. There are mining towns and mining communities that rely almost solely on the air transport that use their air strips. If we had a bus stop in the city which the public could use only when the weather was fine—even if used solely for travelling—there would be cries in the Chamber as to when the Government was going to do something about that bus stop to enable the public to board buses in wet weather.

Our aeroplanes are not a luxury service as far as the public are concerned; one could call them aerial buses. They are used to bring necessary goods, machinery parts, and medical supplies, along with many other essential items, and I therefore feel this is a matter that should be treated with the utmost urgency. Otherwise, we cannot hope to increase the population in the North-West. We certainly cannot hope to get people to remain permanently in the North-West.

The Department of Civil Aviation has an attitude similar to that of the present Government concerning some trading concerns, and its officers will go to any length, when we visit this department, to impress upon us that the North-West air service operates at a loss. We are all aware of this fact. I do not think anybody for one moment considers it should make a profit. The department is quick to say what a good job it is doing with the funds available and how it is keeping many airstrips in operation for only one or two landings a week. We are aware of that fact also.

What is most annoying is that while we are told all these things, the department's spokesman is invariably sitting in a decent sort of plush chair with a polished jarrah table in front of him. One would imagine that it is the department that is putting up with the difficulties that are, in fact, being faced by people in the out-back.

As I said before, I am appreciative of the fact that these airstrips are operated at a loss; and I hope that further airstrips will be established to serve the area, and that these too will increase the loss; because that is the only way we will get an adequate air service for the people who are prepared to live in those areas.

I recently asked the Premier a question concerning another important matter in the area; namely, the sale of iron ore. There seems to be a fair amount of mystery surrounding the tenders that have been called for the iron ore at Mt. Goldsworthy. This iron ore is something which would give the area quite a lift, particularly if sufficient tonnage could be transported, and an export licence made available for these deposits. I also feel that it would be one way of obtaining finance for that area—provided, of course, that the finance was used there.

Some time ago, the ex-Treasurer of the Federal Government (Sir Arthur Fadden) expressed his interest in these iron ore deposits and, at one stage, made a visit to this State and had discussions with the State Government. He also held a Press conference and then proceeded to Japan, presumably to raise finance in connection with this matter.

In the initial stages it did appear that it could have been a type of political plum that was going to be handed out. At all events, a question was asked in the Federal House in connection with this matter as to whether the iron ore deposits at Mt. Goldsworthy were going to be some form of a hand-out to a particular person. I am not, of course, suggesting that they were; but it did seem to start things rolling and it appeared that the question of iron ore deposits at Mt. Goldsworthy became somewhat of a political hot potato.

The next thing we knew was that tenders had been called for the obtaining of this iron ore at Mt. Goldsworthy. Whether or

not those tenders were an afterthought of the Government, or whether the Government had something else in mind but changed its attitude in the light of certain circumstances, I do not know; but it did appear that way at the time.

However, these tenders were then called in a most restrictive manner—I consider a very restrictive manner. They were called on condition that an export licence could be obtained. I do not think that was the best method of calling tenders for this iron ore, because it kept out many potential tenderers who no doubt felt that it was not worth the trouble to tender at the risk of being unable to obtain an export licence.

To secure information on this matter, I put a few questions to the Premier. His answers were somewhat evasive. I asked him as follows:—

- (1) How many tenders were received in connection with the sale of iron ore from the Mt. Goldsworthy deposits?
- (2) Who was the successful tenderer and what was the tendered price?
- (3) Will he table all papers concerning this matter?

The Premier replied to question No. (1)—which concerned the number of tenders—as follows:—

No tender accepted.

He went on to say—

At this period of time it is not considered advisable to table the papers. I then asked the Premier a question without notice on this matter because I was not satisfied with his answer. My question was as follows:—

Arising out of the answer given to question No. 10 on the notice paper, concerning iron ore, would the Premier advise me—

- (a) What are the names of the companies that tendered for the sale of iron ore at the Mt. Goldsworthy deposits?
- (b) Which company tendered the price which appeared to be the most acceptable to the Government; and what was that price?

The Premier replied—

When the Government has made up its mind in respect of this matter, and a decision has been made, that sort of information can be released; but I would not think of releasing it before then.

By interjection I said, at that stage, that they were public tenders. They were public tenders, Mr. Speaker; and even though they were called on the ground that they would apply only if an export license were granted, I cannot see anything wrong in the Government's disclosing the most suitable price tendered.

Mr. Court: There is everything to lose, so far as the State is concerned, by disclosing our hand publicly on that matter.

Mr. BICKERTON: I cannot see that. Whenever the Government appears to be taking such matters so quietly, the excuse is given that much will be lost by the Government's disclosing details. We never received an explanation why, when four tenders were received, the names of the tenderers and the prices tendered were not made public. Is the Government serious about using these tenders, or has it only called tenders to fool those people who have put in an option? If it is the Government's object merely to obtain information from those four options as to approximately how much the project will cost, the Government is fooling the people who have tendered. If the Government is not disclosing the information because it has some idea in mind of handing out the contract to a particular concern, that is not such a good idea, either.

Mr. Court: The Government's objective is to get the best possible deal for the State.

Mr. BICKERTON: Would the Minister for the North-West inform the House what was the purpose in not disclosing the names of tenderers?

Mr. Court: What are tenders called for? To get an indication of various costs.

Mr. BICKERTON: Good! That being the case, if this export license is not granted, say, for two years and is granted at that time, will the tenders that have already been called still apply, or is it proposed to call fresh tenders? Can the Minister, by interjection, answer me on that point?

Mr. Court: We certainly hope we will not have to wait two years. The Premier is in Canberra at the moment on this very matter.

Mr. BICKERTON: The Minister hopes he will not have to wait two years, but there is no evidence that he will not. He has not given the House any guarantee that he will not have to wait two years.

Mr. Court: The honourable member already knows the conditions under which tenders were called.

Mr. BICKERTON: I know they were restrictive conditions. By calling tenders in that manner, the Government stopped other companies from tendering.

Mr. Court: In obtaining full information about prices, it is necessary to consider the question of an export license, particularly with regard to a country like Japan. One cannot export iron ore to Japan without a license.

Mr. BICKERTON: I would have thought that the Government would first of all obtain an undertaking from the Commonwealth that it would receive a license to export some given quantity of iron ore, and would then call tenders. I think a statement should be made at this stage, or as soon as possible, as to whether or not the Government can obtain that license. Costs have altered since then, and will continue to rise. I also ask whether tenders that have already been received are still going to be used once the Government obtains that export license.

The Government should realise the asset it has in those deposits. If there is a tested deposit of 20,000,000 tons of iron ore, with a guaranteed option and a guaranteed license to export it, anybody can sell it; one does not need a businessman to handle that. I would say that if any member of this House were given an option on 20,000,000 tons of iron ore, and granted an export license, he would not have to find buyers; they would chase him until they found him. I believe the Government has, for some reason or other, put the cart before the horse. Instead of first obtaining the export license and then calling tenders from world markets to obtain 30 or perhaps 40 tenders, the Government has simply said, "We will call tenders of a restrictive nature."

Mr. Court: You obviously do not know the system of the Japanese.

Mr. BICKERTON: The development of these deposits should be for the benefit of the area. Before turning from this subject, I would like to add that I hope any money derived from the iron ore deposits in that area, or at least the bulk of it, will be used to improve the area—and I hope we will not finish up with a hole in the ground and very little else—with the hope of increasing the population in our North-West towns.

The matter of education has been mentioned from time to time. I am sorry that the Minister for Education is not here, because I wish to refer one of his questions back to him.

Mr. Norton: You will find he is here but not in his seat.

Mr. BICKERTON: That is quite handy, because he is in a place where he cannot talk back to me. I must say quite truthfully that the primary educational facilities in our North-West towns are quite good, particularly having regard for the proposed additions or new schools to be built in different towns. I know the Minister is looking into the matter of one at Nullagine, and at this stage that is extremely important. But we are faced with the question of secondary education; and, of course, the old problem of which comes first, the chicken or the egg, arises. Governments seem to think that we need the population and then we get the facilities; and we say, "Give us the facilities

and we will get the population." This question seems to have been going backwards and forwards for quite a long time now.

I asked the Minister when we could expect a high school to be built at Port Hedland. I mentioned Port Hedland because I considered that that is a fairly central point as far as the electorate of Pilbara is concerned. His answer, which I suppose could be called quite enlightening, was that the matter would receive consideration when the number of students justified it. I do not know from that whether he means the number of students in Port Hedland proper; if so, that is not really what I was getting at; although, perhaps, I cannot blame the Minister for that.

The point is that a high school in that area will save people from having to send their children 1,000 miles to obtain a secondary education. If a high school is to be erected, a hostel will be required to accommodate the students coming in from the more outlying towns such as Onslow, Roebourne, Nullagine, Wittenoom Gorge, and most of the inland stations, as well as from Port Hedland itself. I would think that the way to go about this would be to ascertain the requirements of the whole area, and not just the numbers in Port Hedland. I believe that the requirements of the area are sufficient at this stage to warrant high school facilities.

At Wittenoom Gorge there are at least 1,000 people, and there is the same number at Port Hedland, with probably another 1,500 or 2,000 in the smaller towns. If hostel accommodation were attached to the high school at Port Hedland the children could come in from the stations and other towns, and at least go home to their families, or their families could come in to see them once a week or once a fortnight. Now children have to come down here and board, which is extremely expensive. On top of that, they are away from their families for three months at a time, or perhaps more—that is, if their people have sufficient money to bring them home at the end of each term, because the Government pays for only one free return trip per year. If people relied only on that free travel they would see their children only once a year.

I request the Minister for Education to have another look at this matter, because I think he might find that even though the numbers are lighter in the North-West, the need for these facilities is ever so much greater than it is in some of those places where high schools are being erected at present.

Mr. Watts: Will you give me your review of the number of children, and where they come from, and we will have another look at the matter?

Mr. BICKERTON: That is fair enough; I will do that for the Minister; because even though the numbers appear to be a

little light at this stage, many of the children who are now attending schools in Perth would probably make use of the high school facilities at Port Hedland if they were provided. Children would come in from the stations and the outlying towns. However, I will accept the Minister's suggestion and do that.

While I have the Minister for Works available, I would like to discuss the matter of water boring in the North-West. I think the Minister will recall that last year he and I had considerable discussions on the matter of boring for water at a place called Roebourne. To my knowledge there is one water drilling plant operating in that area on behalf of the Public Works Department, and that is quite insufficient for the drilling requirements of the area. He will recall that when the drill was sent to Wittenoom Gorge the object was to bring it back to Roebourne to bore for water in that town. However, to my knowledge it has not yet been taken to Roebourne, even though it was expected to arrive within a few months of being taken to Wittenoom Gorge.

At this stage I think I should mention that the immediate requirements, or the emergency requirements of Point Samson were taken care of by obtaining water supplies from State ships, for which I am very grateful, and the people in the area more so. However, I would not like either the Minister for the North-West or the Minister for Works to think that that is the finished product. I would like them to look on it as an emergency measure in the hope that the original intention of running a scheme from Roebourne be looked into and, if possible, be gone ahead with. The reason why the boring plant is required is to ascertain what supplies are available in the Roebourne area, and to get a supply as close to Point Samson as possible. We say that the nearest supply of water is at Roebourne because nobody has bothered to bore anywhere else; but if drilling were undertaken it is quite likely a supply nearer to Point Samson would be found, and that would cut considerably the estimated cost of the pipeline—it is estimated to be around £45,000.

The water supply the people at Point Samson have now is, naturally, a great improvement after having no water at all. But, as I said before, I hope the matter is not looked upon as being fixed, and that the Government does not say, "We don't have to worry about that any more." It is purely an emergency service with a restricted quantity of water for the essential needs of the people, and should be looked upon in that light. If the Minister would be good enough, I would like him to have the boring plant sent to that area, as was promised some 12 months ago, with the object of obtaining sufficient water for Point Samson, apart altogether from what is being supplied by the State ships.

From information available through the newspapers, and from questions asked, I understand the Government intends to spend a considerable sum of money on bituminising the East-West Road, or the Eyre Highway. This is a matter in which I am vitally interested.

Mr. Watts: There is no definite proposal yet; it is only a matter of discussion with South Australia and the Commonwealth to see what the effect will be.

Mr. BICKERTON: That is heartening. It could be that my few words may have had some effect, and before the East-West road is bituminised some money may be used on intrastate roads rather than interstate roads, particularly in the North-West. I thought the Government intended to proceed with it because of answers I received to questions I asked of the Premier. I asked him—

Will he advise the approximate cost to this State of sealing the Eyre Highway?

He said that the estimated cost was £5,280,000. Therefore, I took it that the proposal was serious enough for the Government to go into the cost of it. I then asked him what the distance was, and he said that it was about 463 miles. I then asked him what the State would gain if this work were carried out, and the Premier answered as follows:—

A faster and more comfortable journey for the substantial number of people now using the road; improved transport facilities for pastoralists who depend on the road for their requirements; a substantial increase in the number of visitors to Western Australia, particularly among family men with light cars who could not otherwise afford the journey; and lastly a reliable defence link with the Eastern States, which is strongly supported by the R.S.L.

Five and a half million pounds is an awful lot of money in anyone's language, and 463 miles is a very great distance. In an earlier question I had on the notice paper, regarding my electorate, I asked for the programme of bituminisation, and I was told that this year it would be about five miles. If I remember rightly, the answer to a similar question asked by the member for Kimberley was to the effect that his area would have some 20 or 27 miles bituminised. It seems to me that there is a lot of difference between 30-odd miles of bituminised road and 463 miles.

Mr. Watts: You don't suggest it would all be done in the one year?

Mr. BICKERTON: No; I do not suggest that.

Mr. Watts: It would be very likely over a long period.

Mr. BICKERTON: It seems that from interjections I may be able to find out a little more information than the Premier

has given me. I did not believe that the Government would try to carry out the programme in one year. The Premier intimated that he hoped to receive some assistance from the Commonwealth with regard to additional funds. Whether the work is done in one year, or spread over ten years, a sum of £5,500,000 is still to be spent on an East-West road; and if the only advantages are those outlined by the Premier, to my way of thinking it would hardly have priority over a North-South road.

First of all, other roads in this State will have to be sacrificed, regardless of whether they are in the North-West or any other outlying area, if this £5,500,000 is to be used on an East-West Road; because the Commonwealth Government, through its Minister for Transport, Mr. Opperman—and he should know something about roads because he has pushed a bike over them quite a lot—has stated that the Commonwealth Government is not interested in supplying money for this East-West Road. Therefore, I can only assume that the State will have to find it out of its own funds. I should like to quote what the Federal Minister for Transport, Mr. Opperman, had to say; and I quote from a publication called *The Road Patrol*, of August, 1960. In an editorial of that magazine he is quoted as saying—

I think I should make it clear that I am just as concerned now as hitherto regarding the desirability of a first-class highway to Western Australia. The points which I appreciate more now are that the achievement of this desirable objective would cost a great amount and the availability of Commonwealth funds for this and the many other pressing national needs is a critical factor. The States for their part, and with their constitutional responsibilities for road construction and maintenance must necessarily have regard in their overall programmes to their many road requirements. The article acknowledges that the question of the provision of funds for the Eyre Highway is receiving consideration by the Governments of the two States concerned.

Last year the Commonwealth made grants to Western Australia of £7,498,000 and to South Australia of £4,362,000 to supplement State finances towards road works. Apart from requiring that 40 per cent. of the Commonwealth grants shall be spent on rural roads, the States are free to determine how the funds shall be allotted. In addition to the above-mentioned grants, the Commonwealth since 1947 has made special ex-gratia payments amounting to £227,600 towards the maintenance of the Eyre Highway.

From the defence aspect, this highway is not regarded as having any special defence significance over many other highways in Australia, which would warrant the provision of Commonwealth funds towards its reconstruction. The defence authorities say that having regard to the present strategic conditions, the road as maintained is adequate for defence needs.

From the Commonwealth's point of view therefore the provision of funds for a sealed road at a cost which may reach £10 millions cannot be made at this juncture for this comparatively lightly trafficked road. However, if the States are satisfied that the road is deserving of priority over their other road works, they are at liberty to allot to it funds from the grants made by the Commonwealth for general road purposes.

In other words, if we can take any notice at all of the Federal Minister for Transport, the Government would be receiving little or no financial assistance towards it as far as the Commonwealth Government is concerned. So let us hark back to the reasons why the Premier wants to put this road through. Let us take them one at a time.

He says there will be a faster and more comfortable journey for a substantial number of people now using the road. I suppose that would be a reason; but it does not have to be a road costing £5,500,000; or one running East-West. Surely the people would like to have just as comfortable a journey on the roads within the State! For instance, I am sure the people in the North-West would not mind a much more comfortable journey.

The Premier's second reason is that it will improve transport facilities for pastoralists who depend on the road for their requirements. I agree with that. I agree it could and would make a difference to the pastoralists in the area through which that road passed. But that applies also to many other parts of the State. That does not give it any priority over the North-West; because the pastoralists there also wish to have a decent road, and they certainly depend on it for their requirements.

The next reason given by the Premier was that there would be a substantial increase in the number of visitors to Western Australia, particularly family men with light cars who could not otherwise afford the journey, and there would be consequent expansion of interests in the State. If the road were running North-South, we would still have the family men with light cars who would probably come down, and who otherwise probably could not afford the journey. But what about those going out, as well as those coming in? I am looking for reasons—I have been for quite

a long time—as to why this State should spend, out of its own funds, such an amount of money on a road running east-west.

Mr. Wild: Don't you believe that tourism would be of great assistance to the State?

Mr. Graham: If you developed Western Australia it would also be a great thing.

Mr. BICKERTON: My views on tourists are probably not as grandiose as those of some of the members opposite. They seem to believe that this tourist business is something which will lift Western Australia 500 years ahead. The tourist idea seems to have gone to the heads of many members; and particularly that of the Premier.

Mr. Hawke: And the Minister for Works.

Mr. Wild: He has his head well out of the clouds.

Mr. BICKERTON: We find that Premiers invariably have some sort of a bug, and the bug that this Premier seems to have is tourism. I do not deny that tourists will do Western Australia some good. But can we say that a road built to bring tourists—if that is its purpose—would do as much good as, say, a road somewhere else, to bring wool and beef, or a similar commodity, to the market? I think we are confusing tourists with holiday-makers. The average person who the Government seems to think is a tourist is probably someone on his annual holidays; someone who has saved all the year round for this holiday, and who has a limited amount of money to spend.

Mr. Wild: He will bring some of it to the State.

Mr. BICKERTON: But when the Government speaks of the amount of money that tourism will bring to Western Australia, I think it has more in mind the multi-millionaire running around with a pocket full of dollars.

Mr. Wild: Stop being parochial; why don't you think bigger?

Mr. BICKERTON: The amount of money that this road will bring into the State will not be nearly as much as could be brought in by more and better bituminised roads in our rural areas; in our North-West area; and in the goldfields area. Those roads would bring more money to the State than the road in question, which is to be used by tourists.

Mr. Graham: Of course it would! It is only a fad.

Mr. BICKERTON: The other point made by the Premier was that it is a reliable defence link. According to the Federal Minister for Transport, the present road there meets all the defence requirements; and the Commonwealth is not interested in making this road a defence link. Furthermore, from the little I know of defence

roads, I should have thought they should be built inland. There would be no point in having a road built around the coast for strategic military purposes, because it would be vulnerable from the sea, and be liable to be cut off by enemy landings. Accordingly I do not think the question of a defence link enters into it at all; and from what we have heard from the Federal Minister for Transport, he does not think so either. I would feel happy if, before this matter goes too far, the Government would have another look at it. I think the Government should certainly have a look at it from the defence point of view; because I do not think the Commonwealth, for one moment, is interested in a defence road.

Mr. Wild: Don't you know you are getting a sixth of the total vote of the main roads north of the 26th parallel? I suggest you cast your mind back and see how much you were given by your own Government.

Mr. BICKERTON: I did not realise that the Minister for Works was going to make a speech on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply.

Mr. Wild: You are talking so much rot.

Mr. BICKERTON: What I have said has apparently touched the Minister for Works on a raw spot, because he has taken my remarks as being a personal shot at him.

Mr. Wild: I have not.

Mr. BICKERTON: I do not know whether the Minister is guilty in connection with this £5,500,000 East-West Road or not; nor do I know why my remarks should have hurt him. I realise that a great amount of money has been spent on roads in the North-West. This money has been spent by all Governments; but when we bear in mind that the North-West is not merely an area of the State, but half the area of Western Australia, why should it not have that amount of money spent on it? The North-West members in this House have always paid great tribute to the Main Roads Department, and the engineers in charge of the department, for the condition of the roads. Bearing in mind the area to be served, I say the Main Roads Department has done a wonderful job in the North-West; and I consider the engineer in charge of the area, Mr. Duncan, has done a magnificent job of work, considering the difficulties he has had to face.

Mr. Hawke: You are sure right about that!

Mr. BICKERTON: Apart from that, for a very long time he has been a sick man, and I think it would be a fitting tribute to him if a highway were called the Duncan Highway; because I consider he has done a lot for the roads in that area.

Mr. Hawke: Hear, hear!

Mr. BICKERTON: When it is proposed to spend a certain amount of money on something which in one's own mind will bring benefit to the roads and their users in a particular area of the State, there is no reason why one should not be able to say so in this House on this debate. That is precisely what I am doing.

Mr. Perkins: You were one of the members prepared to miss the matching money rather than raise license fees.

Mr. BICKERTON: I am pleased to hear from the Minister for Transport. I gave full reasons at that stage as to why we considered the extra tax should not be applied to the North-West. The Minister knows full well that I gave those explanations at the time. The reason was that this Government, and past Governments, have always said that the North-West should be exempt from taxation. If we say that, we should be consistent and not place a State impost on this area; which, in fact, was done.

The Minister has probably been around and spoken to members of some of the road boards and has obtained from them their opinions. I have also been around to some of the members of the road boards. They thought it was quite a good thing until I put my point of view. Their attitude then was that there should be no taxation. There is no reason why the North-West could not have been exempt on that occasion. I said it then, and I will say it again.

Mr. Wild: How do you build roads there without money?

Mr. Graham: You don't waste the money in the desert.

Mr. BICKERTON: The Minister could use the £2,000,000 his Government proposes to give to some paper manufacturers.

Mr. Court: It will not help the roads.

Mr. Graham: It could; there is nothing to stop you using it on the roads.

Mr. BICKERTON: I will conclude on the following note:—

The Premier sealed himself a road  
Over East for to travel  
While Nor'-Westers in disgust  
Prayed for rain to lay the dust  
As they jogged along their roads  
Made of gravel.

MR. O'CONNOR (North Perth) [5.13]: I did not originally intend to speak on this motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, but some points have come forward which are definitely worthy of mention. We all know that after the squabble last year concerning the pool in the park, it was eventually decided that the pool should be built in Beatty Park in the North Perth electorate. From my point of view it is the second-best area in which it could have been built.

Mr. Graham: Very second.



Mr. O'CONNOR: I could agree with that. There is some very untidy ground around this area known as Smith's Lake. I have received an assurance that this will be cleared before the Empire Games. The area is most untidy and dirty and an eyesore to the people who live there.

As far as the pool itself is concerned, no work has yet been commenced; there have been no excavations and no buildings erected at all. I recently had the pleasure of visiting the Oasis in Brisbane. It is a tourist resort in the centre of the city. While I was there I thought what a wonderful thing it would be if the authorities concerned gave some consideration to beautifying a section of Beatty Park along similar lines to the Oasis in Brisbane.

For the information of those members who are not familiar with the Oasis in Brisbane, I would point out that it has an area smaller in size than Beatty Park. It has four pools situated in a beautiful garden setting, in which provision is made for lovely gardens, shade houses, bird cages, and the like. Apart from this, there is also a tearoom and dance floor provided for those who wish to avail themselves of those facilities.

Mr. W. Hegney: Did the Government build that park in Brisbane?

Mr. O'CONNOR: No; the city council.

Mr. W. Hegney: Would they do that here?

Mr. O'CONNOR: I do not think they would.

Mr. Graham: It was privately constructed in Brisbane.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Yes. However, it does not mean to say that the authorities concerned could not develop Beatty Park along similar lines. I would now like to quote some of the figures given to me by the Minister for Health in reply to a question which I asked of him in regard to samples of milk. For the year 1960, in the Perth City Council area, 840 samples were taken. There were 24 in the Fremantle City Council area; and in the Nedlands City Council area, there were five. In other words, about 168 samples were taken in the Perth City Council area to each one taken in the Nedlands area.

The taking of these samples does assure consumers and residents of the Perth City Council area that a comprehensive check is being made on milk supplies coming into that area; but it also tends to drive various producers out of the area. For instance, take a producer bringing milk and supplying it to a depot in the Perth City Council area being subjected to severe regular checks by the taking of samples of milk. If that producer moved his supplies to the Nedlands area, or the Fremantle City Council area, he would not be subjected to regular checks and would have no fear of being summonsed for supplying sub-standard milk. I realise the Milk Board

has some control over this matter, but it would be advantageous to all concerned if similar conditions existed in all municipalities.

Mr. Jamieson: Who are you representing—the people of North Perth or Nedlands?

Mr. O'CONNOR: During his Address-in-Reply Speech, His Excellency the Governor said—

The past financial year has also been one of notable progress. There are signs that the economy has further strengthened and that the pace of progress is quickening.

Unemployment has fallen substantially. Employment has reached a record level. Indicators of economic activity encourage an increasing confidence in the future.

Despite what several members of the Opposition have had to say, I feel those words are very true. We regularly see in the Press that various industries are intending to come here. How the position has changed from what it was 12 or 18 months ago! I have here a cutting from the *Daily News* of Friday, the 12th August. It was previously quoted by the member for Maylands, and it carries the heading, "Building Boom Brings Labour Problems." I quote from this article—

Perth is on the threshold of the greatest building boom in its history—but it has no available work force.

Employers have begun a concerted drive for skilled and unskilled labour from the Eastern States.

When I came into this House some 17 months ago, for the first six or seven months a large number of people from my electorate approached me with a view to my obtaining employment for them. Some of these people had been out of work for as long as two years. They were people who would work if they could get it. Some of these people I was able to help, and some I was not, as the position was very acute. However, over the last seven or eight months not one person from my electorate has approached me regarding employment, and I think that speaks for itself.

Mr. Graham: Perhaps they found out you are not much use to them.

Mr. O'CONNOR: They have a better representative than the electors of East Perth are unfortunate enough to have representing them.

Mr. Graham: They are still coming to me.

Mr. O'CONNOR: In his Address-in-Reply speech, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in my opinion, made an unjustifiable attack on certain successful business firms. His idea was apparently to bite the hand that feeds him. Those

of us who are optimistic enough to envisage the continued development of this State welcome the evidence of progress. I recently noticed in *The West Australian* where a goldmining company—I think at Bullfinch—had lost something like £295,000 for the financial year. How insecure must the employees of this firm feel if this loss should continue over the next financial year! The directors of the company concerned must take steps to either reduce the price for working the ore, or close the enterprise down entirely.

Mr. Tonkin: They are not as insecure as the workers in the Public Works Department.

Mr. O'CONNOR: During the week I took the trouble to visit a couple of the firms mentioned by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. One of these firms employs 400 people. It is, therefore, feeding the mouths of approximately 1,200 to 1,600 people. This firm showed a profit improvement of £15,541, as quoted by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. That figure is quite correct.

Mr. Graham: Of course it is!

Mr. O'CONNOR: However, the increase is on a capital in excess of £1,000,000; and on those figures it is not excessive.

Mr. Graham: Why does your mob oppose basic wage increases?

Mr. O'CONNOR: This firm gives super-annuation benefits to its employees; and in the year under consideration, it paid something like £3,500 to them. Expenses for the year increased by £26,000-odd and, of this amount, almost £18,000 was for additional wages and salaries. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition went on to say, "Not a penny for the worker."

Mr. Graham: That is quite right, too.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The net profit when related to shareholders' funds was 6.2 per cent.; and, in actual fact, the employees are shareholders of the company concerned. Another company referred to by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was that of Edwards Dunlop.

Mr. Tonkin: What was the company you just referred to?

Mr. O'CONNOR: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition can find out by checking the figures I have given.

Mr. Tonkin: I think you have reason to cover up.

Mr. Court: He is not covering up at all.

Mr. O'CONNOR: The firm of Edwards Dunlop showed an increased profit of £14,000 odd, bringing its total profit to £135,436. However, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did not mention that the assets relating to shareholders' funds in this company were in excess of £2,000,000. I would go further and say that all the employees of that particular firm receive

above the basic wage. On top of this, the firm has a non-contributory superannuation scheme; and if one of the employees is hurt or is sick during a weekend or during out-of-work time he receives up to six months full pay. In addition, the firm splits a percentage of profits by way of a bonus scheme to its employees. Both the firms referred to are public companies. Therefore, the public generally and the workers have the right to subscribe to these companies. I suggest it would do more service to the working people generally if the Opposition would endeavour to encourage firms of this type to operate in this State instead of trying to chase them away.

Mr. Tonkin: What about letting us hear you on water rates?

Mr. Graham: What tripe!

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

MR. OWEN (Darling Range) [5.25]: I wish to say a few words—

Mr. Tonkin: Bigger and better profits!

Mr. Court: Secure employees.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Crommelin): Order!

Mr. OWEN: —in regard to a matter which has already been mentioned in this Chamber during the present session.

Mr. Graham: Water rates.

Mr. OWEN: It is about water. Not rates, but about water which falls from the heavens.

Mr. Graham: What about when you pay rates and do not get a flow?

Mr. OWEN: We all recognise that Western Australia is predominantly in the low rainfall area. Apart from the extreme north-east and the South-West Land Division, the remainder of the State is short of water for practically the whole of the year. Parts of the North Kimberleys and parts of the south-west receive over 50 inches of rain per annum; but, even in those areas, there are times when there are grave shortages of water. In fact, taking the State as a whole, development is limited because of that shortage of water.

I think it behoves all of us to give consideration to the means of conserving as much water as possible, so that better use can be made of the water which falls, and better use can be made of the land on which it falls. Many of our agricultural industries are restricted because of a lack of water; and this applies particularly to the mining industry.

Last year, severe restrictions were imposed in the metropolitan area because of the poor rainfall experienced during the previous winter. It has also been pointed out in the Stephenson regional plan that Perth will be limited to a population of something like 1,400,000 people. If the

present rate of progress continues, we could possibly reach that stage during the next 40 to 50 years. So there is a grave possibility that in the lifetime of some of the members of this House, the development of Perth will be retarded because of a lack of water for both industrial and domestic purposes.

Although our engineers have surveyed the sources of water for the future, I think the time will come when science will have to step in and find a way out. In fact, many leads have already been given. Even now, science has shown us that brackish, and even salt, water can be converted into fresh water by employing various techniques; and this water can be used either for industrial or drinking purposes.

There are a few different techniques, but the most promising is the use of atomic power for the vaporising and condensing of brackish water. Many of us know that in the early days of the goldfields that was a common method of obtaining drinking water, and it is at present being used in other parts of the world. Unfortunately, however, the cost is still comparatively high, and certainly far more than would be required to conserve the natural rainfall in this State. However, within the next 40 years those techniques will be improved, and it is quite possible that they will bring the cost of distilling fresh water from salt water into the bounds of economic possibility.

There is another method which I feel will be utilised within the near future. I refer to the seeding of rain clouds. When this is done to the right kind of cloud, the water falls instead of the clouds passing over. I asked the Minister for Water Supplies last session whether he would make inquiries into the possibility of utilising that method to increase the rainfall in some of the areas where our storage dams are situated, and he replied to the effect that the matter would be investigated.

Recently an article in the daily Press reported that some of the experts in this technique had been over here with a view to examining cloud formation to see whether it was promising enough to undertake actual tests on seeding the clouds. I do hope that those inquiries and investigations will be continued, because I feel there is great scope within the areas of our comparatively heavy rainfall in the Darling Ranges and further south.

We must, at this stage that the investigations and experimental work which have been carried out in the Eastern States do not indicate that rainfall can be controlled 100 per cent. to be utilised for agricultural purposes. For instance, it seems that it would not be possible to

increase the rainfall at, say, Northam, from approximately 18 inches to a steady 25 inches, or anything as nearly exact as that; but it has been illustrated that there are great possibilities of increasing the rainfall by 15 to 20 per cent.

I would like to quote from an article published in *The West Australian* of the 4th May this year. This article is headed, "Rainmakers Find Key To The Clouds." It is as follows:—

The success of the C.S.I.R.O.'s long-term rainmaking experiments is a major triumph for the man behind the project, Dr. E. G. Bowen, head of the organisation's rainmaking section.

Dr. Bowen says we now have a certain method of increasing rainfall by about 15 per cent. in areas with suitable cloud formation.

Water Research Foundation of Australia chairman J. G. Beale said an increase of 15 per cent. in rainfall over the Snowy Mountains Project area, where five years' rainmaking experiments have just concluded, would be worth £3,000,000 a year.

This would come from increased power output and extra water for irrigation.

Further on the article continues—

In the New England area, where experiments have entered their third year, information indicates that the rainfall could be increased by cloud-seeding by even more than 15 per cent.

Mr. Beale said an increase in New England's rainfall by 25 per cent. would add about £500,000 a year to the district's pastoral and agricultural production.

Mr. Beale indicated that it was possible to get as high an increase as 25 per cent. However, further on in the article is the following:—

Tests for three years north of Adelaide have failed to produce rain as the required cloud conditions do not occur in the area.

So he has indicated that, given the right type of cloud, it is possible to increase the rainfall from 15 per cent. to 25 per cent. It is also stated in this article—

The cost of producing the extra rainfall in Australia is estimated to be about one-fifth of the value of the extra production it should bring.

I feel that if we could invest a certain amount of money, even if it were only £500,000, to obtain a return of five times as much in value, it would be a very good

proposition indeed. It has been demonstrated that the right cloud must be available; and, in fact, further evidence of this is given in another article in the same issue of *The West Australian*.

In answer to a question asked in the Federal Parliament, the following information was given:—

The C.S.I.R.O. had not yet developed a ready method of producing rain wherever it was needed, the Minister in charge of the organisation, Dr. Cameron, said in the House of Representatives today.

Dr. Cameron was reported, in the same article, as having said much the same as Mr. Beale—that the right type of cloud must be available before it is possible to even begin to hope for increased rainfall. Rain cannot be produced from clear skies or even from heavy clouds. They must be the right type.

I believe that in the area in the Darling Ranges east of Perth and 200 miles south, it will be possible to artificially increase the rainfall because for quite a few months of the year heavy clouds form there. If this were possible, our water supplies would be increased tremendously. Let us examine the effect. In that area we have all our major water supply dams: Mundaring Weir, Canning Dam, Victoria Reservoir, and Churchman's Brook, which are already supplying Perth with water. In addition we have the Serpentine Dam; and, further south, there are irrigation projects mainly around the Harvey, Stirling, and Wellington Dams. The last mentioned plays a big part in the Great Southern comprehensive schemes.

Those dams normally, in a heavy rainfall year, are filled to overflowing; but we do know that the water stored in those dams has not always been up to capacity. I believe that with this rain-seeding technique we could be sure that every year those dams would be filled to capacity. In fact, with experience, we might be able to increase the storage capacity of the dams even if only by providing crest gates as has been done at Mundaring Weir.

I would like to give some figures in regard to Mundaring Weir because it is in my electorate, and is one which is very important in connection with the provision of water to the goldfields and also to the comprehensive scheme to the central and northern wheatbelt—apart, of course, from supplying a lot of water for use in the metropolitan area. The catchment area of the Mundaring Weir is approximately 364,000 acres and the mean rainfall between Mundaring and York is 30 inches per annum. Therefore, for every one inch of rain, approximately 8,000,000,000 gallons falls in the catchment area.

So if all of the water ran into the weir, two inches of rain would be practically sufficient to fill Mundaring Weir. But, of course, the effective run-off is only a portion of that water which falls; and it is generally recognised that so far as Mundaring Weir is concerned, we need at least 10 to 12 inches of rain in a season before the creeks begin to flow and bring any appreciable increase to the storage in that reservoir.

In the fortnight to the 1st or 2nd August, the mean average rainfall over the Mundaring Weir catchment amounted to 6 inches which was equivalent to 48,000,000 gallons; and the effective run-off given by the rise in the water level at the dam was roughly 3,000 million gallons. I venture to suggest that had that rainfall been increased by, say, another inch over that period it would have been quite possible for that effective run-off to be at least double, because after that 6 inches of rain over the catchment area, the ground was practically all sodden and the greater part of any further rainfall would have gone into the creeks and thus into the dam. Unfortunately, however, so far as the build-up of the supply in the weir is concerned, it has been a comparatively dry period since then, and the intake into the reservoir has been only slight indeed. In fact, the level has only risen a few inches. But if we had been able to increase that rainfall, even over that short period, by 15 per cent. we would have had many more thousands of gallons of water in the dam.

Therefore, on the evidence given by the officers of the C.S.I.R.O., I feel we could increase the run-off from the Mundaring Weir catchment area by at least 4,000 million to 5,000 million gallons per year. Of course, provision would have to be made at the weir to hold the extra water; but if this were done, based on 1s. per 1,000 gallons, the department would receive an increased revenue of £240,000. That is quite a decent sum of money in any man's language. Were the same procedure adopted for the other catchment areas and dams—even those south of the metropolitan area—we could store more water without the need for the expenditure of much extra money in the building of more dams.

Members will recall that some 18 months ago steps were taken to install crest gates at Mundaring. These gates are only 2 feet or 3 feet high, and they can be folded down if necessary, or raised; and when they are put up, additional water can be retained in the weir. I do not know what these crest gates cost—possibly a few thousand pounds—but they enable the storage at Mundaring Weir to be increased from 15,100 million gallons of water to 17,000 million gallons.

If the same thing were done at Can-ning Dam and at Serpentine Dam, when it is completed, it would mean that for a moderate cost the storage capacity of those dams could be increased; and if the rain-seeding technique, to which I have referred, were further investigated and found to be workable, then we could solve our water shortage problems in the metropolitan area for quite a few years to come.

Also, an increased rainfall over the catchments of the south-west rivers—I refer particularly to the Murray River—would possibly mean that water which at present is, in the main, somewhat brackish or saline could be further freshened so that the total amount of water running in the rivers could be used for irrigation.

So I ask the Minister for Works to try to instil a little more enthusiasm in his department to have these tests speeded up so as to get to the stage, as soon as possible, where rain-seeding techniques could be put into operation. I am sure that with rain seeding we have something which will mean the supply of many more millions of gallons of water than we at present get.

Another matter on which I desire to touch is one that appears to be rather controversial among members on the other side of the House—tourism.

Mr. Tonkin: I thought for a moment you were going to deal with the water rates.

Mr. OWEN: Tourism does offer scope for increased revenue. I am not one who thinks that because we invest a few thousand pounds today we will get it back tomorrow; but I do believe that if we base our tourist industry on a properly organised programme, we will be able to build up tourist interests here which will serve this State not for one year but for many years; and over the years they would return many thousands of pounds of revenue both to the Government and to the investors here.

Last year in the debate on tourism it was suggested that the North-West offered great scope for tourists, and it was suggested that if means of transport were made available, many tourists would go to the North-West during our cold winter months. Some of our transport and tourist organisations have undertaken to do that this year by publicising the possibility of running aeroplane flights to the North-West and bringing the people back by road bus; and *vice versa*. I understand that in the first year of operation of this scheme, quite a few people have taken advantage of this means of transport to have a look at some parts of our North-West.

Mr. Nulsen: This also helps to advertise the State; and people from the Eastern States have an opportunity of learning the potential of Western Australia.

Mr. OWEN: That is quite right. I think from the comparatively small start that has been made this year, the tourist industry will gradually grow. By the same process, tourists can be encouraged to go to other parts of the State. I think the North-West project is already showing what can be done.

On many occasions in this Chamber I have pointed out what can be done in my electorate. Many short-range tourists pass through the district and, incidentally, leave a few shillings here and there behind them, thus building up the revenue in the area. I would again like to mention what I think could be done in one locality—Mundaring Weir, and the surrounds of the water catchment there.

Over the years Mundaring Weir has been recognised as one of the principal tourist attractions close to the city. Through the activities of the Main Roads Department and other instrumentalities, a good bitumen road has been provided to the weir; but quite a lot more could be done. The Goldfields and Country Areas Water Supply Department has taken an interest in the matter and has tidied up the surrounds of the weir, particularly on the northern side, for the benefit of those who go there by road bus and private motorcar. The local business people are interested in the area, of course, but there are very few of them now as the number of local residents at Mundaring has dwindled to an alarming extent; because with the changeover from wood-burning steam pumps to electric pumps, the need for firewood supplies has gone. As a result, the residents near the weir are mostly forestry workers and a few water supply workers. But there is still a hotel at Mundaring Weir, and I think that with a little encouragement the weir has great possibilities as a tourist centre. Also, the indications are that the local governing bodies concerned, particularly the Mundaring Road Board, are interested in doing what they can to improve the surrounds of the weir.

I suggest that if a committee were appointed from some of the Government departments involved, together with the local businessmen and representatives of the local governing bodies, plans could be worked out to develop that area and make it one of the major tourist attractions of Western Australia.

We have the weir itself; and tourists always seem to be attracted by a large stretch of water. In addition, Mundaring Weir has quite a considerable historic interest. The old No. 1 pumping station building is still there, and so is the

chimney. In the building are the old wood-burning steam pumps together with, I think, most of the other machinery. The pumping station could well be turned into a museum which would be of great interest to local tourists and overseas visitors.

In addition, the area immediately below the weir—between the weir and the main road which passes over the stream a quarter of a mile below the weir—lends itself admirably for development as a picnic spot and, as I have suggested before, a botanic garden.

I think that a committee consisting of representatives of the Goldfields and Country Areas Water Supply Department, the Forests Department, the Tourist Bureau, and the local organisations, together with a man like Mr. Oldham, who has shown his ability and enthusiasm by planning botanic gardens, could, with very little cost to the Government, build up a worth-while tourist centre there. In addition, the town-planning authorities who have been trying to implement the Stephenson plan have ideas for a tourist road along the scarp of the hill to the top of the hill and on through Helena Valley to Mundaring. If they were invited to join this proposed committee, quite a lot of new information could be brought to light and the plan I have suggested could be put into effect.

Another aspect of this matter is the so-called tourist—the person who just drives around the countryside. We have hundreds of these so-called tourists; in fact I think there are thousands of them every weekend. I do not regard them as tourists. They go out with the express purpose of collecting cheap firewood. I have been told that because of the advent and popularity of TV in the last few months, and the fact that we have had more than our due proportion of cold weather, the firewood merchants in the metropolitan area cannot fill the demands for firewood. That may be so this year, but in past years we still had trouble with the weekend firewood-getters.

When discussing the Tourist Bill last year, I mentioned the people who picked wildflowers and gathered mushrooms. In their own environment in Perth they are probably quite respectable citizens, and perhaps have quite a deal of civic pride. But once they get out of the metropolitan area and into the hills, they lose all sense of proportion and go berserk. Wherever they see a piece of firewood they stop and put it in the car if it will go in; if it will not, they take out an axe or a saw and, I think at times, chisels, and chip away at the wood. There is nothing wrong with that, of course; the Darling Range Road Board does appreciate that these people have cleaned up the road verges of waste timber.

Mr. J. Hegney: A lot are not energetic enough to take saws and axes in their cars.

Mr. OWEN: These weekend visitors are not always energetic; they look for wood that can be gathered with far less effort.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Fence posts.

Mr. OWEN: Guide posts which have been painted and set up alongside the road are not exempt from the ravages of these firewood-getters. Fences do not mean a thing to them. If fences are erected, they cut the wires or take out the posts and the fences fall down. They enter upon private property and play merry hell. But apart from stealing firewood, they cut down green trees, ravage pastures, and destroy wildflowers. They do everything that we do not want them to do up there. They make themselves most objectionable. They even steal wood that has been cut into 1 ft. blocks by the firewood contractors.

Mr. Nalder: Do you think we would be able to bait them?

Mr. OWEN: They should be dealt with under the Vermin Act, in my opinion. The Forests Department is losing a great deal of revenue as a result of the activities of these people. On the Kalamunda-Mundaring Weir road, the Forests Department has undertaken a reforestation and beautification programme on the land in the immediate vicinity of the road. The department, of course, depends on the timber standing there for the receipt of royalties. After the first lot of mill logs are taken out, the timber is thrown open to commercial contractors and they are charged, I think, 2s. a ton for the right to cut that wood. I do not know how much revenue the Forests Department receives from the timber alongside the road, but these weekend firewood collectors in their motor cars and trucks—I have seen the names of some well-known firms painted on the sides of the trucks that visit this area—collect all the spare wood and timber that is lying around, to cover their week's supply.

The Forests Department not only realises that it is losing revenue because of these people, but it is also aware that they are destroying a great many of the wildflowers in the hills. This must be so, because I find that many new notices have been erected by that department in the hills, warning people that the removal of firewood is prohibited. So I hope that a stop will be made to the ravaging of the forest land and the stealing of timber from private property in the near future. They even go further than that. Into the hills they take their cars, utilities, and trailers. Whether it is used as a means of ballast or whether it is just a means of disposal, I do not know, but these people load their vehicles up with all the rubbish

imaginable; and as soon as they get out of sight of any close habitation, they dump that rubbish anywhere it suits them.

I could show members of this House acres of rubbish in the hills area, comprising old tins, old boots, parts of motor-car bodies and a great deal of other junk which is strewn alongside the road, and sometimes even on the road. These people even dump chaff bags full of rubbish alongside the road; they do not even bother to empty the bag. To keep the roads clean in the hills area is of great concern to the local road board; but despite many notices that have been erected, the practice still continues.

In order to give these people from the city some indication of where they could legitimately dump their rubbish, the Darling Range Road Board has erected a notice with finger-pointing signs to show them where to go to reach the rubbish dump. The road board has done that in an effort to encourage them to dump the rubbish there instead of on the road; but unfortunately they do not take any heed of these signs and continue to dump the rubbish wherever it suits them.

Another matter of local interest which has caused serious concern to a certain part of my electorate is the Maida Vale water scheme. I am sorry the Minister for Water Supplies is not in his seat, because he is aware of what the situation is in that area. I am hopeful that something can be done this coming year towards providing water for those settlers who have searched for, and expected to find, underground water, but who at last have to look to the Government to provide a water scheme for them. The provision of this scheme has been in the investigation stage for quite a long time now, and only recently the department did give some indication of what it would cost each of the residents in that area if they were connected to a reticulated scheme.

I understand now that the majority of those residents have indicated and have signed an authority that they agree to pay a guarantee to ensure that the scheme will be successful economically. So I ask the Minister for Works, when reviewing the coming Estimates, to give further consideration to a start being made on the extension of that scheme as far as the Maida Vale School, at least. That school is served only with rainwater tanks; and the staff and the children there, in the dry summers, have a most unenviable time in trying to make out with the water stored in the rainwater tanks at the school.

If the Minister could see his way clear to extending the scheme only to the Maida Vale School this year, with the object of making a further extension next year, the people of the Maida Vale district would be very grateful indeed.

There is another matter I would like to bring to the notice of the House before concluding my remarks. It is not that we in this House can do much about it, but merely as an item of information, I would like to refer to what is going on in one part of the fruitgrowing industry; namely, the lemon-growing section. In Western Australia the production of lemons reached a record figure, in one year, of 150,000 bushels; but the average production in any year is from 95,000 to 120,000 bushels. About 75 per cent. of that crop are what are known as factory lemons. In winter-time there is not a very great demand for fresh lemons; and, therefore, the greater part of the crop is usually forwarded to factories for the extraction of juices and the recovery of lemon oil.

Over the years, as a result of negotiations between the fruitgrowers and the processors, the price per ton has been more or less satisfactory to the growers. This year, at the commencement of the processing season, the growers arranged a price of £20 a ton with the factory processors. The growers were not unhappy about receiving £20 a ton for their fruit. However, I would like to point out that their counterparts in the Eastern States, particularly in New South Wales, were receiving over £30 a ton.

Those who are acquainted with the situation know very well that that price was too great for the industry to carry; and, as a result, it has had serious repercussions this year on the producers of lemons. It is considered that because the price was so high the processors looked for another source of supply for their lemon juice. As a result of the Commonwealth exempting many items from the import and tariff restrictions this year, many thousands of gallons of lemon juice have been imported into Western Australia. The figures which I have for April and May of this year indicate that lemon juice, equal to approximately 500 tons of lemons, have been imported into Australia; and I understand that, in the months of June and July, even greater supplies have been brought into the country.

The price of that lemon juice, which is used by the manufacturers of fruit drinks and cordials, was approximately 2s. a gallon less than the local product. The price of the Western Australian juice, which is processed and extracted here and then sent to the larger centres in the Eastern States, to the makers of cordials and fresh fruit drinks, is approximately 11s. a gallon. I understand, however, that the price of this imported lemon juice to these manufacturers is 9s. a gallon. One can therefore imagine what is happening. The demand for our local lemon juices has fallen off to a considerable extent, and the growers were informed by processors in this

State that they had reluctantly been compelled to reduce the price for lemons from £20 a ton to £17 a ton.

In the last day or so we have been talking a great deal about the increased cost of production and what these increases mean to industrialists and the primary producer. I have just mentioned this case regarding lemon production to show all is not well with the lemon industry in Western Australia. What we fear is that a worse tragedy would occur if the factories did not dispose of their processed product and were unable to continue paying even £17 a ton. If they closed down and ceased to buy any further supplies of lemons, it would be a real tragedy to the lemon-growers of Western Australia because there is over 50 per cent. of the lemon production still on the trees.

On motion by Mr. I. W. Manning, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 6.12 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 23rd August, 1960

### CONTENTS

	Page
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—</b>	
Death of Mrs. M. J. White : Investigation of circumstances .....	592
Hall's Creek : Investigation of mineral resources .....	593
Petroleum Act : Permits and leases .....	593
Traffic Act : Reinstatement of a subregulation .....	592
War Service Land Settlement : Improvements to Perillup property .....	592
<b>ADDRESS-IN-REPLY : EIGHTH DAY—</b>	
Speakers on Address—	
The Hon. R. F. Hutchison .....	594
The Hon. J. G. Hislop .....	601
The Hon. G. E. Jeffery .....	610

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

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

#### WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT

##### *Improvements to Perillup Property*

- The Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Local Government:

Further to my question on Wednesday, the 17th August, 1960, relating to a contract let by the

War Service Land Settlement Board for scarifying, etc., on a property at Perillup—

- was the contract let to a parents and citizens' association;
- as indicated in the reply to No. (2) of my previous question that settlers are required to do a further 100 acres at their own expense, will the settler be credited with the amount for such work when his final valuation is made;
- if the reply to (b) is "Yes" what will this amount be?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

- Yes.
- No.
- See (b).

#### DEATH OF MRS. M. J. WHITE

##### *Investigation of Circumstances*

- The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY asked the Minister for Mines:

On the 29th November, 1957, a motion was agreed to by the Legislative Council to investigate the circumstances of the death of the late Mrs. M. J. White—

- Was the inquiry required by the Legislative Council in fact conducted?
- If so, what was the decision on each of the 10 points of the query enumerated on page 3842 of *Hansard* Vol. 3 of 1957?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

Apart from the inquiry conducted by the Commissioner of Public Health already referred to in the House by the honourable member and reported in *Hansard* Vol. 3, 1957 page 3837 *et seq.*, no further inquiry has been held pending action to be taken by the honourable member as suggested by the chairman of the Nurses Registration Board in his letter dated the 30th January, 1958, as per Legislative Council File 7/336, 1957.

#### TRAFFIC ACT

##### *Reinstatement of a Subregulation*

- The Hon. E. M. DAVIES asked the Minister for Mines:

Will the Government give urgent consideration to the reinstatement of subregulation (3) of regulation No. 126 made under the Traffic Act, 1919, such subregulation having been revoked on the 6th October, 1959? I make this request