

# Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 19th August, 1958.

## CONTENTS.

### Questions on Notice :

#### State Housing Commission—

Number of employees and proposed dismissals ..... 195

Installation of electric stoves in Bunbury Municipality ..... 197

Town Planning, extension of legislation ..... 195

Conditional purchase land, reduction of price in Hyden area ..... 195

Charcoal iron industry, establishment in the South-West ..... 196

Crown land, availability ..... 196

Midland Junction Workshops, number of employees ..... 196

State Engineering Works, number of employees ..... 196

State Shipping Service, stability of "Koolama" ..... 197

Bunbury Harbour, Government policy on Tydeman plan ..... 197

Juries Act amendment, estimated cost of altering court-houses ..... 198

Car dealers, tabling of bond, registrations, etc. .... 198

Mt. Yokine land resumptions, date, area and compensation ..... 198

Frozen fish, ban on imports ..... 199

Development of the North, tabling of correspondence on special grant ..... 199

Government and semi-Government employees, figures for 1957 and 1958 ..... 199

Search for underground water, use of additional drills ..... 199

Agriculture, bacterial cultures for clover pastures ..... 199

Forests, Greystones pine plantation ..... 200

Water supplies, Newburn scheme, cost and number of consumers ..... 200

Wellington Dam, control of land in water shed ..... 200

Lands, townsite areas, Narrogin-Dwanda railway ..... 200

Decentralisation, ministerial responsibility ..... 200

Pensioner flats, in West Perth, completion dates ..... 200

Motors and engines, control of silencing ..... 201

Gaseoyne River, conservation of water and installation of barrage ..... 201

Iron ore, particulars of Western Australian deposits ..... 201

Karragullen school, commencement and number of classrooms ..... 201

Road trucks, purchase by Forests Department ..... 202

### Questions without Notice :

Unemployment, Government measures to counter ..... 202

Commonwealth Fisheries Department, visit of official and use of trust fund ..... 202

Unfair Trading and Profit Control Act, Premier's opinion on repeal ..... 202

Railway tarpaulins, source of supply ..... 203

Address-in-reply, fourth day ..... 203

Speakers on Address—

Mr. Court ..... 203

Mr. W. A. Manning ..... 220

Mr. Norton ..... 223

Mr. Johnson ..... 228

Mr. Roberts ..... 233

## CONTENTS—continued.

Page

### Speakers on amendment—

The Premier ..... 216

Mr. Ross Hutchinson ..... 216

Mr. Perkins ..... 217

Mr. Bovell ..... 218

Mr. Johnson ..... 218

Mr. Potter ..... 219

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

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

### STATE HOUSING COMMISSION.

#### Number of Employees and Proposed Dismissals.

1. Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) What is the total number of officers employed by the State Housing Commission?

(2) Is it intended to dismiss any of these officers; if so, from what departments, and for what reason?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) As at the 14th August, 1958, there are 384 officers employed by the State Housing Commission.

(2) On account of reduction in funds and building activity it is highly probable that a lesser staff will be necessary. However, every endeavour will be made to provide alternative employment elsewhere.

### TOWN PLANNING.

#### Extension of Legislation.

2. Mr. WILD asked the Minister representing the Minister for Town Planning:

Why is it proposed to extend the interim town planning legislation instead of bringing down the main legislation to implement the Metropolitan Regional Plan?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied:

The Government is still giving consideration to the points raised in debate on the lapsed Bill introduced last year, particularly in connection with the composition of the regional authority and the financing of the scheme.

### CONDITIONAL PURCHASE LAND.

#### Reduction of Price in Hyden Area.

3. Mr. PERKINS asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Has an application been received for a reduction of price of conditional purchase land in the Hyden area because of rail service discontinuance and increased transport cost, added burden of land tax, decreased prices for agricultural produce, and increased costs generally?

(2) Does the Government intend to accede to this request?

(3) If so, by how much will the price of this land be reduced?

The MINISTER replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The question is under consideration.
- (3) Answered by No. (2).

### CHARCOAL IRON INDUSTRY.

#### *Establishment in the South-West.*

4. Mr. HEARMAN asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Is he aware that at a public meeting in Bunbury towards the end of June last, convened by the Mayor of Bunbury, to discuss the proposal to establish a charcoal iron industry in the South-West, it was stated by Mr. Constantine of the Wundowie charcoal iron industry that no decision had yet been made as to whether it would be necessary to transport all timber required for charcoal production to the site of the industry, or whether it would be possible to retort charcoal at various centres throughout the South-West and transport the charcoal to the proposed site of the industry, which site had not yet been determined?

(2) Is it correct to assume that approximately four tons of timber are required to produce one ton of charcoal?

(3) Is it considered that factors such as the site of the industry and whether charcoal can be economically and practically transported have no significant bearing on the ultimate economic success of the industry?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No. Both alternatives have been studied, but further investigation is necessary before a final decision can be reached.

(2) No. It depends on moisture content. A better figure to use is 3½ tons of wood at 25% moisture content per ton of charcoal.

(3) No. Every factor must have some bearing on the ultimate economic success of the industry.

### CROWN LAND.

#### *Availability.*

5. Mr. HEARMAN asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Further to my question No. 7 of the 13th August, is he aware that his answer indicates that no Crown land is available at all in the road board districts of Preston, Balingup, Greenbushes and Bridgetown?

(2) Is he satisfied that this state of affairs virtually precludes persons with little capital from starting new farms in these road districts?

(3) Will he re-examine the position that exists in these road districts to ensure that some Crown land is available for settlement?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes. But it is pointed out that the said road districts are amongst the oldest settled areas in this State, where all available Crown land has long since been selected. The Crown lands that remain are State forests; areas temporarily withheld from selection pending the removal of marketable timber; the Wellington Dam catchment area; and necessary reserves for public purposes.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) The Lands Department is in close touch with the Forests Department relative to the release of land for selection as soon as marketable timber has been cut.

### MIDLAND JUNCTION WORKSHOPS.

#### *Number of Employees.*

6. The Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

What was the total number of employees of the Midland Junction Workshops as at—

- (a) the 30th June, 1952.
- (b) the 30th June, 1953.
- (c) the 30th June, 1957.
- (d) the 30th June, 1958.
- (e) the present date?

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT replied:

- (a) 2531.
- (b) 2478.
- (c) 3081.
- (d) 3001.
- (e) 2986 (latest available figure as at the 26th July, 1958).

The business turnover for each of the completed years referred to in this question was—

- (a) £2,409,800.
- (b) £2,975,900.
- (c) £4,229,600.
- (d) £4,304,400.

### STATE ENGINEERING WORKS.

#### *Number of Employees.*

7. The Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Works:

What was the total number of employees of the State Engineering Works as at—

- (a) the 30th June, 1952;
- (b) the 30th June, 1953;
- (c) the 30th June, 1957;
- (d) the 30th June, 1958;
- (e) present date?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Works) replied:

- (a) 410.
- (b) 419.
- (c) 499.
- (d) 534.
- (e) 536.

The business turnover for each of the completed years referred to in this question was:—

- (a) £488,294.
- (b) £500,608.
- (c) £780,332.
- (d) £890,953.

## STATE SHIPPING SERVICE.

### *Stability of "Koolama."*

8. The Hon. D. BRAND asked the Premier:

(1) Is the new State Ship "Koolama" unstable?

(2) Is the ship's reported tendency to list under certain conditions normal for most classes of shipping?

(3) Is it true that the State Shipping Service has sworn to secrecy those employees who are aware of faults in the "Koolama's" stability?

(4) Has the "Koolama's" stability been investigated by the Commonwealth Marine Branch? If so, with what result?

(5) Is it true that, in an attempt to correct inherent instability, the "Koolama" will have permanent ballast fastened to her hull?

(6) Is it true that the instability of the "Koolama" is partly due to the unusual step of having the ship built to suit the Fremantle slip—rather than having the slip adjusted to suit the ship?

(7) Will he table all reports submitted on the ship's handling on her maiden trip to the North and return?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) No. The vessel's stability has been approved by the British Ministry of Transport and the Commonwealth Navigation Department.

(2) Passenger vessels tend to list when tanks are pumped out. The list is controlled by the use of the ship's tanks.

(3) No. The State Shipping Service sees no reason for any secrecy.

(4) Yes. The vessel's stability is satisfactory subject to correct use of ballast and other tanks, and stowage of cargo. This applies to all ships.

(5) Permanent ballast is not necessary, but it is likely that sand ballast will be carried during the cattle season, as on other State vessels carrying cattle.

(6) Both the "Koojarra" and the "Koolama" were restricted in weight to enable slipping at Fremantle. This does not involve the stability factor.

(7) The master's voyage report is tabled.

## STATE HOUSING COMMISSION.

### *Installation of Electric Stoves in Bunbury Municipality.*

9. Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) How many electric stoves have been installed in homes constructed, under any scheme administered by the State Housing Commission, within the boundaries of the Municipality of Bunbury; and in what years were such stoves installed?

(2) Are such stoves purchased by building contractors through normal trade channels, or does some Government instrumentality supply them to the contractors concerned?

(3) If supplied by a Government instrumentality—

(a) From whom are they purchased?

(b) What is the price paid for each such stove?

(c) Are the stoves charged to building contractors—

(i) if so, at what price;

(ii) if not, what is the basis of supply?

(d) What amount is included in the assessment of cost of the completed house for such stove?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) 1956	....	....	....	....	5
1957	....	....	....	....	63
1958	....	....	....	....	14
					<hr/>
					82

(2) Purchased by public tender through Government Stores Department.

(3) (a) Metters Ltd, through Government Tender Board and Government Stores Department.

(b) £65 - £69.

(c) (i) No.

(ii) Contractor allows for installation only in his tender price for house.

(d) Cost only (£65 - £69).

## BUNBURY HARBOUR.

### *Government Policy on Tydeman Plan.*

10. Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is it the intention of the Government to adhere to the developmental programme, as laid down in the Tydeman Plan, in relation to the Bunbury Harbour?

(2) If not, what are the details of any proposed departure from such plan?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Minister for Works) replied:

(1) All works in progress, or those contemplated by the Government when funds can be made available, are in accordance with the Tydeman Plan.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

## JURIES ACT AMENDMENT.

*Estimated Cost of Altering Court-houses.*

11. Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Justice:

(1) What is the estimated cost of improvements and additions to each of the court-houses throughout the State, to provide the necessary accommodation for women jurors, consequent upon the amendment to the Juries Act of last year?

(2) What are the details of the proposed alterations, etc., to the court-house in Bunbury?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) In addition to accommodation for male and female jurors, the proposed additions and alterations include urgently required accommodation for other purposes. Particulars of each project are listed hereunder:—

(a) Supreme Court. Additions and extensions to provide for—

(i) Two jury rooms, each with male and female toilets.

(ii) Public waiting room.

(iii) Public toilets—male and female.

(iv) Press reporting room.

(v) Office for police orderly.

(vi) Extensions to barristers' robing room and additions to provide a robing room for female barristers, with male and female toilets incorporated therein.

(vii) Barristers' Board room.

(viii) Office for interviewing persons seeking legal aid under the Poor Persons Legal Assistance Act.

(ix) Additional office accommodation for the staff of the Arbitration Court.

(x) Improvements to staff toilets.

(xi) Extensions to strong rooms.  
Estimated cost, £47,000.

(b) Kalgoorlie. New toilet block for male and female jurors, court staff and visiting judges.

Estimated cost, £3,300.

(c) Bunbury.

(i) Conversion of existing rooms used by barristers and witnesses to toilets for male and female jurors.

(ii) Additions to provide rooms for barristers and witnesses and a store room for court records.

(iii) Internal toilet for visiting judges.

(iv) Pavement of area at rear of court.

Estimated cost, £5,000.

(d) Geraldton.

(i) Alterations to existing jury toilets to provide for female jurors and visiting judges.

(ii) Addition of a store room for court records.

Estimated cost, £2,500.

(e) Albany. Provision of toilet accommodation for female jurors was incorporated in sewerage installations already in hand.

Estimated additional cost, £400.

(f) Carnarvon. Additions to provide accommodation for female jurors.

Estimated cost, £100.

## CAR DEALERS.

*Tabling of Bond, Registrations, etc.*

12. Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) Has finality been reached with the form of bond required from car dealers under the provisions of last session's amendments to the Traffic Act?

(2) If so, would he table a copy of the form of bond?

(3) If not finalised, when is finality expected, and will amendments to the Act be needed?

(4) How many dealers have registered?

(5) Is it thought there are other dealers liable to register, and how many?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) This is not available at the present.

(3) It will be necessary to amend the Act before finality can be reached.

(4) 128.

(5) Yes, approximately 400.

## MT. YOKINE LAND RESUMPTIONS.

*Date, Area, and Compensation.*

13. Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Works:

Is compensation still unpaid for part of the Mt. Yokine land resumptions? If so—

(a) when were the resumptions made;

(b) how much land is involved;

(c) how many claimants;

(d) why the delay in settlement?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Minister for Works) replied:

Yes.

(a) The 27th November, 1950.

(b) 440 acres, including land for which claims have not been lodged.

(c) Three, involving 180 acres.

(d) Unwillingness of claimants either to accept the departmental offers or proceed for adjudication in accordance with the Public Works Act.

**FROZEN FISH.***Ban on imports.*

14. Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Police:

(1) Was the sale of 20,000 packets of imported frozen fish recently banned in this State?

(2) If so—

(a) Why?

(b) What is to be, or was, the fate of such packets of frozen fish?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) (a) Not applicable.

(b) Disposal through the trade.

**DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTH.***Tabling of Correspondence on Special Grant.*

15. Mr. COURT asked the Premier:

Will he lay on the Table of the House correspondence with the Commonwealth Government covering the State Government's submission to the Commonwealth in respect of the special grant for the North?

The PREMIER replied:

Yes, for one week.

**GOVERNMENT AND SEMI-GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.***Figures for 1957 and 1958.*

16. Mr. COURT asked the Premier:

What were the State Government and semi-Government employment figures as at the 30th June, 1957 and 1958, under the heading—

- (a) Public Service Act;
- (b) other salaried appointments;
- (c) State Trading Concerns;
- (d) Railways;
- (e) other Government employment;
- (f) total of all Government and semi-Government employment?

The PREMIER replied:

Category.	Employment at 30th June—	
	1957	1958
(a) Public Service Act ..	4,433	4,516
(b) Other salaried appointments ....	*	*
(c) State Trading Concerns ....	2,955	3,120
(d) Railways ....	13,712	13,351
(e) Other Government employment † ....	27,632	30,002
(f) Total Government employment † ....	48,732	50,989

\* Not available separately; included in figures shown under categories (c)-(f).

† Comprises Boards, Trusts, Commissions, etc. and Departmental and Government-Assisted Hospitals.

**SEARCH FOR UNDERGROUND WATER SUPPLIES***Use of Additional Drills.*

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

(1) In what areas is it proposed to use the two additional drills to be purchased to extend the search for underground water?

(2) What type drills are proposed, and when will they be in operation?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied:

These questions should have been addressed to the Minister for Mines. The answers are as follows:—

(1) This will be decided when the drills are available.

(2) The type of drill to be purchased will be decided by experience gained in drilling at present being carried on. When they will be in operation will be governed by this and the time taken for their supply.

**AGRICULTURE.***Bacterial Cultures for Clover Pastures.*

18. Mr. OWEN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Is he aware that many farmers have experienced difficulty in establishing new clover pastures, and feel that the heavy mortality in young plants is mainly due to faulty nodulation caused by the absence of the necessary bacteria?

(2) Are the several proprietary lines of bacterial culture at present available considered to be effective in supplying this bacteria, and are they as suitable for this purpose as were the agar type cultures formerly supplied by the department?

(3) Are these present cultures regularly tested by the department for viability and for suitability of type?

(4) As the viability of these cultures could be adversely affected by improper storage prior to delivery, will he take steps to ensure that only suitable and effective cultures are supplied to farmers?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) It is realised that difficulty is often experienced in establishing new clover pastures, due to seedling mortality associated with faulty nodulation. However, although the absence of the necessary bacteria is often blamed by farmers for this difficulty, other causes may be responsible, including adverse seasonal or soil conditions or faulty sowing methods.

(2) Commercial peat cultures are just as effective as the agar cultures formerly supplied by the Department of Agriculture and some new strains are possibly even more effective.

(3) Commercial cultures are checked for effectiveness by the department as necessary. In addition, farmers' interests are further safeguarded by a special laboratory testing service which has been set up at

Sydney University with the object of testing the commercial cultures at each processing stage, and ensuring that only the highest grade cultures are marketed by the manufacturers.

(4) The storage and handling of commercial cultures by distributors or agents is not controlled by the department. However, distributors are fully aware of the essential requirements to maintain the viability of such cultures.

### FORESTS.

#### *Greystones Pine Plantation.*

19. Mr. OWEN asked the Minister for Forests:

(1) Have records been kept of the costs involved in planting, maintaining, and cutting of pine forests on the Greystones plantation at Mundaring Weir?

(2) If so, what has been—

(a) the cost of these operations per acre;

(b) the aggregate yield of timber per acre;

(c) the monetary return per acre as royalties?

(3) Could these figures be considered average for this type of forestry on good soils in the wetter parts of the State?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes, but plantation costs for Greystones cannot be separated from the cost of the Mundaring plantation group.

(2) (a) Information not available for Greystones in particular.

(b) The Greystones plantation has not yet reached maturity, but volumes removed as thinnings per acre up to the present time vary from 20 to 100 loads, depending on age and site quality.

(c) Royalty values cannot be calculated correctly until the plantation area is cleared of its final crop. However royalties range from £4 3s. to £10 a load. In all cases subsequent thinnings and final crop still remain.

(3) The volume per acre being produced on the better sites at Greystones will be indicative of the volumes which can be expected on the good soils in the wetter parts of the State.

### WATER SUPPLIES.

#### *Newburn Scheme, Cost and Number of Consumers.*

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

(1) What distance is involved in the recent extension of water supply pipeline along the Malda Vale-rd. near Newburn?

(2) What was the cost of this extension?

(3) How many consumers will be supplied?

(4) When was the first application made for this extension?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Minister for Water Supplies) replied:

(1) 310 chains of piping were laid for the Newburn scheme.

(2) The actual cost is not yet available. The estimated cost is £15,000.

(3) The scheme will serve 72 properties, 51 of which are improved.

(4) The 12th December, 1947.

### WELLINGTON DAM.

#### *Control of Land in Water Shed.*

21. Mr. W. A. MANNING asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Does the Water Purity Committee control the use of all land in the watershed of the Wellington Dam?

(2) If not, in whom is control vested?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Minister for Water Supplies) replied:

(1) No.

(2) The Minister for Water Supplies.

### LANDS.

#### *Townsite Areas, Narrogin-Dwarda Railway.*

22. Mr. W. A. MANNING asked the Minister for Lands:

What policy will be adopted in regard to townsite areas on the closed Narrogin-Dwarda Railway, seeing that these will not now be required except for agriculture?

The MINISTER replied:

Action in regard to townsite reserves on the Narrogin-Dwarda railway will not be considered until the Government has dealt with the report of the Royal Commissioner, following his extended terms of reference, as recently announced.

### DECENTRALISATION.

#### *Ministerial Responsibility.*

23. Mr. W. A. MANNING asked the Premier:

Which Minister holds the responsibility for decentralisation of population and industry?

The PREMIER replied:

All Ministers.

### PENSIONER FLATS IN WEST PERTH.

#### *Completion Date.*

24. Mr. HEAL asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) What is the estimated completion date of the S.H.C. flats being erected on the corner of Hay and Colin-sts., West Perth?

(2) How many flats will be available for pensioner couples?

(3) What other type of accommodation will be available?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Contract date for completion is the 22nd February, 1959, but it is estimated that the flats will be completed in December 1958.

(2) 45 flats.

(3) 25 flats on the 2nd floor.

## MOTORS AND ENGINES.

### *Control of Silencing.*

25. Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Labour:

(1) Has he, or any other authority, power to ensure that engines and motors sold to the public do not make offensive noises?

(2) Is noise control the responsibility of the seller, the purchaser, or the maker?

(3) Can steps be taken to ensure that motors sold to model aeroplane enthusiasts are silenced before sale?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No, but the Commissioner of Police can take action against persons driving noisy motor-cycles or vehicles.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) Not under existing legislation.

## GASCOYNE RIVER.

### *Conservation of Water and Installation of Barrage.*

26. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

(1) Is any work being carried out on a survey of the Gascoyne River with a view to further conservation of water?

(2) If the answer is "yes," to what extent?

(3) Is it anticipated that more clay bars will be placed in the river during the present financial year?

(4) Has any consideration been given to the placing of a "barrage" at the mouth of the Gascoyne River (similar to those on the Murray River in South Australia) to stop the encroachment of the sea and to dam back the fresh water when the river is flowing?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Minister for Water Supplies) replied:

(1) Investigations are proceeding to assess the potential storage in the river sands upstream from the bridge.

(2) Observation bores have been established over a length of two miles and a survey is in progress to determine the water bearing potential of the sands over a length of five miles upstream from the bridge.

(3) No.

(4) Yes.

## IRON ORE.

### *Particulars of Western Australian Deposits.*

27. Mr. MAY asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) What locations, areas and estimated quantities of iron ore deposits have been set aside under the Broken Hill Proprietary Steel Industry Agreement?

(2) What are the terms of this agreement, as related to the period of the leases and the amount of royalties payable per ton of ore extracted?

(3) What are the locations and areas of known deposits of iron ore in this State, recognised as being economic for use, outside those areas included in the Broken Hill Proprietary Steel Industry Agreement?

(4) From what area, if any, would iron ore be obtained for use in the South-West charcoal iron industry in the event of this industry becoming an accomplished fact?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yampi Sound deposits and the Koolyanobbing deposit, which comprise—  
Cockatoo Island, 16,600,000 tons above sea level.

Koolan Island, 92,000,000 tons above sea level.

Koolyanobbing, 69,250,000 tons down to plain level (136 ft. below surrounding country).

(2) The leases granted on Cockatoo Island and Koolan Island are for a period of 50 years from the date of passing of the Act, with right of renewal for successive periods of 21 years. The Koolyanobbing deposit is reserved for 10 years from the passing of the Act, and the reserve may not be declared open for mining, cancelled, or temporarily occupied after that period without the approval of Parliament, but the Minister may remove from the reserve an amount of ore not exceeding fifty thousand tons in any one year.

The royalty fixed in the agreement is at the rate of 6d. per ton, but since the 1st December, 1945, the company has voluntarily paid royalty at the rate of 1s. 6d. per ton.

(3) All major deposits of iron ore in Western Australia have been examined superficially in the last two years. Exploratory investigation by diamond drilling and other mining activity have not been carried out on these deposits, but diamond drilling has been commenced on the Tallering Peak deposits.

(4) Decision on this would be made as a result of investigations in No. (3), but almost certainly from Koolyanobbing.

## KARRAGULLEN SCHOOL.

### *Commencement and Number of Classrooms.*

28. Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Education:

(1) When is it expected that the new school at Karragullen will be commenced?

(2) How many classrooms is it expected will be erected?

The MINISTER replied:

It is not proposed to erect a new school at Karragullen, but to shift the existing two classrooms to the new site as soon as finance is available. It may not be possible for this work to be carried out during the current financial year.

### ROAD TRUCKS

*Purchase by Forests Department.*

29. Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Forests:

(1) Is it correct that when men formerly employed by the coal-mining companies at Collie last year transferred to the Forests Department road transport trucks were purchased by or on behalf of the Forests Department?

(2) How many trucks were purchased and were tenders called?

(3) If not, why not?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes, through the Controller of Stores after Tender Board, Treasury and Executive Council approvals.

(2) Five. No tenders were called.

(3) Transport was urgently required and prices were obtained for suitable types which were readily available. The vehicles purchased were at the lowest quotes obtained.

### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT.

*Government Measures to Counter.*

The Hon. D. BRAND asked the Premier: In view of his statement in today's issue of "The West Australian", that there are now 500 more people in Western Australia lacking work, would he indicate to the House what special measures the State Government has in mind to stimulate employment opportunities in Western Australia?

The PREMIER replied:

The Government is providing the maximum employment available with the funds at its disposal. The Leader of the Opposition and those who think with him condemn this policy. The Government is following a policy of trying to persuade more and more people in Western Australia to support local industries, with the idea that the demand for goods made in Western Australia will increase and thereby provide much greater opportunities for the employment of more people in Western Australia.

I might point out that if a sufficient demand were available from the people of Western Australia for the goods which already established factories and workshops in this State could produce with the plant and equipment available, there would be employment opportunities for a further

10,000 people in our manufacturing industries; and that objective, if it could be achieved, would more than overcome the unemployment problems which exist in Western Australia at the present time. I would appeal to the Leader of the Opposition, to all members of Parliament and members of the public, to give far greater support to the products of our local industries and thereby employ more people in this State.

### COMMONWEALTH FISHERIES DEPARTMENT.

*Visit of Official and Use of Trust Fund*

2. Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Fisheries:

(1) Is he aware that a representative of the Commonwealth Fisheries Department is at present in Western Australia?

(2) If so, is the visit of that official in connection with the allocation of funds from the Commonwealth Fisheries Trust Fund?

(3) Is he aware of any application having been made to the Commonwealth Fisheries Trust Fund by private industry in Western Australia for assistance in developing the fishing industry; and, if so what was the result?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes. The Superintendent of Fisheries and Mr. Gates have been in the South-West for some days investigating various matters in connection with this fund.

(2) The reply is "partly". He has other duties while in this State, but among matters with which he will deal will be a crayfish survey of the south coast. He is also looking into the matter of the Albany whaling station and the Carnarvon whaling station.

(3) The answer to both parts of this question is "No".

### UNFAIR TRADING AND PROFIT CONTROL ACT.

*Premier's Opinion on Repeal.*

3. Mr. BOVELL asked the Premier:

Further to his reply to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition and in view of the fact that no major private industry has commenced in Western Australia during the past two years does he not consider it advisable to expunge from the records the unfair trading legislation?

The PREMIER replied:

I say that the best, safest, and surest basis for the promotion of economic progress in Western Australia is that provided by the industries which we already have here. I would emphasise that the factories and workshops which we already have, with the skilled managements which they possess and the plant and machinery



already installed, could produce a far greater volume of goods than they now do; and if people in this State, including the member for Vasse, would buy less goods manufactured in the Eastern States of Australia and more goods produced in our own State, there would be far more employment available in Western Australia.

Mr. Bovell: The little capital I have is invested in Western Australian industry.

The PREMIER: I am talking about our buying habits and not the investment of our surplus capital. If our existing factories and workshops could produce at their maximum capacity—the already installed capacity—additional employment could be made available in Western Australia for 10,000 more people. In regard to the specific point mentioned in the hon. member's question, I say that the legislation to which he refers has not had the effect of keeping any large industry away. I would go further and say that several people already engaged in industry, trade and commerce generally in this State have sought the protection of this law against the more monopolistic business firms operating in this State and some operating in other States.

#### RAILWAY TARPULINS.

##### *Source of Supply.*

4. Mr. HEARMAN asked the Premier:

In view of the answers he gave to the Leader of the Opposition and to the member for Vasse, would he look into the source of supply of railway tarpaulins in this State, particularly in view of the fact that flax is produced in Western Australia?

The PREMIER replied:

Yes. A very constructive question.

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

##### *Fourth Day.*

Debate resumed from the 14th August.

MR. COURT (Nedlands) [4.57]: [It is my desire to contribute to the debate on the Address-in-reply, as amended, and I would like to comment under three particular headings. I wish first to deal with a matter which is partly parochial and partly of concern to all members in the House; namely, the National Parks Board, with particular reference to Matilda Bay. I will deal, secondly, with the industrial outlook in Western Australia at the present time, and the effect on it of Government policy. I will make, thirdly, some comments on long service leave. So that Ministers cannot plead that they are not forewarned, I desire to foreshadow that when I conclude my remarks I intend to

move a further amendment to the Address-in-reply. I make that clear so that there can be no suggestion of discourtesy or lack of prior notice.

The Minister for Education: Are you going to trot out the code again?

MR. COURT: I am not going to foreshadow that. No doubt the Premier will seize this opportunity to take part in the debate. We hope he does. On the first of the matters I mentioned—the question of the National Parks Board and, in particular its administration of the Matilda Bay area, more generally known as Crawley—I wish to make some observations that are pertinent, not only to that area, but also to the overall problems which confront this board.

Let me hasten to say that I am not being critical of the board. I have said previously in this House, and particularly during last session's debate on the Estimates, that I am amazed that this board is able to achieve as much as it does with the very limited resources and funds at its disposal. It has been given a very large slice of territory to look after; areas which, once one starts spending money on them, involve colossal sums if any major contribution is to be made to their development and the achievement of the purpose for which they have been set aside.

We must also remember that many of the areas that this board administers were wished on to it, mainly because no one else wanted them. In times of local financial stringency, or for some other reason, these areas have been passed on to the National Parks Board; and it is left with a very considerable area of land which, of course, brings with it financial embarrassment.

I preface my remarks with those observations in fairness to the National Parks Board, which I appreciate is ready and willing at all times to develop these areas to the limit of the resources that are made available to it. In my opinion, the area of Matilda Bay is the perfect setting for greater development. It is well served with transport which is easily supplemented to meet seasonal and special occasions. It is centrally and conveniently located—being very close to the city and at the same time very convenient for tourists and others travelling from Perth to Fremantle—and it is also equally well located in its proximity to many other suburbs.

It is easy to develop car-parking facilities at this particular site. It has the advantage that it is ideal, both in the water and on the foreshore, for people with young families. It has the further advantage, in its natural setting, that parents—in particular those with young children—can sit on the foreshore and look out over the river to watch either the activities of their own children, yacht races, or other events

taking place on the river, and yet still have their backs to the sun for the greater part of the day.

That is an important point, for on most of our ocean beaches one has to sit facing the glaring sun for a considerable part of the day; whereas if one is sitting on the banks of Matilda Bay, one has one's back to the sun for the major portion of the day. I repeat, therefore, that for parents with young families this is a most important consideration.

The area has other natural advantages, in that it includes Pelican Point. This has the advantage of isolating on Pelican Point all the yacht clubs, together with all their necessary clubhouses, boats and gear, without interfering with the people's use of the main bay foreshore and swimming area.

In other words, there is one part of the bay which can be used by the general public and those people who want to swim or picnic there; and then at the far end there is Pelican Point, which is ideally situated for use by yacht clubs with all the appurtenances which are necessary for their activities. Having made those observations, I would like briefly to state what is needed in this area.

Firstly, there has to be development of the area on a master plan. It is insufficient to do a little here and a little there without a properly co-ordinated plan for the development of this beautiful bay—one of the most beautiful in the world. It is important, even if the money is not available to do the job immediately, that a master plan for the development of the bay and Pelican Point be agreed upon, so that all money expended and all work undertaken is done towards reaching the ultimate goal set down in this master plan.

There is urgent need for the further development of lawns and shade, although considerable progress has been made in that regard. There is urgent need for the provision of car-parking facilities. At the moment, car-parking facilities are such that, during the summer months, it is only a matter of a few weeks after the commencement of the busy period, before cars get bogged in the sand in that area; and, of course, this leads to many traffic hazards and inconvenience as a result.

The alignment of the road is important. A Bill was passed last session for that to be done. It has a direct bearing on the ultimate building of the new teachers' training college; because it follows that without a new road alignment, with necessary improvements, it will be impossible to obtain satisfactory access to the new teacher's training college which is to be built in that area.

A further point is the general beautification that is needed, including the replacement of unsightly fences and other outmoded constructions. Those members who

have driven around Hackett Drive will recall that there are unsightly fences on the National Parks Board's side and on the University's side. No doubt the authorities, in each case, are awaiting the realignment of the road before these fences are replaced with something more pleasant and attractive. There is no doubt that, at the moment, they are an eyesore.

Some of the amenities that are needed in the programme of development include, firstly, modern tea-rooms. The present structure is very old and out-moded, and certainly does not enhance the district. The proprietor operates the tea-rooms to the satisfaction of the people who use the area so far as the facilities at present available will permit, but he is restricted in his operation of that shop.

~~The Minister for Housing: Socialistic or capitalistic tea-rooms?~~

MR. COURT: Of course, if the Government insists on owning the area, it may insist on reconstructing the tea-rooms. However, there is an alternative to that course; because I have a feeling that, if the matter were properly approached, tenders could be called on a ground lease basis whereby, given a long lease, the proprietor might be prepared to build modern tea-rooms which would revert to the authority owning the area when the lease expired. That is not an unusual method. If my memory serves me right, the circumstances under which the King's Park tea-rooms were reconstructed and modernised were on that basis. I think tenders were called for a building lease, although I would not be sure on that point.

In constructing these modern tea-rooms, it is important that facilities be made available so that tourists may, whilst using the tea-rooms, admire the beauty of the river—both by day and by night. It does not call for much imagination, and it certainly does not present many technical difficulties—with modern methods of construction—to provide such a building on the Matilda Bay waterfront. It is important that picnic facilities be increased, including children's playthings on the foreshore. Some have been installed already by the Lotteries Commission, but I envisage that these will have to be increased many times over with increased patronage to the area.

There is further scope for improvement in the amenities in the water itself. There are many beaches—Geelong, for instance, comes readily to mind—where improvements and facilities have been installed in the water. Not only are there swings and slides on the foreshore, but also a series of wheels and chutes and the like are provided in the water where the children can safely play. At the moment there is nothing like that in the water at Matilda Bay. In fact, the old springboard, which existed when most of us were small boys, is barely there; it is purely a relic, and that is all.

That particular part of the bay lends itself to that kind of development, so that not only children, but also parents can use these facilities in a safe area. It goes without saying that once this area is developed for greater use by the public, some insurance will have to be made against the algae nuisance so that it will not frighten them away. However, I am sure that, with modern methods, there is no reason why that beach cannot be kept clean during the summer season. It all comes back to the question of what are the problems preventing these things being done. It can be summarised in one word; and that is, finance.

Up till now I have been extremely reluctant to raise this issue. In fact, I have been extremely patient because I felt that, in the immediate postwar years, it was important to get housing and other problems out of the way so that it could not be suggested that development of Matilda Bay, for example, was being done to the exclusion of providing the essentials of life. We are in the situation at the moment where this State claims to have solved its housing problem. In fact, the information we received would suggest that we have a slight surplus of houses if world standards are taken as the basis. Therefore, it is time we started to examine projects such as those I have mentioned. No longer can they be shelved and pushed off as being of no importance.

In fact, I am fast coming to the conclusion that such matters must be regarded as investments and not as luxuries in the life of this community. All the areas of this State which are suitable for relaxation, and which have scenic attractions, must be included in a master plan for their greater development. Each one must have its own master plan so that all money expended in a particular area, whether it be Crawley or anywhere else, is spent towards reaching the ultimate goal of developing the whole area.

Haphazard treatment is not enough, either for local use or for tourists; so we return to the National Parks Board which is being asked to do an impossible task if the Government does not propose to make available sufficient finance for it to get on with its job. Incidentally, most of the work it does creates employment. It is significant that some of its areas were developed for that particular reason, namely, to create a large proportion of manual work as distinct from that done by mechanisation.

If we care to have a look at the Estimates we will find that for the year ended the 30th June, 1957, the estimate is only £17,500 for the whole of the work done by the National Parks Board. That is not for Crawley alone; that is the whole of the National Parks Board's vote. In addition, during the debate on the Estimates, the Treasurer explained that other revenue was received from gate takings, rentals and so

on—the details of which, to the best of my knowledge, are not available to the House, and therefore we do not know what that other revenue is.

I would suggest that even the most optimistic estimate of the revenue that this board could obtain would not be a very great contribution towards solving the problem that it has to solve. It boils down to this: that it becomes a butt for criticism. The people complain that the amenities are not good enough; that the sanitation is not good enough; and that this and that are not good enough, when this board has not the finance that it desires to carry out its work. I am sure that the board, or some other appropriate authority, could develop Matilda Bay into one of the most beautiful beaches in Australia, and certainly turn it into a tourists' delight.

If it is the policy of the Government not to grant the board sufficient money to get on with the job, it must supply an alternative. We cannot let a beautiful area such as that remain stagnant. We then have to examine whether a local authority would be prepared to encompass that area in its boundaries and expend a satisfactory sum to develop it.

Having made those few observations on a matter which is partly parochial and partly general in its nature, I would now like to make some comments on the outlook on industrial matters in this State, with particular reference to the effects of Government policy. The other night I thought that my Leader made an extremely convincing speech on this subject. He quoted some very pertinent and telling points. When my Leader was putting those points over, the Minister for Lands was not smiling quite as much as he is tonight.

The Minister for Lands: I was feeling quite happy.

Mr. COURT: The Minister did not look it, because I thought the Leader of the Opposition made some extremely telling points in the submission he made to this House.

The Minister for Transport: The Minister for Lands was concentrating on the meeting of the Agricultural Council and the price of wheat.

The Hon. D. Brand: Has he come to any worth-while decision?

Mr. COURT: The current position is not healthy. I agree it is not good to harp on those conditions when they are not as buoyant as they could be, but we in this House have to face these facts. It is our duty to try to find a reason. I submit that the reason for the industrial outlook in this State is directly related to the general atmosphere which surrounds the Government's policy. All these matters have some basic cause; sometimes it is a physical thing and sometimes it is a

psychological thing. It is my opinion that on this occasion we can bring it right down to the point of the general atmosphere which surrounds the economy of this State because of Government policy.

It was advanced by the member for Leederville the other night that we have no right to criticise the Government's policy; that once the Government is elected, we of the Opposition are bound to its policy. That is tommy rot and nonsense! We would not surrender our policy or political beliefs any more than the Government would. Therefore we are entitled to criticise the Government's policy, and to explain in our way why it is to the detriment of this community.

In my opinion, what this State badly needs is a clean start. We need the opportunity to wipe the slate clean and get off from a fresh start, indicating to the world at large that industry and population are desired and welcome.

Mr. Lapham: Were you referring to any business activities?

Mr. COURT: I think the attitude towards industry and commerce in this State has to be changed. We have to give them the feeling that they are wanted and welcome, because they do not feel that now. The policy of the present Government makes this almost impossible to achieve unless the Government is prepared to declare publicly that it has changed its mind—changed its policy, in other words. Even if the Government did that, in my humble opinion it would take many years, and possibly a decade, to restore the confidence that this State needs to get geared up again to the position it was in a few years ago.

The attack on industry in this State has taken place under two headings—on the legislative side, and on the administrative side. On the legislative side we find the unfair trading legislation. Regardless of what the Government might think of the merits of that Act, the way it is interpreted from one end of the world to the other is doing something to scare off industry.

Mr. Norton: Is this the only country that has this legislation?

Mr. COURT: What does that matter? We have to recognise the result, the effect, and the remedy because of these things. That is why I say the solution is to wipe the slate clean.

The Minister for Education: You have done your best to belittle this State overseas. That is what you and your party have done.

Mr. COURT: That is a malicious and improper remark.

The Minister for Education: You have done your best to sabotage this State.

### *Point of Order.*

Mr. COURT: I ask for the withdrawal of the remarks implying that I have done my best to sabotage this State.

The Minister for Transport: In the same way as your Leader did not withdraw his remarks the other night.

Mr. COURT: I am now addressing the Speaker.

The Speaker: I understood the hon. Minister to say that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had done his best to sabotage the State. The hon. member thinks that is a reflection on him. I therefore ask the Minister to withdraw that remark.

The Minister for Education: I willingly withdraw the remark if it is regarded as offensive. I substitute the phrase that the Liberal Party has tried to put the boots into the Government with regard to this legislation.

### *Debate Resumed.*

Mr. COURT: Of course we can take the last part of the Minister's remark as something of a compliment. Only the repeal of this legislation will give us the necessary clean start that we need. There was an Honorary Royal Commission which started off as a select committee inquiring into this legislation. It was representative of all parties. I say this: The select committee which became a Royal Commission turned over backwards, to use a colloquial phrase, to try to produce something which would not only get the Government out of the mess it was in, but give the State a new chance.

What has happened? There is no mention that the Commission's report is to be acted upon, and legislation introduced in lieu of the Unfair Trading Act. After all, that body consisted of members of the three parties—the Liberal, the Labour and the Country Party. It sat and earnestly applied itself to this particular legislation. On a large area of points the members reached unanimous opinion. It is true there was a minority report; but there was a large area of agreement which the Government could have seized on and said, "Right, we will give it a new start; we will clean the slate, and at least overcome this objectionable legislation and start off with legislation which has the support of the three parties—the parties which make up the Parliament of this State."

The Minister for Health: I think this cry of the unfair trading legislation is only a bogey. It has not made any difference at all.

Mr. COURT: I made this point earlier. Even if there is nothing in it undesirable—I do not admit that for one moment, and if the Minister wants to debate these points, I think we will have the opportunity to do so later on in this session—the

fact is that this legislation created a state of mind which is stopping the development of Western Australia.

The Minister for Education: You have tried to create such a state of mind.

Mr. COURT: Nonsense! The way in which the Minister puts it, we are going round damaging Western Australia.

The Minister for Education: So you are!

The Minister for Transport: Your Government damaged this State for six years when it was in office.

Mr. COURT: If the Minister wants to take up that point, I can say that he would cheerfully accept a return to the state of employment which existed in this State during those six years.

The Minister for Transport: But then your Government had the advantage of a good Federal Labour Government which gave it a flying start.

Mr. COURT: In spite of that, our Government created a state of prosperity, the equal of which Western Australia has never experienced.

The Minister for Transport: The more Liberal Governments there are in Australia, the more unemployment there is.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has the floor. I appeal to hon. members to give him a chance.

Mr. COURT: The Minister for Transport is usually fairly shrewd in his approach to these political problems; but in this instance he walked right into our corner when he spoke about unemployment, in view of the fact that he is a senior Minister in a Government which has the highest proportion of unemployment in Australia.

Mr. Johnson: And a very small amount of Federal funds.

The Minister for Transport: Don't you think that the position would be a little different if we had schemes similar to the Snowy River, St. Mary's, and rail standardisation in this State?

Mr. COURT: If the Minister wants a debate on rail standardisation, I will ask him what representations his Government has made in recent months to have this scheme implemented? So much on the legislative side. That is not the end of that side, because there are many other facets of the Government's programme which have been detrimental to the industrial expansion of this State.

The Minister for Transport: On the legislative side your mob had price control for six years. You are now talking about a milk-and-watery thing—profit control and unfair trading—which is insignificant by comparison.

Mr. COURT: I hope that all this time which the Minister is taking out of my speech will be allowed to be added on at the other end.

The Minister for Transport: I have tried to give you the right view so that you will be right at the end of your address.

Mr. COURT: The Minister's reflections on the price control laws are completely inconsistent with the allegation that he personally made against the McLarty-Watts Government regarding the administration of price control. He was critical of the fact that that Government did not administer it with sufficient ferocity.

The Minister for Transport: Your non-interference with profiteering for six years.

Mr. COURT: It did a wonderful thing for this State—to a degree which the present Government never experienced.

The Minister for Transport: Such as housing problems, classroom problems, blackouts, and everything else!

The Hon. D. Brand: There were no blackouts when we left.

The Minister for Transport: Yes there were!

The Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: We built over 27,000 houses in our term.

Mr. COURT: I return to the point I put to the Minister: he would be very cheerful to return to the state of employment that existed in Western Australia during the era of the McLarty-Watts Government.

The Hon. D. Brand: Might I ask how many blackouts the Minister for Housing experienced—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask for order. While interjections are all right, we cannot have everybody interjecting. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition may proceed.

Mr. COURT: I was about to comment on the administrative actions of the Government which are militant against the industrial expansion of Western Australia. These are the things that are not quite so obvious to the public, because they do not involve an Act of Parliament each time some action is taken by the Government. A direction is given as part of Government policy as an administrative measure, and the job goes on. It is not until a particular industry starts to feel the squeeze that it realises just what the Government has done to that industry.

We have the expansion of the State Trading Concerns; we have the expansion of the day labour organisation; and what is even worse, we have the direction of business to the Government concerns, without the opportunity for competitive tender or competitive quote.

I find that as one travels in the Eastern States, these things are understood by the Eastern States industrialists, even more than by Western Australians, because they

examine these matters and get reports on them. It is only just now that industry in Western Australia is starting to rouse itself, starting to realise the squeeze being put on it. I think we will hear a lot more from industry, which has been very complacent up to now in respect of Government policy. It is our duty, as members of Parliament, to tell more and more people in Western Australia of the Government's policy of socialism through stealth, because that is what it amounts to.

The Minister for Education laughs again. We can always tell when he is in difficulty. He gives a laugh, trying to make out that he is indifferent to the situation. But underneath it all he is extremely worried.

What are some of the examples of this Government's policy? In regard to the labour position, I refer to the Albany Hospital project. We were assured in this House that the foundations would be built under day labour, and the building itself by tender. It seemed peculiar to me to erect the foundations by day labour and then build the rest by tender. But what happens? Time goes on, and the next thing the Government decides is to build all by day labour, and when asked why that has come about just comes out with the statement that it is Government policy. Of course, admitting to the world that this Government is a socialist government—

Mr. Johnson: Is day labour a socialistic step?

Mr. COURT: Under certain circumstances it may not be; but in point of fact, the way in which it is used by this Government it definitely is, without any reservations. We come to the Medical School.

Mr. Johnson: You have not proved your submission. Get back to it!

Mr. COURT: I am not going to be caught for time as I have been in the past. On the question of the Medical School, we have the buildings under way, but find them being built by the Public Works Department by day labour. This is taking place in spite of the fact that a very generous response was received from the public generally in the State, and particularly from so many industrialists. What does it amount to? It amounts to this: Some of these people have, in fact, made a generous contribution towards providing work for an organisation which has the objective of putting them out of business. It is just like asking me to make a donation to the A.L.P. It would be as crazy as that.

The Premier: If you did that, it would be the best use to which you have ever put any money.

Mr. COURT: That is a matter of opinion.

The Hon. D. Brand: I think that is a reflection. Ask the Premier to withdraw that remark.

Mr. COURT: Another point which is clearly understood by industrialists not only here, but in other parts of Australia and in other parts of the world, is the method by which the diesel railcars were handed over to the Midland Junction Workshops.

The Minister for Transport: Thereby finding it work. Do you want this Government to sack the employees?

Mr. COURT: Definitely not! We are trying to create employment for workers. In view of the fact that we have geared up and increased production we must increase the consumption from our existing factories, and part of that process is in creating new factories. It just cannot be stagnant. Industry is dynamic and must go on or back.

The Minister for Transport: You would like the Government to sack its employees.

Mr. COURT: No-one has ever suggested that. We want to create more employment and have an expanded economy, but the Government is not going the right way about it.

The Minister for Transport: You still want the Government to sack its employees.

Mr. COURT: These are the questions I asked at page 2974 of Hansard for 1957—

(1) With reference to the 10 diesel railcars on which it is reported work will start almost immediately at the Midland Junction Railway Workshops, does this mean that the Government is committed to an expansion of metropolitan rail passenger transport services, regardless of the fate of the Metropolitan (Perth) Passenger Transport Trust Bill and the findings of the select committee examining the Bill?

(2) What is the anticipated effect on metropolitan rail passenger transport losses when the 10 diesels are in service?

The following replies were given by the Minister for Transport:—

(1) The new railcars are required to cope with increased peak hour services.

(2) It is anticipated that losses will be substantially reduced.

The next question asked of the Minister for Transport, or the Minister representing the Minister for Railways, was—

(1) Were tenders called for the supply of the 10 diesel railcars and new set of coaches for the Westland express, which it is reported are to be built at the Midland Junction Railway Workshops?

The Minister's reply was—

(1) Tenders were called for the diesel railcars but not for the Westland set.

My next question was—

(2) If so, how many tenders were received, whom from, and for what amounts?

This was the Minister's reply—

(2) Tenders were called for 10 railcars sectionalised under the following headings:

- (a) Body and underframes,
- (b) Power unit and underfloor equipment,
- (c) Bogies and axleboxes.

Tenders covering railcars complete (exclusive of painting) and alternatively without bogies were submitted by Cravens Ltd. Other tenders received were:

- (a) Commonwealth Engineering Co. Ltd. and Ruhaak & Co. Ltd.
- (b) Commonwealth Engineering Co. Ltd. and David Bell Pty. Ltd.
- (c) Bradford Kendall Ltd. and Industrial Steel Ltd.

My next question was—

(3) Were the railcar and Westland coach specifications identical for the tenders called and for the work being undertaken in the Midland Junction Railway Workshops?

To this question the Minister replied, "Generally." I then asked the Minister—

(4) What are the Midland Junction Railway Workshops quotes or estimates for the work?

The answer to this question is most fascinating. It shows the state of mind of the Government. The Minister said—

(4) The complete estimate for the railcars is not yet available for the work to be performed at Midland Junction Workshops but is confidently expected to be much lower than the tendered prices. The total estimate for the Westland train set is £420,000.

What chance have we of attracting industry when we do business like this in the calling of tenders—and expensive tenders, which sometimes cost hundreds and thousands of pounds to prepare? It is not a thing the office boy can do.

Mr. Potter: I did not think private industry relied on the Government to that extent.

Mr. COURT: If the Government insists on running the trains, of course it has to buy trains. These people tender, in all sincerity; and the Government does not accept any tender, but hands the job to a Government instrumentality without completing the quotes or estimates. What

chance has industry in these circumstances? Does this not reflect a state of mind hostile to private enterprise?

Mr. Potter: I don't think it does.

Mr. COURT: I do not think I shall take too seriously the comment of the member for Subiaco. The remaining questions asked at that time are irrelevant to this discussion; and I go now to the follow-up questions. At page 3036 of the same Hansard, the Minister representing the Minister for Railways was asked—

(1) With reference to the question I asked on the 12th November, with regard to the calling of tenders for the supply of diesel railcars and Westland coaches, what were the amounts of the tenders?

To this question the Minister replied—

It is not the practice to make public details of prices submitted by private tenderers.

My next question was—

(2) With reference to another answer he gave, how can the Government be confident that the work can be performed cheaper at the Midland Junction Workshops than by tenderers when complete estimates are not yet available?

The Minister replied—

By comparing recent tendered prices with the cost of previous purchases.

I do not think that deceived anyone.

The Minister for Transport: Do you recall the preceding Government ordering millions of pounds worth of stuff, overseas, without getting a quote, or calling tenders, or anything?

Mr. COURT: I think the circumstances of that have been well canvassed in the House.

The Minister for Mines: But they still remain the fact.

Mr. COURT: Even if we eliminate the fact that the circumstances were entirely different, does that excuse this Government from going about its business in this manner?

The Minister for Transport: Without receiving an estimate, calling tenders, or anything—a blank cheque!

Mr. COURT: The Minister was prepared to give this order to the Midland Junction Workshops without their completing an estimate.

The Minister for Transport: To Western Australian workers, yes.

Mr. COURT: But these were going to be built mainly in Western Australia.

The Minister for Transport: Your blank cheque was for overseas.

Mr. COURT: The instances are not comparable. This was a case of 10 diesel railcars to be built in Western Australia.

The Hon. D. Brand: Anyhow, the Minister knows you couldn't obtain labour, whether skilled, unskilled, or anything.

The Minister for Transport: Who couldn't? There are many things your Government did not do.

Mr. COURT: I refer now to the question of the Serpentine Dam tenders. I am using statements made not by Liberal people, but by Ministers of this Government. We pressed the Minister for Works for some indication as to why he did not call tenders for the Serpentine Dam project. I invite members to see the answers given at pages 2129 and 2522 of Hansard for 1957. I will not weary the House by going through them in detail. Suffice it to say that the Minister for Works just brushed aside the question of calling tenders for this job; and not only for the whole job, but for the major parts of the job—for instance, the earthworks.

The Minister for Transport: What tenders were called for the construction of the Causeway and the raising of the wall of Mundaring Weir?

Mr. COURT: If the Minister wants to go back to those days, I shall have to start a new subject.

The Minister for Transport: Let him who is without sin—if it be one—cast the first stone. This Government is doing exactly what your Government did in the matter of principle.

Mr. COURT: I am not talking of the history of the Government of that time. Let us examine the situation. We had then over-employment, not only in Western Australia, but Australia; and indeed in most parts of the world. We got a job done where and how we could.

The Minister for Transport: Why do you think the Government could get workers at that time, and private industry could not?

Mr. COURT: The Minister knows what the situation was then.

The Minister for Transport: It took a fancy to and had a love for socialism and used the Public Works Department day labour.

Mr. COURT: It took no love for socialism. The Minister for Transport: I judge on performance.

Mr. COURT: It got away from it as fast and as far as it could.

The Minister for Transport: No, it just got out of it.

Mr. COURT: I move on to a further question regarding the State Engineering Works; but before doing so, it is interesting to go back to a question asked in 1956

which shows that the rot was then first starting to set in with a vengeance. I am afraid that neither the Opposition nor industry in this State, realised just what was the import of the Government's action, and the end effect of it; or how far and fast the Government was going on this policy of administrative action instead of legislative action to achieve its policy of socialism.

In respect to the famous tender No. 1100/56, we asked the Minister for Works this question at page 879 of Hansard for 1956—

With reference to the tender accepted—vide "Government Gazette," page 2206, the 31st August, 1956, and being Tender Board No. 1100/56—

(a) Were there any other tenderers?

To this question the Minister replied. "Yes". My next question was—

(b) If so, who were they, and what were their tenders?

The Minister's reply was—

	£
(b) Mephan Ferguson	97,250
Humes Ltd	77,760
State Engineering Works	80,320

This is important. The State tender was the second highest. My next question was—

(c) Was the accepted tender the lowest?

The answer given by the Minister, without a blush, was, "No". I then asked—

(d) If not, why was it accepted?

The reply was really amazing; and if it was not so serious it would be funny—

(d) Allowing for profit included in the tender, the overall cost to the Government was less by acceptance of the second lowest tender.

In other words, the Government could pay the State Engineering Works £80,320 and it was cheaper to do that than have the job done by Humes Ltd., who are experts at this type of work, for £77,760. It is interesting to learn from answers given to me by the acting Minister for Works, that some trouble at the Narrows bridge arises because of this particular work. But that is only on the side.

The Minister for Transport: It is completely irrelevant.

Mr. COURT: I do not think it is. In one case the Government rejected the tenders of experts who had been in this game for many years; and in the other it accepted the tender of some concern which had to bring in new equipment to do the job because it was foreign to its normal production. The fifth question was—

(e) What is the total cost under the accepted tender and what would it be under the other tenders?



The Minister replied—

- (e) By accepting the following tenders, the cost to the Government would have been as follows:—

	£
Mephan Ferguson .....	97,250
Humes Ltd. ....	77,760
State Engineering Works: £80,320 less £7,000 profit allowance plus £1,200 for duplication of automatic welding plant	74,520

By this mysterious reasoning the Minister arrived at a figure of £74,520; and he used that as an excuse to give the job to the State Engineering Works after having called public tenders. Surely the tenderers were entitled to have their tenders accepted on their merits.

The Minister for Transport: Have you never heard of someone calling tenders; and, after receiving the prices, deciding to do the job himself? Of course you have!

Mr. COURT: That is all right. That happens quite often, but for special reasons. This is a different thing. When Governments go into the tendering field they are in a different category from that of a member of the public. Furthermore, here is a case where the Government has a tender from an experienced firm. The Government could not doubt this firm's stability or its technical ability; and it was, in fact, the lowest tenderer. But by this mysterious piece of bookkeeping the firm was made to be only the second lowest tenderer in the eyes of the Minister. At page 976 of Hansard for the same year I asked the Minister further questions—

- (1) With reference to his answer to my question without notice on the 18th September, 1956, dealing with Tender Board tender No. 1100/56, does this mean that in future where a Government instrumentality is tendering, such instrumentality will be permitted to revise its tender after the closure of tenders?

To this question the Minister replied—

- (1) Tender was not revised.

My next question was—

- (2) Were all tenderers given the same opportunity to revise tenders in this particular case?

The Minister's reply was—

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

My third question was—

- (3) Is not the method used in this particular case an unfair use of Government influence to the detriment of other tenderers, and is it not unfair competition?

As would be expected, the Minister, in view of the predicament he was in, answered, "No." But he did not convince anybody because if that is not unfair competition and an unfair method, I do not know what is.

Mr. Johnson: You have had plenty of experience, too.

Mr. COURT: I do not know what the hon. member is getting at.

The Hon. D. Brand: Go on preparing your half-holiday Bank Bill.

Mr. COURT: The charcoal iron and steel industry at Wundowie is another State concern, and one which the Premier regards as his baby, and which he now wants to extend into the South-West. That is the type of thinking that comes with State trading concerns.

The Premier has been pressing very hard for the release of 1,000,000 tons of iron ore for export to Japan; and the general impression, from the publicity that has been given to it, is that this is to form the basis for the establishment of a major charcoal iron industry in the South-West. In response to a question asked by me the other day, the Premier said that if it had been possible to exercise the option for Koolyanobbing ore, there would have been a profit in excess of 20s. per ton.

In round figures, for 1,000,000 tons of ore there would have been a profit in excess of £1,000,000, presumably after all mining, handling, and transport costs and the like. I then asked—

What are the latest estimates of the cost of establishing a charcoal iron industry in the South-West?

and the Premier replied—

Approximately £2,000,000 but subject to variation in respect to ultimate site selected.

It foreshadows, of course, that even if the original deal had gone through, something in the vicinity of £1,000,000, even on the Premier's estimates, would have been necessary to build this State-owned charcoal iron industry in the South-West. I submit that the figure of £2,000,000 would be an unrealistic one; in my opinion, the figure would be much higher, and therefore a much bigger burden on the State's finances.

If hon. members look at the Auditor-General's report for last year, they will find, at page 106, the balance sheet for the Wundowie wood distillation charcoal iron and steel industry. The capital and the liability to the Treasury total £1,903,000, as at the 30th June, 1957. I submit that since then something in the vicinity of maybe £700,000 or £800,000 could be added to that cost, because there has been an expansion of the plant over the last few months, and therefore the figure would now be almost £3,000,000.

I have always understood that the Wundowie project was a pilot plant and not the ultimate so far as a wood distillation and charcoal iron and steel industry was concerned. So it seems logical to me that this new show, which is to be much bigger than the one at Wundowie, could not be built for any lesser figure; and therefore at least £2,000,000, if not more, would have to be found from State finances further to expand State Trading Concerns. The Government would do that rather than put the money into real types of work that would expand the economy of the State and give the necessary boost and encouragement for private industry to proceed.

Mr. Johnson: Such as what?

Mr. COURT: I could go on quoting answers given by Ministers—during last session, in particular—regarding directions given that State Trading Concerns were to be patronised by Government instrumentalities, regardless of quote and regardless of tender; but with time running out, I will not be able to quote all the examples that I would like to give. So I shall now refer briefly to the Government's attitude in 1957 towards the expansion of private industry in Western Australia.

The Minister for Transport: When are you going to release this secret document?

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: All in good time.

Mr. COURT: There is no secret about it; I have already given notice of it.

The Minister for Transport: It is secret up to this stage.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member will please resume his seat. Last session I referred to the fact that members were in the habit—at least many of them—of opening their papers in the Chamber and reading them. I have sent a note to some of the members who have been doing this in an effort to avoid having to bring the matter forward again in the House. However, the practice is still continuing, and so I ask members on both sides of the House to refrain from opening their papers and reading them in their seats. If they want to read papers, they should fold them up.

Mr. COURT: I think the Government is realising that some of its policy, if not all of it, is backfiring rather badly, and there has been a panic attempt to try to give the impression to the public that there is a change of heart.

Mr. Jamieson: You must mix in funny circles.

The Premier: Liberal Party circles.

Mr. COURT: I should now like to quote from page 1187 of the 1957 Hansard, where I asked some questions of the Minister for

Industrial Development. There is a whole series of questions, among which was the following:—

Has the Government any plans to sponsor and assist any interstate or overseas delegation of Western Australian representatives to encourage industrial and commercial expansion in Western Australia?

In reply to that the Minister said, "No."

The Minister for Industrial Development: What date was that?

Mr. COURT: The 3rd September, 1957. He went on—

However, consideration is being given to the possibility of the Government participating in a proposed trade-ship venture tentatively scheduled for 1958, and likely to be arranged in the Eastern States. Detailed information has been requested.

That gives some indication of the Government's thinking at that time. The question of a mission was far from the Government's mind; and it would appear to me that because things were not looking too good it was decided to rush this mission through.

The Minister for Industrial Development: You are only trading on words.

Mr. COURT: The Minister does not want to rush in too quickly, because the next question was also addressed to the Minister, and not by me.

The Minister for Industrial Development: Another arch villain!

Mr. COURT: It was addressed by the member for Victoria Park. He asked:

How many manufacturing businesses have started in Western Australia during the last 12 months and during the last three years?

The Minister replied—

1954-1955—130 factories completed at a building cost of £3,125,000.

1955-56—117 factories completed at a building cost of £1,878,000.

1956-1957—92 factories completed at a building cost of £1,105,000.

There was a drop in the number of factories established from 130 to 117, and then to 92; and the cost of establishing these factories dropped from over £3,000,000 to £1,105,000.

The Minister for Industrial Development: I suppose you would have a lot of those industries duplicated if you had your way?

Mr. COURT: I think this is where the Government and the Opposition are at variance. It is true that there are existing industries throughout the whole of Australia, with their production potential not fully absorbed; but in developing new

industries, more factories have to be built. We have to keep getting new factories because it is the building and equipping of them that creates the biggest boost to employment. Once we stop building and expanding factories we have a pool of men on our hands for whom we cannot get work.

The Minister for Industrial Development: You do not recognise that you have some obligation to existing industries?

Mr. COURT: Apparently that is not the view of the Government at present, because the trade mission which is abroad has offered very generous terms—and the Premier has confirmed that in this House—to new industries to come to Western Australia. I would hazard a guess that if Western Australian industries asked for the same conditions they would not get them.

The Minister for Industrial Development: Do we have a tyre industry here?

Mr. COURT: The Government is asking for new industries to come to Western Australia; and is offering them an inducement to come here.

The Minister for Industrial Development: Yes, for the manufacture of chemicals, tyres and so on. There are various new industries.

Mr. COURT: Do not let the Minister get me wrong; we all want to see them established here; but a few moments ago the Minister asked me if we wanted these industries duplicated. If people want to come here and set up in competition with other industries, why stop them? They will create some expansion themselves. The very establishment of the factories, and their presence here creates employment. This thing has caught up with us because the ball was rolling along and gaining momentum all the time. The creation of new factories means the creation of employment; but all of a sudden that came to a stop.

Mr. Potter: The same as happened in Detroit.

Mr. COURT: But things do not have to come to a stop here because that happened in some other part of the world. Ours is a young and a vigorous State, and should be expanding. Unless we put our heads out to get these industries to establish themselves here, and so create employment, we will have some sort of a recession. The men required to operate a factory are only small in number compared with the men required to build and equip that factory.

My remarks on this particular point would be incomplete if I did not make some reference to circulars which have been sent out by the Premier. Firstly, there was

one in connection with printing; and, secondly, one in connection with the R. & I. Bank. The Leader of the Opposition dealt in some detail with the circular sent out by the Premier with respect to printing; and I would like to bring to the notice of the House the circular that the Premier has sent out, over his personal signature, to Government departments and Government employees regarding the R. & I. Bank.

I do not suggest for one minute that the Premier, in sending the letter out, thought that it would have the effect it has had in certain quarters. I think he expects that by the circular the Government will get new and extra business for the R. & I. Bank; but the effect has been that having received a letter from the Premier of the State, many civil servants have interpreted it to be a direction.

In other words, the fear complex has come into it; and whether it was person A or person B who received such a letter, the reaction could be the same among the Government employees receiving it. It has also had another effect; it has given the impression to other bankers in the State that they are not welcome any more, in spite of the contribution they have made to the development of Western Australia.

The Minister for Health: They have made a good profit out of it too.

Mr. COURT: The moment one talks about the contribution made by industry, certain members of the Government start talking about what profits they have made. Of course they make profits; but is there anything wrong with that? Is there anything indecent about it?

The Minister for Health: But what about huge profits?

Mr. COURT: People who are making money put on more employees. They have to continue to expand; they do not just stop. It is only the firms which are losing money which cut down on their labour force.

Mr. Jamieson: How much has the Bank of N.S.W. invested here?

Mr. COURT: The hon. member would be amazed.

Mr. Jamieson: Yes; I would be amazed because I have seen the figures.

Mr. COURT: The hon. member will have an opportunity to deal with that aspect later in the session. I will be able to give him the figures because I have taken them out.

The Hon. D. Brand: The Minister for Health referred to big buildings. What about the big building being erected by the R. & I. Bank?

The Minister for Health: That is good for the State, because everyone gets a share of it, not only the shareholders.

Mr. COURT: If the Bank of New South Wales were putting up such a building, the Minister would not say the same thing. But that is the thinking of the Government.

The Premier: It will be good for the building industry.

Mr. COURT: I am not decrying the merits of the R. & I. Bank. But we have to be very careful in case the wrong impression gets abroad—the impression that other industries and other banks in this community are not wanted. But that is the sort of impression that will get abroad when a circular, or letter, is sent out by the Premier, such as the one he sent out in regard to the R. & I. Bank.

I say to the Premier in all sincerity that certain men in fairly senior positions in one Government department which received this circular—and I have a copy of a circular that was on the notice board of this particular department—transferred their accounts because they felt that if they did not do so there was a chance that somebody might say that X, or Y, or Z had not transferred his account to the R. & I. Bank following the request from the Premier.

The Premier: Then they do not deserve to hold high positions.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Be careful, big brother is watching you!

Mr. COURT: My view is that the private life of civil servants is their own; and if they want to bank with a private or Government bank, that is their own business.

The Premier: Hear, hear!

Mr. COURT: It is not for the Government to interfere.

The Premier: Hear, hear!

Mr. COURT: But the Premier, in sending out this circular, has wittingly or unwittingly embarrassed some of these people in regard to their bank accounts, because he has requested them to transfer their business to the Government bank. If that bank could go out and compete for business, in open competition, in its own right, that would be all right.

Mr. Evans: What about the State Government Insurance Office? Do you think it should have the right to compete with the other insurance companies?

Mr. COURT: The hon. member will get his chance to have a say on that, too.

The Premier: You have not read the circular yet.

Mr. COURT: Would the Premier like me to read it?

The Premier: Yes.

Mr. COURT: This is a personal letter or circular from the Premier to all Government departments. The circular is headed "The Rural & Industries Bank of W.A." and reads as follows:—

From a commencement in 1945, the "R & I" is today well up with the leaders in the banking field in Western Australia, and the support of Government employees has contributed in no small measure to this success.

The Government is appreciative of the support already extended, but at the same time I would like to point out how desirable it is that all Western Australians should bank with their State bank and how appropriate it is that Government employees, who have such a vital interest in Western Australia, should give the lead.

If all members of the Government service conducted their banking business, both cheque and savings account, with the "R & I," the bank would receive a tremendous impetus in the task it has set itself of marshalling its funds for the urban and rural development of the State.

This is one point that has been emphasised by the people who have complained to me.

I would therefore urge you to lend your personal support to these views and to encourage your staff to do the same.

Bear in mind that this letter was signed personally by the Premier. It continues—

I would appreciate your circulating this letter amongst your staff, displaying copies of it on your office notice boards, and publishing it in the departmental domestic magazine you may issue.

(Signed) A. R. G. HAWKE,  
Premier.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: No wonder some of them felt frightened!

The SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has expired.

On motion by Mr. Roberts, time extended.

Mr. COURT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will endeavour to be brief.

The Premier: It is not the Speaker, but the House.

The Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: The Premier should have added a P.S. to his circular that nationalisation was still his party's objective.

Mr. COURT: It is no good our fobbing this off and saying it is of no significance. I would not for a moment suggest that the Premier would personally want to spy on these fellows, or call for a list; but the mentality of many people is such that

they fear that will be done. One gentleman who came to me about this matter transferred his account; and when asked why—because he had been a person with a very decent sort of banking background—he retorted, “If you were in my position and had received this letter, what would you do?” I think we all know what the answer is.

The Minister for Transport: I do not think the person is worthy of the responsible position he occupies if that is his attitude.

Mr. COURT: The person to whom I refer is a very responsible man and a very loyal servant of the present Government.

The Minister for Transport: What you have said does not do him any credit. He had the right to refuse.

Mr. COURT: I would now like to move on to my last point. I see that the Minister directly concerned has left the Chamber.

The Premier: We all do that occasionally!

Mr. COURT: The matter I wish to mention is long service leave. It is interesting to look at the situation which existed during the last session. The Government introduced a Bill designed to embarrass the Legislative Council, and, I suppose it could be said, to embarrass the Opposition generally. The Government was rather nonplussed when it found, however, that we had supported the principle of long service leave for a very long time, and had made that fact public.

Why the Government, and the Minister concerned, did not anticipate that is beyond me. However, the Government introduced a Bill, which was firstly an unrealistic measure; secondly, it backfired, because the public were quick to sense that it was a political stunt. The Bill provided for three months' leave after 10 years' service. This was not to be operative until 1961, and it was to have retrospective effect to 1951.

The Opposition put forward a proposal which we referred to as the code. The code was a proposition for three months' leave after 20 years' service with immediate effect, and with retrospectivity for 20 years. The Government laughed that to scorn, and brought about the defeat of that legislation, leaving the employees in private industries without any immediate protection—a protection they could have had just as quickly as the Government gazetted the measure.

The Minister for Transport: You should make a correction. It was the Legislative Council that brought about the defeat of the legislation.

Mr. COURT: No. The Minister should study Hansard. The Government defeated the legislation. It just dropped the Bill; and, what is more, the Government announced this publicly before the Bill was

dropped here. So the Government defeated the legislation. What has happened since last session? The unions have had to go to the Arbitration Court, at considerable expense and inconvenience; and the Arbitration Court in its wisdom, and with complete freedom, has considered the matter and granted leave on the basis of the code. The court gave long service leave on the same basis as the Opposition offered it in this Chamber last session.

The Minister for Transport: Minus many strings.

Mr. COURT: The Minister for Transport ought to be careful; it was not “minus many strings.” It was in line with the code. The Arbitration Court was unable to cover all workers. We offered this on a plate to all workers with immediate effect. The Arbitration Court, being completely free to make up its mind, could have given three months in ten years had it thought that desirable in the interests of the economy and of the workers of the State. However, it granted three months after 20 years; and, through no fault of its own, the court left a large number of workers at the mercy of Parliament.

In other words it requires legislative action to cover all these employees who could not be granted leave through the Arbitration Court. It is beyond my comprehension that a Government which makes such a play of industrial measures, and which is always holding itself up as the champion of the worker, should make no mention of this in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech. Nor were several other industrial matters mentioned. But we will confine our remarks to this for a moment.

Did the Government decide to leave these workers outside the scope of the Arbitration Court, without long service leave? Is it a method of intimidation so that people will be brought into the net of unionism—in many cases maybe against their will? Surely no responsible Government would do that. There must be some other reason. Having that in mind, I propose to move an amendment.

Before doing so, however, I wish to observe that following the controversy that arose here last Thursday, I took the trouble to look up the opinion of the celebrated May on that point. We find in May's “Parliamentary Practice,” 15th Edition, Chapter XIV, page 292, the following:—

The debate on the Address falls into two parts. The first is used for a review of Government policy especially in relation to the contents of the King's Speech. The second consists of a series of amendments, generally regretting omissions from the King's Speech, which are usually moved by Leaders of the Opposition and occasionally by back-benchers. Thus the first part of the debate is wide enough to cover the whole field of Government

policy, and in the second part practice concedes the initiative to the Opposition.

Backed by that illustrious opinion, I would like to move the following amendment to be added to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply:—

and regrets the omission from the Lieut.-Governor's Speech of any reference to legislation for long service leave for employees in private industry not covered by awards or legislation because of the Government's rejection last session of a comprehensive scheme with immediate effect put forward by the Opposition.

**THE PREMIER** (The Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam—on amendment) [6.10]: After listening carefully to practically the whole of the speech of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Nedlands, one cannot imagine a bigger flop than this being moved by way of an amendment. Had the Deputy Leader moved something about the unfair trading legislation, or about the alleged lack of industrial development, or something which affects all the citizens and the economy of the State as a whole, or generally, the amendment might have had some stamina.

Mr. Court: You did not think that about my Leader's amendment the other night.

The PREMIER: This amendment completely lacks stamina. It is so weak and wobbly that it is not likely to stand up at all, let alone for a little while.

Mr. Court: At least you are speaking to it. You would not speak to the one the other night.

The PREMIER: If we are to go back to the other night—and if we are allowed to do so for a moment or two—I would say the debate on that occasion collapsed because of the obvious, and inexcusable, failure on the part of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to stand up and support his Leader's case.

The Hon. D. Brand: You cannot get away with that; it was your Deputy who let you down.

Mr. Court: You had better have a talk with the Minister for Transport.

The PREMIER: Let us come quickly to this weak, wobbly and pathetic amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. In the first place it expresses regret because something is not mentioned in the speech with which the Lieut.-Governor declared Parliament open on the 7th August. Many members who heard the Lieut.-Governor's Speech thought there was too much in it. I heard some members say that, after the Speech was delivered. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition may have been one of them; though I did not hear him say so.

Any member of Parliament of any consequence, and with any experience in these matters—and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has not had that experience—will know the Lieut.-Governor's Speech does not contain all the Legislation that the Government intends to introduce, and very often it does not contain the more important measures the Government intends to bring down.

Mr. Court: It should give consideration to the main issues.

The PREMIER: So there is no significance in the fact that the Lieut.-Governor's Speech did not contain some reference to long service leave for those employees in the State not covered by the Arbitration Court awards. For the information of the House, and for the information of the public, I can say the Government has been giving very active consideration to this question for many weeks past. The Minister for Labour has been giving special and particular attention to the question, and legislation is in the process of being drawn up in a detailed form, in order that the final draft, for introduction to Parliament, can be considered and approved by the Ministers of the Government. Therefore I sincerely hope and trust that this amendment will receive a short, sudden, and drastic fate.

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

**MR. ROSS HUTCHINSON** (Cottesloe—on amendment) [7.32]: I rise to support the amendment moved by my Deputy Leader just before the tea suspension, an amendment which in its context regretted the omission from the Lieut.-Governor's Speech of any reference to legislation concerning long service leave. I feel the amendment is justified; and I would like to say that even if no-one else regrets the omission from the Lieut.-Governor's Speech, it must be surprising to anybody who reads that Speech to see that this particular item of legislation—which now I believe is intended to be brought forward—was omitted. It was heartening that the Premier, on this occasion, did rise and reply to the amendment moved.

Mr. Court: Not for long.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: However, he tended to dismiss the amendment in a very light fashion and did not give it the import which I feel it deserves. You will recall, Sir, that it was only last session that this particular matter of long service leave was regarded by the Government as one of extreme importance and of extreme urgency. You will remember also that emphasis was laid on these particular facts; yet we find that the Premier at this stage of the proceedings is able to dismiss it very lightly in a speech that lasted no more than two or three minutes.

The Minister for Education: Very effective, though.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: It was also regarded by the Premier as of so little importance that it did not merit inclusion in the Speech made by the Lieut.-Governor. The Premier, in the course of his few remarks, did say that he felt it might have been different had the amendment been moved along lines which concerned the economy of the State; or, I think more particularly, along lines having regard to the industrial development of the State. He must have a very short memory because it was very much along those lines that my Leader, last week, moved an amendment to the Address-in-reply.

Following that amendment there was no reply from the Government whatsoever; no reply to any of the criticisms made during the course of my Leader's speech. The fact is that this present amendment still contains an important issue. The workers of this State who have not been covered by the award have lost at least 12 months in their long service leave conditions.

At the time the Bill was introduced last session, it was the Opposition's viewpoint that the code should be accepted; and if it had been, as it was subsequently dealt with and accepted in the Arbitration Court, these workers could have immediately availed themselves of long service leave conditions, because at that time the code went back as far as 20 years to give workers an opportunity of taking their leave immediately.

Mr. Lawrence: What awards do you refer to?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON: Therefore, it is regrettable that this was not included in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech; and it must indicate, to a great extent, the way the Government feels about this situation at the present time.

The Lieut.-Governor's Speech contained reference to a great deal of legislation. In looking through the Speech I note that Bills will be introduced to amend the Mine Workers' Relief Act, the Coal Mines Regulation Act, the Inspection of Machinery Act, and the Mining Act. A Bill will also be introduced to suspend the interim development order for a further term, that having to do with the metropolitan regional plan. The Swan River Conservation Bill will be resubmitted with amendments. There is also a Bill to give natives full status as citizens; and mention is made of seven or eight additional types of legislation, all gaining recognition in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech by virtue of the fact, presumably, of their importance. Yet this particular item of long service leave did not merit inclusion. Therefore, I feel that this amendment is entirely justified.

MR. PERKINS (Roe—on amendment) [7.38]: I am beginning to wonder whether it is perhaps by deliberate intent that this particular subject is not in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech. We realise now just

how ill-advised the Government was when this legislation was before the House last session that it did not accept the advice given by members of the Opposition when the Bill was introduced at that time and accept what is referred to as the code rather than insist upon the provisions which were included in the Bill as brought before the House in order to implement long service leave in Western Australia. The result, of course, is well known. Therefore, because of the Government's insistence on some of these conditions, the Bill was lost. The matter was later considered by the Arbitration Court, and finally a judgment of that Court was exactly along the lines of the code which the Opposition stressed the Government should accept when this legislation was before the House last year.

Mr. Andrew: Has that code ever been sighted?

Mr. PERKINS: I suggest that the member for Victoria Park find out more about the subject. I imagine that he, together with other members on that side of the House, are not particularly happy with what has happened, and are probably having to answer some very nasty queries from certain workers of this State as to what are their duties in Parliament in order to safeguard the interests of the people they profess to represent.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PERKINS: All that happened is that when this matter came before the Arbitration Court, that court accepted the opinions which were voiced by members on the Opposition side of the House, and certain workers coming within the judgment were able to obtain long service leave. Workers in those unions are now protected, but obviously there are a great many other workers who have no legal right to long service leave in any shape or form. My understanding is that, in a great many cases, the employers are giving these conditions; but the fact is that they are not legally protected. The only people to blame for their not being legally protected are members on the Government side of the House.

Mr. Heal: Do farmers get long service leave?

Mr. PERKINS: I suggest that it is perhaps by deliberate intent that the Government has left this particular subject out of the Lieut.-Governor's Speech to the House, because I cannot imagine that any member of the Government is particularly proud of the position in which he is placed at the present time. Members on the Government side have certainly not done a good service to some of the people they represent.

Several members interjected.

Mr. PERKINS: No doubt it would suit members to get on to side issues, but the question we are discussing, as I understand it, is whether we should express surprise at the non-mention of the question of long service leave in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech.

Mr. Andrew: You are not concerned with the workers anyway.

Mr. PERKINS: I think that some of us take a more reasonable position on this subject than the member for Victoria Park. There is a lot of hot air talked sometimes which achieves very little result. I am suggesting that it is very much in the interests of both employers and employees to see that similar industrial conditions exist in Western Australia as elsewhere in Australia. This is essential from the point of view of good management as well as good labour, in order to achieve efficiency in any industry. For that reason, employers as well as employees have accepted what is commonly known as the code relating to long service leave.

It seems to me that the Minister for Labour in the present Government was either so ill informed on that particular subject, or so bound up by party dogma of some description that he would not listen to reason; and because of that, such an ill service was done to so many of the employees in industry in Western Australia. For that reason I think we are entitled to express surprise and regret that this subject received no mention in His Excellency's Speech, when so many other matters of comparatively minor importance were mentioned. I support the amendment.

MR. BOVELL (Vasse—on amendment) [7.46]: The Premier, having risen in his place—although only for a few moments—to speak to the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, has thus given members opportunity to debate the amendment. By that means he has extended to the Opposition the courtesy of an opportunity to speak to the debate.

No member on this side of the House supported the Leader of the Opposition last week, when he moved an amendment to the Address-in-reply, because we were waiting a reply from the Government, and thus no debate ensued. Admittedly the Premier was not in his seat at that moment, because it was almost at the exact time of the tea suspension, and he could not be criticised for being absent then; but at all events we now have opportunity to speak to the amendment before the Chair.

There were two matters on which I did expect His Excellency's Speech to inform Parliament. One of them—I know I will not be permitted to elaborate on this—was the proposal by the Government for a civilian land settlement scheme; and

the other was a proposal to bring uniformity of conditions to all the workers in Western Australia in the matter of long service leave. Those, in my opinion, were two matters of paramount importance for debate during the present session.

The Minister for Education: What do you mean by "uniformity of all workers"?

Mr. BOVELL: Legislation in regard to long service leave was introduced into Parliament by the Government last session, and it was intended to legislate for a 10-year qualification period for long service. That was considered by members on this side of the Chamber as being uneconomic; and, furthermore, it was felt that the Arbitration Court should deal in some measure with the matter, in regard to the 10-year period.

During the eight months recess of Parliament certain consent awards were made, and some workers in Western Australia—this replies to the interjection by the Minister for Education—are now enjoying, by means of the consent awards, the privilege of long service leave, while many others are not. I say that the Government, if it is to represent the people whom it professes to represent, should consider this a question of paramount importance for debate during the present session. Although the Premier did speak to the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I was disappointed that he devoted only a few seconds to it. The Address-in-reply has already been amended by the Government; and in my opinion that amendment is frivolous and unworthy—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot debate that aspect.

Mr. BOVELL: I submit that the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is worthy of consideration; and I feel that the Government will not be living up to its responsibilities if it rejects the amendment now before the Chair, because it seeks to allow debate, during the present session of Parliament, on legislation to enable all workers to enjoy the privilege of long service leave. I support the amendment.

MR. JOHNSON (Leederville—on amendment) [7.51]: In rising to debate the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition at the conclusion of his speech, I wish to say a few words in relation to the amendment, and a good deal more about the speech itself. The Premier spoke to the debate on the amendment, in a speech which was rather over-long in view of the purpose of the amendment. I admit that the Premier spoke for three minutes, but I think he should have spoken for only one minute. In speaking for three



minutes, I believe the Premier spent longer on the subject matter of the amendment than did the member who moved it.

There are a number of things to be learnt from the speech of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and the first of them is that he can deliver a far better speech than can his Leader—a speech with a good deal of material in it, and one resulting from considerable study; one which does no discredit to the proposition of having an Opposition in the House.

That is not to say—because I give it some meed of praise—that I agree with the contents of the speech of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, or that I think he believed it himself; because I feel sure that, after doing the volume of research indicated by what he had to say, he knows a good deal more about the matter than he told the House, and that there is a good deal more to be said.

The second point is that the Leader of the Opposition can give loyalty and support to his Deputy Leader in a manner in which the Deputy Leader neglected to give it to the Leader when the Leader of the Opposition moved his amendment—

Mr. Court: Fair go!

Mr. JOHNSON: His Leader did rise to support him and hold the position of his party—

Mr. Court: On this occasion the Premier did do us the courtesy of speaking to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON: I was surprised, on the previous occasion, that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did not rise when no other member was on his feet.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I think that after a while you begin to believe these things. That is the strange part of it.

Mr. JOHNSON: There is no need for that; they are obviously true.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member must confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON: In the course of his speech the Deputy Leader of the Opposition dealt with a number of points mainly concerned with industry and suggested, by implication, that it was the fault of the State Government that there was less industrial development going on in Western Australia than in the other States. He went so far as to suggest that the reason for that was to be found in certain legislation which was passed by Parliament last session, in relation to the control of monopolies and unfair methods of trading—

Mr. Court: And the administrative acts of the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON: Right oh! To deal with the slowing down of the importation of capital—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member must resume his seat. The amendment before the Chair is clear, and members must confine their remarks to it. It deals with the subject of long service leave and regrets the omission from the Lieut.-Governor's Speech of any reference to legislation for long service leave for employees in private industry not covered by awards or legislation because of the Government's rejection last session of a comprehensive scheme, with immediate effect, put forward by the Opposition. I therefore suggest that the hon. member apply his remarks to the amendment rather than refer to other matters to which, under the Standing Orders, he is not entitled to refer.

Mr. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will make no reference to anything that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has said, other than his concluding words, which had no reference to the rest of his speech; and I hope to make some comments on the major portion of his speech after this amendment has been dealt with. Having listened to the whole of the speech of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, it was a great surprise to me to find such an irrelevancy as the amendment attached to the end of it, particularly when I feel sure it is well known—and certainly could have been known and probably is known to the mover of the amendment—that considerable research is going on in relation to legislation to cover just this point—

Mr. Court: I do not know of it.

Mr. JOHNSON: It is known to me, and I did not do any research on the matter.

Mr. Court: Unfortunately the Minister does not tell me what he is doing.

Mr. JOHNSON: Perhaps it can be said that His Excellency's Speech lacked something, in that it did not cover the whole of the legislative programme for the session. But, had it done so, the Speech would have gone on for so long that the people who came to witness the ceremonies of opening day would not have had their afternoon tea at all; and in future we would not have been blessed with such a large audience.

The Speech was the traditional Speech, in general terms. The amendment now before the Chair is one which is not in keeping with the volume of research which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition puts into his speeches. I regret that I am unable to deal with his speech at this moment; but I hope to have opportunity of dealing with it after the amendment has received the summary execution which I think it deserves.

MR. POTTER (Subiaco—on amendment) [7.55]: It is pleasing to note that there is so much unanimity among hon.

members opposite on the question of long service leave and so much concern for the worker. I hope that later in the session, when legislation dealing with this subject is introduced, it will pass through this Chamber with the minimum of debate and will meet with no objections from the Opposition.

Mr. Court: We rewrote the Minister's Bill last time, but he did not appreciate our help.

Mr. POTTER: The hon. member tried to rewrite it, and spoke about a code which did not exist, but which was only foreshadowed. There was nothing concrete in it, because the code still does not exist; so much so that a number of Federal unions are asking to be covered by the State Arbitration Court. So much for the code! I wish hon. members opposite would keep themselves up-to-date in regard to our industrial legislation; because, after all, they are the Opposition, and we do expect some criticism from them. But when they are so woefully out of date as to quote a code which was only foreshadowed, what can we expect?

I repeat that I am pleased to see on this occasion that hon. members opposite are so concerned about the worker and the question of long service leave. It is regrettable, in one sense, that this subject was not mentioned in His Excellency's Speech; but, of course, with about 120 pieces of legislation introduced last session, had His Excellency's Speech had to cover a similar programme on this occasion it would have gone on for ever.

In common with a number of members in this Chamber, I understood that some legislation of the type that has been mentioned was to be introduced this session; and that is the understanding of a number of workers, also, who hope to be covered by it—

Mr. Court: They must have got an awful fright when they read the Speech.

Mr. POTTER: No. As I have endeavoured to point out to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, His Excellency's Speech would have continued for much longer than the duration of most speeches delivered in this Chamber, if he had had to cover all possible points. I think the Leader of my party must have been astute enough to realise that, if mention of legislation to deal with long service leave was omitted from His Excellency's Speech, we would have this unanimity from the Opposition and this cry to Heaven to help the workers. That brought them right in on our side and we feel that we have at least by an omission, done something worth-while on behalf of the workers of this State.

Mr. Court: Your logic amazes me!

Mr. POTTER: In any case, the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was so out of keeping with the

whole of his speech that, beyond a few words spoken from those on this side of the House, I do not feel it should merit much attention.

Amendment (to add words) put and a division taken with the following result:—

#### Ayes—16

Mr. Bovell	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Court	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Owen
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Roberts
Mr. Mann	Mr. Watts
Mr. W. Manning	Mr. Wild
Sir Ross McLarty	Mr. I. Manning

(Teller.)

#### Noes—24

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Lapham
Mr. Bickerton	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Evans	Mr. Molr
Mr. Gaffy	Mr. Norton
Mr. Graham	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Hawke	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. Heal	Mr. Potter
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Rowberry
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Toms
Mr. Kelly	Mr. May

(Teller.)

#### Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Crommellin	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Brand	Mr. Hall
Mr. Thorn	Mr. Sewell

Majority against—8.

Amendment thus negatived.

MR. W. A. MANNING (Narrogin) [8.5]: To get on to some fresh subject, with broad vision, I shall now deal with the wide acres of this State of ours, which approximate 600,000,000. When that figure is considered, it appears to be most essential that we should obtain the utmost production from that number of acres. I have here some figures for the year ended the 30th June, 1956, showing that the value of primary production in this State in that year was £99,671,000. Of this, £37,350,000 was obtained from agriculture, and £36,578,000 from pastoral pursuits. Mining and quarrying came next with £14,521,000, to be followed by forestry with only £4,328,000.

Those figures show that by far the most important industry in this State is agriculture. Forestry, mining and other industries would no doubt occupy many acres of this State; but because of their very nature there is little possibility of additional acres being required for their expansion. Therefore, it seems to me that the expansion of our agricultural areas, together with more intensive use of land already occupied, is the secret to a great deal of success in this State.

It could be said that there is already much being done in this regard. But when we consider the vastness of the State and the problem confronting us, there is, in reality, very little being achieved. I would

suggest that even a 10 per cent. increase in agricultural production would create a tremendous stimulus in this State, because that would represent approximately £10,000,000. We would find that such production would give us busier railways, busier ports, create more general business activity, and expand our home markets.

Those items are most important; because when we analyse the agricultural production figures, we find that of the amount of almost £100,000,000, that spent on marketing is £7,895,000, which represents 14.4 per cent. of the production of agriculture. In addition to marketing costs, there are goods consumed in the process of production to the value of £9,600,000, or 17.5 per cent. of agricultural production. I consider that if we wish to bring about more activity in this State, one of the surest ways to achieve that end is to stimulate agricultural production; because, from the income earned, 14.4 per cent. is paid out again in marketing costs, and 17.5 per cent. is consumed in the process of production.

What greater stimulus could we have to support an industry that is providing employment to such an extent as agriculture? It is surprising, however, when we consider these figures, to notice that at present the Government cannot find sufficient finance to provide for the proper education of young men who wish to study agriculture at the Narrogin School of Agriculture. At that school there is sufficient staff and facilities available to teach 100 students. Despite this, because the Government cannot find money for the provision of dormitories, the number of students that are being taught is reduced to 58.

There is no doubt that if we wish to stimulate agriculture, we have to provide for the education of agriculture students. If we seek to promote more activity in industry, we have suitable technical schools to train the personnel who will be engaged in them; and the dormitories that are required in an agriculture college are just as necessary as the plant and equipment in a technical school.

We find, too, that the Government looks upon these matters in a negative way. For example, I can quote its closure of many railway lines instead of developing the vast agricultural lands of this State. We have to adopt a more positive outlook on this question. What is needed? I consider that some stimulus is required to develop agriculture, mining and other vast areas in Western Australia which, as I have pointed out, total approximately 600,000,000 acres.

Hon. members will notice a question on today's notice paper that I directed to the Premier. It is as follows:—

Which Minister holds the responsibility for decentralisation of population and industry?

The answer given was—"All Ministers."

I suggest that any job that becomes the responsibility of everybody finally becomes nobody's job, and that is exactly how the position appears to be in this State today. There is not the interest taken in industry and in the development of our country areas that there should be. I think there should be a Minister for decentralisation and country planning. We have town planning; we have a metropolitan regional plan; and when we have these positive things before us, they stimulate activity because we work to a programme and we are inspired to reach our goal. However, what plan have we for the country?

Mr. Evans: Did the McLarty-Watts Government have a plan for the country?

Mr. W. A. MANNING: I am speaking of the present and the future and of nothing else. I am speaking of employment and industry. Why should we not stimulate activity in our various industries and so provide employment which would make for the enlargement of our State? I can tell from the interjections by members on the other side of the House that they are not interested in the development of this State. It is time we had a plan to place the responsibility on one person so that the decentralisation of industry is ensured.

The Premier has told us that all Ministers are interested in decentralisation. However, only this week I find that the specifications for homes that are being built by the State Housing Commission in Narrogin require that State bricks shall be used for the erection of chimneys in timber-framed houses. Local bricks are available at a price considerably less than that for State bricks without any added costs and without added cartage charges at the other end, and yet the specifications provide that State bricks shall be used.

If that is an example of decentralisation which is administered by all Ministers, it is a poor outlook for the country areas of this State. How are we to develop our 600,000,000 acres when we have a decentralisation policy such as that? That is only one example.

Another aspect that we should keep in view is that we should adopt a broad outlook in regard to forestry land. There are some areas that are more suitable for forestry development and the regeneration of timber than others, and those lands should be reserved for that purpose. There are some lands more suitable for agriculture but there may be valuable timber on them at the present time to a lesser or greater degree.

I suggest the question should be this: How long are those lands to be held? We need to assess the value of those timbers

as timber; assess the production from agriculture; and then get to work by laying down a plan so that those lands are systematically allocated to agriculture—not under any haphazard plan as at present. They are reserves and stay reserved until someone objects or tries to get them released. In many cases the timber has been cut over, and the timber remaining as a whole is very little. I am not saying it should be lost; but it should be cleared to a plan, cut over, the timber utilised, the land used for agriculture, in accordance with a plan.

I am pleased to note there has been a recent decision for the opening up of certain reserves which have been held year after year on the east of the Great Southern. Most of these were mallet reserves with a few trees. Now they are to be opened up for selection, provided those granted the land reserve the timber on it. That is a decided step forward, and we should have more of that kind of activity.

Concerning road board rates on revested farms under the war service land settlement scheme, in some cases developed farms, for various reasons, are revested in the War Service Land Settlement Board, and then they are reoccupied by the designates. Although these farms should be able to carry on at a profit, there is no payment of rates. I know of two instances, which I have before me, where the farms were revested in the board in August, 1956. Those are not paying rates. They paid rates before; and they will pay rates when the lease is granted. In the interim they are not paying the rates.

Why should that be? Because the land is being profitably, or should be profitably worked. It is not undeveloped land. They are developed properties. If I were speaking of land previously undeveloped, that would be a different proposition. Other ratepayers of the road boards are called on to pay higher rates while the properties revested in the War Service Land Settlement Board pay none at all. There does not seem to be any equity, and I think the matter needs very close attention.

Another matter that is most important at present, as far as I am concerned, is housing. I wish to read a sub-leader in "The West Australian" of the 8th July, 1958, dealing with the proposition for Dutch help for housing. It concluded with these words in which I am interested—

By attacking the problem industriously and intelligently Western Australia has overcome its lack of houses.

That is a very fine statement and is very good news; but I suggest that the writer must be a resident of the metropolitan area and his view of the State as a whole

must be very limited. One can understand how he reached such a conclusion; because if one reads "The West Australian" on any day one can see many advertisements offering metropolitan houses for sale on a deposit of £150 or £250. One can find flats and houses available for letting in nearly every suburb. One cannot wonder that the leader writer in "The West Australian" is aware of many houses in the metropolitan area available; but he does not go further afield.

Let us look at the country districts. What is the position? We find people living in the most aggravating circumstances. They are told that their names are at the bottom of the list for vacant houses; that there are so many others ahead of them that they cannot be told positively when houses will become available. There are families—husband, wife and three children—living with the grandparents in a room because there is no other accommodation. There is a family of three children living with relatives also with three children. Those are examples of what goes on.

I am not blaming the State Housing Commission. It is doing its best. It puts the name of applicants on the list and says in effect, "Take your turn." That is fair enough. But then we become aware of a marvellous piece of information when we discover the Minister for Housing, who was then Acting Premier, saying that money for housing was not limited. A figure of £300,000 was mentioned, but that would not be the limit if more were needed. That is excellent.

If Perth is going to be the venue for the Empire Games, we will have to provide the housing. Afterwards those houses used for the games will be used as houses in the metropolitan area. Let us see what happens in the interim. I suggest that more money be allocated for country houses; that it be used immediately to satisfy the people who are without homes of any sort.

The Premier: It is good to hear you advocating more socialism.

Mr. W. A. MANNING: This is in regard to the provision of homes. We need them. People cannot live without homes. I am all for the provision of more.

My final point concerns the staffing of country hospitals. The procuring of nursing staff is a very difficult problem at the present time. I suggest there is a way to overcome this to some extent; that is that training in nursing should include a period of 12 months in a suitable and approved country hospital. It may be a good proposition to provide that in the final year of training, or in the following year as staff nurses, those in the metropolitan area should be transferred to the country, in the same way as they are posted from ward to ward.

In large country hospitals they would derive very broad experience with a much greater responsibility than in the city. They would be thrown on their own resources and would work under less perfect conditions. This would all tend to make their training better. This method would also overcome the staffing difficulties in the country, because under the scheme each nurse would be required to spend 12 months in an approved country hospital.

Country hospitals would benefit from such a plan from a staff point of view; the nursing profession would gain in experience; and as a way of contributing towards these advantages, those trained in country hospitals should be able to spend 12 months of their term working in city hospitals. Those are some of the realistic ways of approaching the question of training nurses and the provision of suitable staff for country hospitals.

**MR. NORTON** (Gascoyne) [8.23]: in 1954, both Houses of this Parliament passed a motion that a committee be set up to investigate the possibilities of the North-West, and to put forward a recommendation to the Federal Government for assistance in many directions. When the residents in the North heard of the suggestion, it gave them great heart to think that at last some notice was being taken of them and of the job they were doing in developing that vast area. But time went on and no reply—one might say no acknowledgment—was made by the Federal Government to the petition which was presented to the Prime Minister by an all-party delegation from this House.

Last year they were heartened to know that at last some recognition was apparently being given to their position when the Commonwealth Government had decided to make a grant to the State amounting to £2,500,000 to be spent north of the 20th parallel, which to all intents and purposes is the Kimberleys. That was provided to assist in major developments in that area. Even for the area of the Kimberleys, this was only a very minor amount compared with the actual amount required for its development, let alone the amount required for any developments in the Pilbara and Gascoyne district which are included as part of the North-West.

In May of this year we read in the Press that the Prime Minister was coming to Western Australia and was going to visit the North-West. I am aware that every North-West member and all North-West residents were particularly interested in this announcement. They wondered where he was going. When it was announced that he was restricting his tour to a practically straight line from Meekatharra to Broome, they realised how little of the area he would see. Some of us even wondered who was organising his tour, and what interests were included in those particular parts he would visit.

Whilst up there, he made many statements to various organisations which gave him civic receptions. He finished up by speaking over the Flying Doctor pedal service. As would be expected, throughout his tour the Press made several announcements concerning the things he had said. That was very interesting reading and very heartening at the time. We saw the headlines in "The West Australian" of the 19th May: "P.M. Pledges Study of Tax in N.W." The announcement said—

Prime Minister Menzies pledged at Meekatharra yesterday that between now and the next Federal Budget he would give close personal attention to the taxation problems of the North-West and to the encouragement of mining and investment in the search for oil.

Later, he said—

I will work along certain lines that have been forming in my mind on the journey.

In a further portion of the news item this was stated—

One of the points the Prime Minister will study in Canberra is the taxation incentives proposed by the Northern Rehabilitation Committee. Menzies announced this at a public reception at Wittenoom Gorge on Saturday night.

Already he had given a great deal of thought to the argument put forward by the committee.

Further on it is stated—

Before leaving Meekatharra yesterday the Prime Minister said that it would be extremely difficult for the Federal Government to deal with particular projects in W.A. even if it were legally possible.

In effect he had practically said, "I have said all this; but how can I deal with the matter?" He did make a pledge that he was going to consider these matters. When he got to Canberra he had more to say. It was this—

The vision of a growing Australia Unlimited was inadequate unless we regarded the development of our northern and north-western resources as a matter of moment, Prime Minister Menzies said tonight.

Australia must shape her policies to give practical encouragement to the development of this part of the continent.

"Increasingly, I believe that in our northern and western areas we have sources of wealth which properly developed, could make the second half of this century an even greater period of development than the first," he said. He was describing in a broadcast his recent tour of the North-West of Australia.

The article finished up by saying—

Earlier he told a Press conference that tax concessions as a stimulous for the development in the North-West were being considered.

"But these are Cabinet and Budget matters," he said. "I have several ideas running through my mind but they cannot be discussed now."

He was putting up a "softener" for what he knew would come out of the Budget. Let us see what did come out of the Budget. The North and pensioners got help. Apparently that is about all there is in the Budget according to "The West Australian." Let us look at the report in the paper which says that people in the North interested in the search for oil and primary producers will be the only people to benefit from taxation concessions in the current financial year. These investors in oil search—I wonder who they are, and where they come from? Are they people in Western Australia or in the East? If they are in the East, we are receiving a concession; but it does not much help Western Australia, because the money has been subscribed towards the development of oil there.

Mr. Court: Are you opposed to it?

Mr. NORTON: Not in any way. But for the edification of the Opposition, I am pointing out that it is only a sop. It does not even help the North-West. Then the report goes on to say—

All zone allowances for people living in remote areas have increased in northern Australia, and north of the 26th parallel the allowance is raised from £180 per annum to £270.

Let us analyse this and find out just whom it affects. It affects those people who are justly entitled to be affected. It gives some relief to the person on wages.

Mr. Court: You have not given the full concession. Are you going to tell us the balance?

Mr. NORTON: I am making this speech, and I shall make it in my own way and in my own time.

Mr. Court: You want to give the other concessions.

Mr. NORTON: The other concession to which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wishes me to refer is that another 50 per cent. will be added to the dependant's allowance. To continue, this concession only brings the workers in the North somewhat into line with the workers in the city. The reason I say this is because the basic wage in the North-West is based on the Kalgoorlie rate, which at times has been as much as 4s. less than the Perth rate. Yet these people are living in outback areas.

However, I must be fair here. In the Gascoyne area a district allowance of 15s. a week applies. I must say, too, that this allowance in 1928 was 22s. So this tax

concession only brings the worker in the north into line with the people working in the city. Members can see that the pledge to study the tax in the north was probably just so much talk. I do not think there is any doubt that when the Prime Minister returned to Canberra he conferred with his two or more advisers, who are Western Australian parliamentary representatives in Canberra.

No doubt members of the Opposition here are wondering to whom I am referring; but perhaps they are not. I cannot do better than quote from a leading article contained in "The West Australian" of March last to identify them. The heading is "Western Australia First." I am not going to read all of it, because it is a long article; but what it says is quite interesting. It reads—

Freeth may be fine as a Prime Minister's handyman in Canberra, but we doubt if he is making a good impression as an elected representative of Western Australia. He asks loaded questions aiming to show that the Federal Government is unduly generous to this State. He has an enthusiastic confrere in Senator Vincent.

Another leading article, headed "Canberra Propagandists," appeared in "The West Australian." Again I shall read only an extract from it—

Federal Ministers, with some exceptions, show no true interest in our State. They throw us a bone occasionally only because we have a few votes. Freeth has been quoted in the "South-Western Times" as having described the State as "a hungry mouth yelling for Commonwealth help." If he is to be politically useful to any body of electors he should get himself a blue-ribbon seat in Victoria or New South Wales—

I heartily agree—

—because he is not only not working for, but seems to be positively opposed to, any proper Federal consideration of Western Australia's problems.

Later this leading article states—

Senator Vincent and Gordon Freeth have this in common: that they seem always prepared to put their political hostility towards the State Government before the interests of the State.

The Premier: Very true.

Mr. NORTON: The development of the large areas of this State is far beyond the capacity of the State Government, and the resources which are made available to it by the Federal Government. Many times we have heard just how well the State is treated. We are told it receives so much per capita; but can we develop a State of empty spaces on a per capita allocation? Can any person develop land on a per capita basis?

The figures on the basis of a per capita allocation show that Western Australia received reimbursement from taxation of £48 and loan reimbursement of £33, making a total of £81 per capita for the year. New South Wales received £23 reimbursement and £24 from loan, making a total of £47 for the year. Victoria received £22 reimbursement, and £32 from loan, making a total of £54 per capita for the year. Queensland received £27 reimbursement, and £29 from loan, making a total of £56. South Australia received £32 reimbursement, and £37 from loan, making a total of £69. Tasmania received £37 reimbursement, and £32 from loan, making a total of £69.

But let us look at the position now on broad lines—on the basis of the area the State has to develop. Let us see how well we fare in this way, because that is what we have to do; namely, develop our undeveloped areas. Let us consider how much we received per square mile compared with other States. From Budget reimbursements or taxation reimbursements, Western Australia received £35 and from loan moneys £23, making a total of £58 per square mile. New South Wales received from taxation reimbursements £282 and from loan funds £287, making a total of £569 per square mile. Victoria, which holds the blue ribbon as far as allocations on this basis are concerned, received £696 from taxation reimbursements, and £1,004, making a total of £1,700 per square mile. Queensland received £58 from taxation reimbursements, and £61 from loan funds, making a total of £119. South Australia received £76 from reimbursements, and £83 from loan funds, making a total of £159.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Would you say that amount should not be given to Victoria?

Mr. NORTON: Definitely, if that State has not got a large amount of development to carry out. We have to carry out development in this State which is necessary.

Mr. Court: Your reasoning is hard to follow.

Mr. NORTON: The hon. member is an accountant and should be able to follow it easily. He can see the whole set-up. But no doubt he did not look at it in this manner. Not many members of the Opposition would. Tasmania—only a little State—received by way of reimbursement £492, and from loan it received £657, making a grand total of £1,149 per square mile.

Mr. Perkins: A Labour Government did not treat Western Australia any better in days gone by.

Mr. NORTON: Like one member of the Opposition, who has just resumed his seat, I am speaking of the present and the future and not of the past. It is to the future we are looking, and to the future development of Western Australia,

Mr. Perkins: A lot of us haven't got much faith in Dr. Evatt.

Mr. NORTON: In developing the North-West, it is essential that encouragement be given not only to those who are going to work there but to the interests that are going to invest money in that part of the State. The area is remote and the transport lines are long and expensive. This development can be carried out in only two ways.

First of all, it can be done by encouraging capital to go there; and to that end, the investors must be shown that they can put their schemes into operation at a cost similar to that which would apply in more settled areas. Therefore a subsidy should be paid to encourage them to have their goods and materials transported to the site where they have decided to operate.

Let us look at the mineral wealth of the North-West. I am not going into this subject in detail, because it is too big to deal with at the moment, and too many figures would have to be prepared; besides which I do not suppose that we have evaluated one-tenth of our mineral wealth there. If we look at the number of abandoned gold leases recorded at the Mines Department, we find that a large number of them have not been worked since 1905. In those days these shows were just worked by prospectors who took away the free gold. There is no doubt that these areas could be turned into thriving gold towns provided we were able to diamond drill and estimate the gold that was there, and at the same time assist the companies by way of subsidy to get building materials, plant, and equipment there.

Also we have quite a large potential in other metals which have only just been skimmed over. Wittenoom Gorge would not be operating now except for the assistance rendered by this Government.

The North-West not only has the minerals but also a big potential in regard to all types of agriculture. One industry that has not been touched on is the fishing industry. I shall deal with this a little later.

Mr. Oldfield: You touched on it at tea tonight.

Mr. NORTON: Yes, and very nice it was, too! If the Commonwealth Government cannot see fit to give us reimbursements by way of taxation, or loans, why does it not take into consideration the fact that a country that is under-developed is a potential danger because other people, who have not got what it contains, will look upon it as an easy area in which to settle?

The development of this area could be a defence project, and I can see no reason why the Commonwealth Government should not allot money for the purpose. Each year it allocates approximately £190,000,000 for defence and over the past

years only about three-quarters of that sum has been used. If the Commonwealth allocated £1,000,000 a year from the £30,000,000 or £40,000,000 which it has in reserve for defence, that would go a long way towards developing the North over a period of years. Also, if the Commonwealth Government can see fit to spend £18,000,000 a year on the Snowy River project, surely it could make available £500,000 of that sum each year! It would make little difference to the time of completion of the work. In that way £1,500,000 could be allocated as a special grant each year for the development of the remote areas of the North-West.

I should now like to dwell for a few moments on the fishing industry in the North-West; but before doing so I would like to tell hon. members of the impact the importation of fish is having on our local fishing industry. The figures are most enlightening and one wonders, after reading them, how our own fishermen will be able to survive. Excluding cray fishing, just on £1,000,000 is invested in fishing boats and gear in this State.

Mr. Roberts: Is that only in the North-West?

Mr. NORTON: No, in the State.

Mr. Potter: And not by Bunbury.

Mr. NORTON: In addition, approximately 500 men are employed on the water, and there are the shore installations, the necessary road transport and so on. I do not think I would be far wrong if I said that approximately £2,000,000 is invested in the fishing industry of this State by people who are in a small way.

To give the House some idea of how importations have jumped over the last 12 months I will quote statistics for the year 1956-57, and for the 12 months of the year 1957-58—figures for the full 12 months are not available. In the year 1956-57, 537,211 lb. of fresh fish were imported from overseas. For the 11 months ended May, 1958, 1,558,556 lb. were imported, or an increase of 1,021,345 lb.—and that is for only 11 months.

In smoked or dried fish, for the same years, 453,056 lb. were imported, in the year 1956-57 and for the 11 months ended May this year, 1,320,003 lb. were imported, a net increase of 866,947 lb. With canned and other fish products there was an increase but not to the same extent as in the cases I have mentioned. There is one interesting point which can be obtained from the figures—because when the Commonwealth gives the figures it also gives the value of the imports. All the prices quoted are at the port of export, free on board; in other words, the importers are purchasing the fresh or snap frozen fish in packets, or in bigger quantities, in fillets unwrapped, at an average cost, f.o.b., of 1s. 5.8d. per lb. There is

1d. duty on that plus shipping costs, and for some unknown reason the shipping companies are opposed to giving any exact details, or any details whatever, about shipping freights from the United Kingdom to Western Australia.

However, I have been able to ascertain that the actual freight on these commodities is 3½d. a lb.; so members can see that these importers are importing fish at an average of well under 2s. a lb. Some fish may cost more and some may cost less; but when we look at the prices they are charging to the public we can clearly see why they are pushing the use of imported fish. Take English bream for instance. This is sold in the packet at 3s. 9d. for 14 ounces, which is the equivalent of 4s. 3d. a lb.; unwrapped and in bulk it is being sold at 2s. 9d. a lb. With cod and other varieties the price is much the same and in the packets it works out at about 4s. 7d. a lb. average.

There is one pack which intrigues me very much and it is called fish sticks or fish fingers. The packet does not describe what type of fish it is; it simply says fish sticks, and it is sold at 5s. a lb. The fish could be anything, and why the public are falling for it I do not know.

The Minister for Fisheries: There is a lot of it being sold.

Mr. NORTON: There is, and I quoted the figures. With fresh fish alone nearly 1½ million lb. are being sold annually. There seems to be some idea that the local fish is of inferior quality, and packed in an inferior packet. Last Friday week members had the opportunity of tasting what some of our filleted schnapper fish from the packets was like. I think one and all agreed that it was as good as, if not better than, the imported article.

Tonight we had the privilege, through the courtesy of one of the producers, of tasting scallops. This is a new industry in the North-West. It may have been the first time that some hon. members had tasted scallops, but I had eaten them before, and I am sure that all hon. members were impressed with them. This is another industry which will boost the income to this State; and I am told that our scallops are superior to the American, Tasmanian, and Queensland variety.

Mr. May: You can see the effect that they have had on members.

Mr. NORTON: Now let us have a look at the packet fish. The overseas product looks very attractive. It is done up in a nice coloured cardboard carton; but can anyone see inside it? No. Its contents are hidden from view. The Western Australian pack has a transparent cover. It is not as pretty to look at, and it does not have as many colours; but it does not hide the contents. One almost wonders what is inside the overseas packet.



I read a magazine which gives a report of a fishing conference held recently in the Eastern States. It deals with imported fish and I think a short extract from it would be very enlightening and well worth recording.

Mr. Roberts: What was the name of the journal?

Mr. NORTON: The "Fisheries Department of Western Australia Monthly Service Bulletin." I think it is a reliable publication, and one which would give the true facts. This extract reads—

The delegates from New South Wales and Western Australia, following representations by fishermen in their respective States, brought before Conference for discussion the matter of the impact which was currently being made on local fish by the recent great increase in imports.

This is the interesting part—

Complaints were made that many of the imported lines were not true to label and the opinion expressed that the Customs authorities should satisfy themselves that the contents of packages were not misdescribed.

I have already commented on that angle.

The Minister for Fisheries: They were referring to the selling of hake as schnapper.

Mr. NORTON: It does not say what it was.

The Minister for Fisheries: That is what it was.

Mr. NORTON: When I began my speech I was talking about the money required for the development of the North-West. If the Commonwealth Government does not wish to give us larger allocations than has been the case up to date, there is a source from which we are entitled to get some consideration, and I refer to the Fisheries Trust Fund which derived its funds from the profits on the sale of the Carnarvon whaling station. I think that when the station was sold, everybody in the State was under the impression that at least Western Australia would get a share of the proceeds from the sale of the station; and it is very interesting to read, in the August issue of the "Fisheries Newsletter", what has been taking place and what has been happening to the funds. According to this report £252,500 has been allocated from the £850,000 which was received from the sale of the Carnarvon whaling station.

Now let us have a look at where the money has gone; and I quote from page 9 of the publication—

Purchase overseas of a large diesel trawler and formation of a company to operate initial commercial fishing in the Great Australian Bight for fresh fish cost about £260,000.

Another edition goes a little further and says that the policy has been adopted that the company would not be tied by direction to the Commonwealth in relation to its operations and marketing details. It is estimated that a sum of £260,000 would be made available from the fund.

Mr. Roberts: Doesn't that money have to be paid back to the fund?

Mr. NORTON: I do not care whether the money has to be paid back or not. If any company in Western Australia were offered £250,000 to set up a fishing industry here, does not the hon. member think it would jump at it?

Mr. Roberts: Has any company made an approach to the trust?

Mr. NORTON: According to the Minister, no.

Mr. Roberts: Then what are you growing about?

Mr. NORTON: Has a company made a request, or is it something that has been thrown to the South Australian Government, or the South Australian people to accept and form a company? Have they said, "Here is £250,000. Go ahead and form a company and we will get a trawler for you?" That is what it amounts to. A 12 months' survey into prawns was carried out along the coast of New South Wales and Queensland. This survey cost £30,000; and there has been a pilchard survey, also along the New South Wales coast, carried out at a cost of another £35,000. This extract continues—

Barracouta investigation by Commonwealth Scientific Industrial Research Organisation and Department of Primary Industry which might result in a new winter fishery in Victorian-Tasmanian waters and an increased supply of fresh fish—estimated cost £27,500.

But not one penny has come the way of Western Australia—the State that produces the money to develop that fund. I can only say that the Commonwealth Government is not giving Western Australia any consideration at all, financially, for the development of its latent resources.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You people on that side would make an excellent Opposition.

Mr. NORTON: I would now like to deal with a matter that concerns the electorate of Gascoyne which I represent. I wish to deal particularly with the closer settlement area centred around the Gascoyne River. In spite of the past bad seasons, primary production over the past few years has increased in Carnarvon very considerably. During the last two years we have exported to South Australia just short of 400 tons of runner beans each year. This year that amount could be trebled. In one week we have exported to South Australia by road and rail a total of 60 tons, which is no mean achievement over that distance.

If water were assured, we could save the State large importations of bananas from the Eastern States. In those two lines alone Carnarvon would be helping to balance the import-export budget as far as this State was concerned. But consideration must be given immediately, and by way of special grant, to the sealing and preparation of an all-weather road from Northampton to Carnarvon. I say this because we are transporting from there, by road, a perishable product for export to South Australia; and the vehicles that bring these products through must run to a very strict time schedule to enable them to link up with trains which convey the produce direct to South Australia.

If the road transport is one hour late into Perth, the chances are that the train connection will be missed, as will the market. This will mean that beans will have to be placed on the Perth market, resulting in a glut, and a consequent loss to the grower. It is important that the Perth market should be supplied from Carnarvon regularly; but if the trucks are too late for one market, the next market receives a double supply which, as I have said, causes a glut and a loss. It is imperative therefore that an all-weather road should be provided as soon as possible.

The other point that requires immediate attention is the necessity for further water conservation in order that the industry might be protected in this regard, and allowed to develop along the lines which it has under extreme disadvantages. If we can supply water, this will give to the State an industry which will help balance its imports and exports, and also do what the previous speaker said; namely, help decentralisation, and keep the people away from the city.

**MR. JOHNSON** (Leederville) [9.4]: Earlier this evening, Mr. Speaker, you very properly under Standing Orders, precluded me from replying to what the member for Nedlands had said when moving his amendment to the motion to adopt the Address-in-reply. The amendment has since been defeated but I would like to complete the speech I had started to make.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition made it clear that in his opinion, and in the opinion of the party he leads, the legislation which this House passed in relation to the control of monopolies was having a deleterious effect on the economy of the State.

**Mr. Ross Hutchinson:** That is true.

**Mr. JOHNSON:** Nothing is further from being accurate. The sources from which overseas capital are sought are, of course, the fully developed countries.

**Mr. Court:** I linked administrative action; it is important to link that at the same time.

**Mr. JOHNSON:** The hon. member should not try to crawl.

**Mr. Court:** I am not crawling but merely stating a fact.

**Mr. JOHNSON:** Fact, in relation to this, would sound funny in the mouth of any Liberal. The sources from which capital is sought are the developed countries overseas—and principally the countries of Great Britain, the United States and possibly Switzerland, which is a hard currency country. There are probably other countries from which capital could conceivably come.

However, what has been wrong with our legislation has been the attack upon it by people who deliberately misinformed themselves in the idea that this was novel legislation, and that it would scare anybody who was competent in business administration, or knew anything about business. The facts of the case are that all developed countries have legislation of this type.

**Mr. Court:** Not exactly like this.

**Mr. JOHNSON:** They are very similar to this; they might be different in some slight detail. After all, ours is only in its first and second year.

**Mr. Court:** It is different in several particulars.

**Mr. JOHNSON:** Except that theirs is a great deal stronger than ours. In order that the prospective Leader of the Opposition cannot claim not to know in the future, I will read a short extract giving very little but the names and a few dates of legislation in some of the other countries. Legislation in Great Britain is the Monopolies and Restrictive Practices (Inquiry and Control) Act, 1948. That is some time ago. There is also the Monopolies and Restrictive Practices Commission Act, 1953, and the Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1956. I might mention that the 1956 Act was passed by a Tory administration; it was severely criticised by a Labour Opposition on the ground that it was not intended to be really effective. And, personally, I think that is true. But there are in the library of this House books giving full details of that particular legislation and its practice.

We find that in Canada the first statute dealing with restrictive trade practices and monopolies was passed by the Parliament of Canada in 1889. Hon. members will note that I am not speaking from memory but from a textbook. This was passed one year before the Sherman Act of the U.S.A. The statute at present in force is the Combines Investigation Act, Chapter 314, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1952, as amended by Chapter 51 of the Revised Statutes of Canada 1953-54. There are also four sections of the Criminal Code of Canada which deal with the subject; namely Sections 409 to 412 inclusive, as enacted by the Statutes of Canada 1953-54, Chapter 51.

In Denmark, which is a fairly prosperous and progressive country, there is the Monopoly and Restrictive Practices Act, 1955. In Western Germany a Bill dealing with restrictive trade practices in the Federal Republic of Germany (Kartellgesetzentwurf), was brought before the Federal Parliament in June, 1951. It passed the Upper House on the 21st May, 1956. I have not been able to check whether it has passed the second Chamber.

The Hon. A. F. Watts: It has.

Mr. JOHNSON: Thank you! We find that the Irish Republic has the Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1953; the Restrictive Trade Practices (Confirmation of Order) Act, 1956; and the Restrictive Trade Practices (Confirmation of Order) (No. 2), 1956. In the Netherlands the original Act, which was the Entrepreneurs' Act of 1935, was superseded by Cartel Decree, 1941, during Nazi rule. This was amended in 1950 after the occupation. The new Bill that was under discussion in 1956 was The Economic Competition Bill. Once again I have to check whether that was completed. It will at least show there is a long history of this general form of legislation in that country going back to 1935; and no one would say that Holland was a non-progressive country.

We find that New Zealand has the Monopolies Prevention Act, 1908, which refers to agricultural implements, flour, wheat and potatoes. There is also the Commercial Trust Act, 1910, and The Board of Trade Act, 1919; and, going on newspaper reports, there has been further legislation before the Chamber in recent months. Norway has The Control of Practices in Restraint of Competition and Unreasonable Prices, 1926, which is generally referred to as The Trust Act. It also has the Control and Regulation of Prices, Dividends and Competitive Conditions, 1953.

The legislation in South Africa dealing with this matter is the Board of Trades and Industries Act, 1944, which was amended by The Undue Restraint of Trade Act, 1949, repealed and codified by the Regulation of Monopolistic Conditions Act, 1955. Sweden has The Supervision of Restrictive Practices in Industry and Trade, 1946, and Measures against Restrictive Practices in Trade, 1953. In Switzerland the Constitutional Referendum of the 6th June, 1947, authorised legislation against "Economically or Socially Damaging or Injurious effects by cartels and similar organisations."

We know how difficult it is in this country to get a constitutional referendum through on any subject. In Switzerland the final reports on legislation, etc., were expected in 1956. In the United States of America—the spiritual and economic home of so many Liberals—there is the Sherman

Act of 1890, which is an Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies. It is generally referred to as the Sherman Act. It has been amended in a number of ways, but the basic Act is still there.

The United States also has the Federal Trade Commission Act, 1914 (An Act to create a Federal Trade Commission and to declare unlawful "unfair methods of competition in commerce and unfair and deceptive methods in commerce"). The Clayton Act (An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies). There have been many amendments to these three basic Acts. Some are now codified in Criminal Law and Criminal Proceedings 62 Stat 683, 730 and 896; 18 U.S.C. 402, 660, 3285 and 3691. Even here in Australia we have the Australian Industries Preservation Act, 1906-1950. The Federal Act covering much the same territory was never fully implemented—in fact it hardly was implemented at all—and there are various Acts in a number of Australian States, which I will not enumerate, dealing with various aspects of the subject.

The whole point I wish to make is that in all developed countries legislation of this general type exists, and is no surprise to experienced persons in the fields of competition or large-scale enterprise. I might mention, for instance, that the motor industry, as a whole, was proceeded against in the U.S.A. for the violation of various sections of the trading practices, mainly in relation to trade methods and selling on hire purchase. I might mention in passing that all members know hire purchase is an interest of mine. The motor industry was charged with an offence in that they spoke about a 6 per cent. market, using a flat rate in a selling plan and were found to be misleading the public.

Mr. Perkins: There is a lot of material difference in those Acts and the Western Australian Act.

Mr. JOHNSON: There is a detailed difference but not a material difference.

Mr. Perkins: The declaring of the trader does not seem to exist in that legislation, and that is the most obnoxious part contained in ours.

Mr. JOHNSON: I would point out that under the legislation in this State there are no provisions under the Criminal Code, but in some of the countries to which I have referred offences of this kind are criminal offences. Quite a number of these types of economic offences are treated as criminal offences.

Mr. Perkins: If they are serious enough they should be.

Mr. JOHNSON: For once we have some agreement. I agree they are economic crimes and should be punished as other crimes are punished.

Mr. Court: Under the Criminal Code you at least get protection and justice.

Mr. JOHNSON: You get the application of the law, and my experience has been that justice and the law are not always parallel.

Mr. Court: There are still things under our Act from which you have no appeal.

Mr. JOHNSON: There are still things under our Act which nobody with a conscience would object to. The big point is that those who object to this Act have either a political axe to grind and are not concerned with accuracy, or else they have a very delicate conscience, and that is that. No reasonable man would object to the situation as it is in this State, and no reasonably experienced entrepreneur would be surprised at it; not to say some people would not express surprise although they knew everything in advance.

Mr. Court: They still do not come.

Mr. JOHNSON: For a number of reasons; but not those ascribed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: What are the reasons?

Mr. JOHNSON: They include the fact that there is less money in circulation in Western Australia for a very obvious reason. There is a less than just expenditure of Commonwealth money in this State. We have no Snowy River expenditure. There has been a considerable amount of money channelled into New South Wales and Victoria because of the Snowy River project. I am not objecting to that, but I am just bringing it forward as a fact. It has done a world of good for the industries of those two States. No one would deny it. There has been a very large expenditure at St. Mary's, which is not in Western Australia. Whether the expenditure was justified or not, I will not go into; but I will point out that that expenditure did stimulate the economy of the State in which it took place. It stimulated industries, stimulated employment, and stimulated trade generally.

Mr. Roberts: What was the expenditure in South Australia?

Mr. JOHNSON: There are the Salisbury weapon establishment and the Woomera rocket range. A good deal of money has been spent there with a good deal more success than in your spiritual home in U.S.A. The expenditure in South Australia is considerable and resulted in the extension of the City of Adelaide.

Money is being spent on rail standardisation. Not in the States where it is most needed, but in a State which is not handicapped as we are here. If we were to have expenditure in Western Australia on Commonwealth works of some magnitude, then

our economy would take a very big rise. Actually what happens here is like spitting in the sea; it is just about as effective.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition grizzled about the expansion of State trading and the use of day labour. He said that day labour was socialism. He was unable to support it and produced no argument to suggest that day labour was socialism. His whole argument appeared to rest on the fact that the Labour Party prefers day labour; and it does so for a very sound reason.

The point, if it is examined, is that day labour is the method employed by all the contractors. They employ their people on day labour. The difference between Government employment on day labour and private contractors' employment on day labour is that if there is any profit in the work, then it is absorbed by the Government and not by commercial firms outside. However, taxpayers—the large ones more so—should commend the Government for doing its utmost to avoid commercial profit in places where it is not essential.

Mr. Court: In other words, you would have no private builders if you had your way.

Mr. JOHNSON: I did not say that.

Mr. Court: Sounds horribly like it.

Mr. JOHNSON: We should not criticise the Government for saving costs to the taxpayer.

Mr. Court: That is our argument. They do not save costs to the taxpayer; they go on, and on, and on.

Mr. JOHNSON: That is the assertion of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, but he produces no figures and nothing that could be regarded as an argument beyond the assertion. Where is the proof? The Government figures indicate there is a real benefit in quite a number of circumstances, but not all day labour is more profitable to the employer than the other method.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was—he may not be now—at one time a director of a large number of companies which had an objection to Government work being given to Government work places. He has an objection to Government printing going to the Government Printer, and he has quite a number of objections to such things as the State Building Supplies being given preference in Government contracts. As a director of companies, I have not the slightest doubt—

Mr. A. W. Manning called attention to the state of the House.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and there is now a quorum present. The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON: It is very good of the member for Narrogin to draw attention to the fact that the facts I am putting before the House have caused all members of the Opposition but three to leave the Chamber.

The point I was referring to is that I have not the slightest doubt that as a director of companies, the member for Nedlands expected companies in which he was concerned to give preference in business to their own subsidiaries or from the subsidiaries of the principal company. That is a very sound practice.

Mr. Court: I am afraid you do not know me too well.

Mr. JOHNSON: It is one which is carried out by all businesses because there is a very real value in it. However, I find it hard to follow his objections to that very sound principle and his implication that he failed to understand the figures given in the case he quoted from. The fact that a contract let to a Government instrumentality, even if it were at a slightly higher price than one tendered outside, should be less expense to the taxpayer—

Mr. Court: That has not been the experience with State Trading Concerns, and you know it.

Mr. Andrew: It is a fact.

Mr. JOHNSON: The member for Nedlands should examine with great care figures relating to Government accounting and private business accounting, as they do not always amount to the same thing.

Mr. Court: The average cost from the Government instrumentality is higher than any competitive tender.

The Minister for Transport: For instance.

Mr. JOHNSON: I only know figures in the insurance industry—some of them—and I would suggest that that is not so. I do not know the costs in the printing industry; but I have seen the figures of the State Building Supplies. I think that the interjection may have some truth in some circumstances. But he has no right to proclaim it as a general principle. It is not correct.

Mr. Court: It is general experience.

Mr. JOHNSON: It may be experience on odd occasions; but as a general principle, it is less than accurate.

Mr. Perkins: Some sections of the State Building Supplies are losing money at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON: So are sections of many industries. A lot of private enterprises are losing money. Another point to which I wish to refer is the suggestion of the member for Nedlands that civil servants had

been buffaloed or bluffed into banking with the Rural & Industries Bank, and that the Premier did wrong in drawing the attention of civil servants to the fact that the bank exists.

Mr. Court: He did more than draw their attention to it.

Mr. JOHNSON: Seeing that a copy of the notice is on the notice board outside this Chamber, one could hardly call it more; but I would suggest that the people whose form of employment is in the Civil Service and who do not bank with the State-owned bank are showing a degree of loyalty which would be less than tolerated in most private enterprises. It certainly would not be tolerated in the banking world. They more or less insist on your banking with your own bank.

As a former employee of a private bank, I have some knowledge of the subject and the rules of the bank in which I worked. I had to bank in the branch in which I worked so the manager could see I did not overdraw. I feel that that is not perhaps completely objectionable; but that is the situation. I would point out to those who object to the nationalisation of banking, that the only banks which may not be nationalised are State banks; and State banking is something which we should all encourage. Whilst I still show some loyalty to the bank with which I used to bank, I have in my pocket two little green envelopes which cover Rural & Industries Savings Bank books.

I admit there is not much in them, but I suggest that everyone employed by the Government should, out of loyalty to his employer as well as to the State in general—I regard members of Parliament as employees of the Government in the broad sense—do everything possible to support local industry. Any profits made by the R. & I. Bank represent a relief to the taxpayers of the State and any expansion that that bank makes is made in Western Australia. It is quite a good industry and that bank is a reasonable employer; no better and no worse than the private banks. It is covered by an award which is largely parallel with that covering the other banks.

I thought that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in claiming as he did that he was trying to create jobs for workers, was endeavouring to mislead the House, because what he was trying to do was to create profits. I know there is a philosophy which holds that any profit is a good profit, but I do not subscribe to that view. I believe that increased employment can be brought about more quickly and more directly by means of Government employment, in Government productive works, than in making profits and particularly excessive profits—and there is such a thing as an excessive profit.

Legislation in all the countries to which I referred earlier shows that that point is agreed to by progressive people and that there are ways of taking a profit and degrees of profit that are so high as to constitute an offence against the economy of the country concerned. I would remind members of a seldom remembered incident in the life of one of the most celebrated leaders of economic thought. I refer to the fact that the only time that Jesus was known to lose His temper and use physical violence was when he took action against the money changers, whom He threw physically out of the temple, with their tables after them.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You would have been in strife as a banker.

Mr. JOHNSON: Their offence was that of taking an improper profit. Members will find no other reference to violence on the part of Jesus in any part of His life.

Mr. Court: Are you sure of your facts there?

Mr. JOHNSON: They are pretty accurate.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The offence was conducting business activities in the temple.

Mr. JOHNSON: It was not only the place, but the type of activity. It is so long since the member for Cottesloe had any reference to the information that I think he had better read it again.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I think I am better informed in that respect than you are.

Mr. JOHNSON: If the hon. member refreshes his mind he will find that the reference was not solely to the place, but also to the type of business being done.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You had better ring for the Good Book now.

Mr. JOHNSON: I have not my copy with me at the moment. Jesus said to these people, "You have turned this temple into a den of thieves," and they were the bankers and moneychangers. I have some vivid recollections of a beautiful picture painted, I think, by Sir John Millias, in a children's edition of the Bible which I had as a boy. In it the money-changers were depicted going down the stairs, with their tables falling on top of them. I have always enjoyed that one.

The only other matter to which I wish to refer is one already mentioned in this Chamber today in a question—the matter of noise and particularly that created by the engines of model aeroplanes. There are, in the Leederville electorate, a large number of youngsters very keenly interested in model aeroplanes and it is an activity

that I would like to encourage; a constructive activity and one from which we might in the future draw aeroplane designers. It is an activity which prevents the youths concerned from falling into bad habits, but it is one that is being severely hampered today.

Those youngsters who graduate from building gliders to planes powered with rubber do not come in for criticism, but once they graduate further to the stage of using motor power in their aeroplanes they are hunted from pillar to post. These little motors are quite costly, ranging in price from about £7 to up to £20, and they are purchased from the savings of youngsters in their early years of apprenticeship, and such like. I repeat, that these youths are hunted from place to place by park rangers, under instructions from local authorities, and for good reason, as the residents of the districts concerned are disturbed by the noise. I might add that the noise is not very loud, but is of high pitch and extremely penetrating.

The Hon. J. B. Sleeman: You see them on the south side of the Causeway every Saturday.

Mr. JOHNSON: There are very few places in the metropolitan area where the flying of model aeroplanes powered by engines is permitted. I do not criticise the residents who complain about the noise, although I think that the average motor-powered mower, which so many householders own, makes a lot more noise, but I do feel that there is a responsibility on the people who sell these engines to ensure that they are of such a standard as to cause no offence. I feel it would be in their interests to take such action because, were it not for the annoying noise that these machines make, I believe far more engines would be sold, with the result that there would be a possibility of developing an excellent model aircraft group and possibly a future aircraft industry.

Mr. Court: Is it practicable to silence the engines effectively without reducing their power too much?

Mr. JOHNSON: I think it would be within the power of a smart engineer to do a good deal about it. Perhaps an expansion chamber could be fitted, or a fairly long exhaust pipe or something of that nature, which would not have too much effect on the compression and other factors about which I have not a great deal of knowledge. I do not think the difficulty is insuperable, and I remember a similar discussion about the impossibility of silencing motor bike engines in my youth, when I took the baffles out of the muffler on my own machine and eventually put them back, because I discovered that they had been scientifically

designed and that their removal had reduced the power of the motor. I would suggest to those interested in private enterprise that they might point out to the makers and sellers of these engines that they would make and sell a great many more of them if they overcame this trouble. I think all that is necessary is a certain amount of research.

Mr. Court: Are not the boys attracted by the noise of these engines?

Mr. JOHNSON: They are attracted by noise of any kind and one which attracts them most is the sound of a football being kicked. My youngsters seem to be able to hear a football being kicked up to three-quarters of a mile away, and the sound of a model aeroplane engine would not travel further than that. I think we should encourage youngsters to build model aeroplanes, as it is a constructive activity and one from which they can learn much. It also keeps them from getting into bad habits. I feel that the private enterprise which produces these engines and that which sells them show a degree of irresponsibility in regard to their own profits.

We can take it for granted that private enterprise ceases all intelligence once it is capable of achieving a profit, and that is a common pattern. The pattern of private enterprise, as illustrated here, is consistently that of slaying the goose which lays the golden egg. We expect it and we know it. The people of Leederville are not given to a great deal of study of the various "isms". They are not socialists or private enterprists or "ists" of any other kind, but simply people who have one desire only—to lead a satisfactory social life, and their main demand is for security. In the main their greatest ambition is to get a Government job for their youngsters, if they have not had one themselves, and simply because they are realists—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: They will put you out of a Government job.

Mr. JOHNSON: This is not related to their political outlook, but to their realistic approach—

Mr. Court: We will be in a fine position when everyone works for the Government and no-one produces a taxable income.

The Minister for Transport: Don't you think Government employees pay taxation?

Mr. JOHNSON: Drawing my whole income from Government sources, I would point out that I pay a lot of taxation—I notice it—and I have not yet had my refund.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Look out that the people of Leederville do not put you out of a Government job!

Mr. JOHNSON: The people of Leederville are a fair cross-section of the community, and I think we can rely on their realism and political good sense.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Then you are gone.

Mr. JOHNSON: I find that I can face the future, politically, with a good deal of quiet confidence which perhaps others do not possess.

Mr. Court: Leaving political propaganda aside for a moment, are you having difficulty in getting ground at Leederville on which these young fellows can fly their model aircraft?

Mr. JOHNSON: They have been hunted off every available ground in the Leederville electorate. The last place where they were able to operate, to my knowledge, was Wellington Square.

Mr. Court: I know it is becoming a problem, but I think members should take a stand on this issue and encourage local authorities to allow youths to use certain grounds for this purpose, as it is a healthy and constructive sport. At present many of them are becoming discouraged. They can operate in my electorate, and I think the member for Subiaco has helped them in his.

Mr. Potter: And if we had some of King's Park we would be able to help them further.

Mr. JOHNSON: Just over the boundary of my territory and in that of the member for Subiaco there is a ground where youths are allowed to fly their model aeroplanes, but I know that very often they are hunted away from a number of areas. I know that there is some flying done, but it is done with an eye on the ranger and off they go when they see him.

That is the main point I wish to make. However, I wish to make a passing reference to what was said by the member for Narrogin. I notice that, unfortunately, he is out of the House again, apparently having his supper. The hon. member said that he wanted to establish a further board for country planning and yet I have heard him on many occasions objecting to Government interference. So we can see the difficulty we have with some people who are not entirely practical in their outlook when they put up some of their isms. I support the motion, as amended.

MR. ROBERTS (Bunbury) [9.46]: Last Tuesday night, during the debate on the supply Bill, I brought to the notice of the Government the dire necessity to allocate certain funds to extend and strengthen all the levees along the lower reaches of the Preston River near Bunbury. I am going to take this opportunity to point out again to the Government the importance of this matter; because unless the Government, between now and the next winter rains, makes some move to strengthen the

levees and extend them to the Leschenault Estuary, tremendous damage could be done to the property of those in close proximity to the banks of the Preston River. Untold devastation could result. I for one will hold the Government responsible if any catastrophe occurs during the next winter season as a result of those levees breaking down.

I know that the cost of the probable dredging of the mouth of the Preston River and the strengthening of the levees will be great. I know that the Government will realise that some of the bridges over the Preston River may have to be raised owing to their decking being practically level with the top of the levees. Therefore, I again press the Government to give serious consideration to this matter.

This is the first opportunity I have had to express my congratulations to the member for Pilbara and the member for Warren on their election to this Chamber. I do that with all sincerity, and I hope that in due course we will hear them contribute to the debates in this Chamber. I cannot say, in a serious vein, that I hope they will have a long parliamentary career.

The Minister for Lands: Be careful.

Mr. ROBERTS: But, nevertheless, while they are representing those electorates, I wish them well.

The Minister for Native Welfare: You have spoiled a good speech.

Mr. ROBERTS: The first matter I wish to talk on tonight is the Bunbury sewerage scheme. Last year, in reply to various questions that I put to the Minister for Works, he indicated that £12,000 was to be spent on the sewerage works at Bunbury. According to certain Press reports, the Public Works Department had indicated that it was to make a start on a sewerage scheme, and that the estimated cost of those preliminary works was to be £36,500.

At this stage, no doubt, considerable detailed work has been proceeding on the levels and the surveying that is necessary for such a scheme. However, as at this date, there is little evidence of any construction work proceeding. It has been mentioned that the outlet for the sewerage scheme will be into the Indian Ocean off the breakwater. According to Press reports, the Minister for Works—who is at present overseas—indicated that that was the scheme the Government would consider; namely, that of discharging the effluent from any sewerage works into the Indian Ocean from the breakwater.

I cannot, for one moment, agree with that, because members will recall that last year I referred to the question of sewerage

in my Address-in-Reply speech. I again stress that every gallon of effluent from any sewerage works should be used for the production of some sort of primary product or for the reafforestation of certain areas. As every member of this Chamber knows, there is a scheme in Victoria known as the Werribee Farm Scheme, whereby the sewage effluent is used for irrigation purposes. I understand that that farm is 24 miles from Melbourne and covers something like 26,000 acres. The amount of effluent that flows on to that farm per day is, I understand, 70,000,000 gallons.

If we consider the Subiaco sewerage scheme, all of us in this Chamber will recall that we have been told that the effluent from that scheme amounts to 300,000 gallons per hour, and this is discharged into the Indian Ocean. That means that in 24 hours, 7,200,000 gallons of liquid flows into the ocean which, instead of being wasted, could be used for primary production on a sewerage farm in this State. On the 5th November, 1957, I asked the Minister for Works the following question:—

Is he aware that an average hourly rate of 300,000 gallons, equalling 2,628 million gallons per year, of effluent from the Subiaco treatment plant is discharged into the Indian Ocean?

The Minister's reply was—

Yes.

I also asked this question:—

Is he aware that this quantity of discharge is approximately one-sixth, one-seventh and one-third of the present storage capacity of Mundaring Weir, Canning Dam and Wellington Weir, respectively?

and the Minister replied "Yes." I asked other questions, and the replies are recorded in Hansard. But the point I want to stress is that the effluent from any sewerage scheme should be used for the production of some wealth in this State; because we cannot, as Western Australians, afford to waste one gallon of water. Storage of water in Western Australia is most important, not only to the future development of the metropolitan area, but also to that of the country districts. So I stress that serious consideration should be given to the establishment of a sewage farm in relation to the Bunbury sewerage scheme.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Is there any scientific data available on the incidence of disease that might result from primary production being carried out on a sewage farm?

Mr. ROBERTS: I understand that there is, and that when Werribee was first established they had some difficulty with the fattening of stock. But I understand, also, that that difficulty has been overcome.



However, so far as pasture and re-afforestation is concerned, I cannot see any difficulty arising. Closely related to the proposed sewerage scheme at Bunbury is the pressing problem of contamination of the Leschenault Estuary. Into that estuary at the moment various town effluent drains are discharged. Some of those drains are connected to various businesses in Bunbury, including hotels, fish-shops and other establishments. This has made a difference to the estuary at Bunbury, especially since the old estuary mouth was sealed by what is now commonly known as "The Plug."

With the plug being placed at the estuary mouth, a cut was made in the sandhills to the north of Turkey Point, thus giving access to the sea from the estuary. I do feel the Government should give considerable and close investigation to the possibility of building floodgates in the plug. In saying that, I want to stress that the floodgates should be built in such a way that only water from the harbour area should be able to enter the estuary. I do not agree that the estuary waters should be able to pass through the plug into the harbour.

Last year, as the Minister for Works well knows, there was a considerable growth of algae in the Leschenault estuary. I agree that last year this estuary was not an orphan in regard to this matter. However, the Minister for Works visited Bunbury to investigate the matter for himself, and early in January he made a very close and comprehensive study of the algae problem in that area.

In order to overcome this problem of the deterioration of the Leschenault estuary, a great deal of thought should be given not only to deepening the present cut but also to the floodgates in the plug. At present when the sea is running in a certain direction, it is practically impossible for fishing boats to move through the cut.

Members will recall that in July of last year there was a near disaster when 13 passengers from a ship in the port of Bunbury tried to get through to the cut and the lifeboat in which they were travelling stuck in the cut. I know that the Government is watching the position closely with regard to the cut, but within the very near future a considerable amount of money will be required in that area for the building of additional breakwaters to hold back the sand drift which is so evident to anyone who cares to make an inspection.

The next matter with which I wish to deal has caused much criticism in Bunbury over a period of many many years. On the 6th August, 1943, an area of 5 acres 1 rood 5.8 perches was resumed from Matron Matilda Brown. On the 19th

December, 1945, 2 roods 9.5 perches was resumed from the same lady. At the time of resumption the buildings on the land resumed consisted of a maternity hospital and comprised some 15 large bedrooms, an operating theatre, service rooms, bath-rooms, a large hall, sitting room, pantry, storeroom, nurses' and orderlies' quarters, laundry, garage and very large and commodious verandahs practically around the building.

To give members some idea of the construction of the house, it is very solidly built. The ceilings are 13 ft. high, and the building itself is very large. I understand that when the building was originally resumed, a claim for compensation was submitted on the 23rd July, 1945, amounting to a total of—I ask members to note this—£30,077. I might mention that the reason for the resumption was that the land was required for school purposes. On the 24th November, 1955, I asked the the Minister for Education—

(1) Have plans been drawn up for a new State school to be erected on a site in Lovegrove Avenue, known as St. Clair's Private Hospital?

(2) If so, when is it proposed to commence work on the erection of the new school?

The answer to both those questions was "No." I further asked what was the anticipated cost of same, and the answer was the approximate cost would not be known until plans had been finalised. The following is the gem of all the answers to those questions, because here is an old hospital, soundly constructed, with at least 15 reasonably large wards. I asked—

How many classrooms will comprise the new school?

The answer was —

The present intention is to erect a four-roomed school.

I must admit that was in 1955. Since then nothing has happened until the 30th July last, and the lady in question made an approach to the Minister for Works asking him for a firm decision in reference to this matter. On the 30th July, 1958, the Public Works Department wrote to the solicitors for Matron Brown making an offer of £7,975 for the whole of the land and buildings.

The Minister for Transport: You could buy the whole of Bunbury for just about that!

Mr. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has interjected in typical style. It shows how much he is out of touch with a very progressive town.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: He is just wrong, as usual.

Mr. ROBERTS: I can assure him that any land in the Stockley-rd. area, on to which this property abuts, would be worth a considerable amount of money today, if it were available. A quarter-acre of land there would cost quite a bit. This property abuts on Stockley-rd., Reading-st., and Lovegrove avenue. Its location, by road, is approximately half a mile from the centre of Bunbury; as the crow flies it is about a quarter of a mile.

I feel there is an injustice being done here; because if that land were put up for public auction tomorrow, it would bring a very large sum of money. It is now a little over 15 years since the land was resumed, and no finality has been reached. I think the time is long overdue for the Government to give some definite decision in the matter. I will admit that the Government has made an offer, and the lady in question has 60 days in which to accept. But I feel that a very close investigation must be made by the Government in reference to this matter, because the lady has suffered considerable torture over the last 15 years in reference to her property.

The unfortunate part of this resumption is that the same lady owned two blocks in Scarborough in addition to over 5 acres in Bunbury. It was her lot to have the Scarborough blocks resumed by the Government in 1954; and it now looks as though she will lose her Bunbury property. I appeal to the Minister representing the Minister for Works to come down to Bunbury and make a personal inspection of this property; because, in my opinion, it is worth a great deal more than the £7,975 that has been offered.

The Hon. A. F. Watts: Has the value of the land increased much in recent years?

Mr. ROBERTS: The value of land in Bunbury has increased out of all knowledge.

Mr. Rowberry: Who is responsible?

Mr. ROBERTS: For the benefit of the Minister for Transport, I would say that a quarter-acre of land, within half a mile of the post office in Bunbury, is probably worth a lot more than many of the suburban blocks in the metropolitan area; and the land around St. Clare's Hospital in Bunbury has increased considerably in value in the last 15 years.

The Minister for Education: Is it not still being conducted as a hospital?

Mr. ROBERTS: No; more as a convalescent home. I think the Minister for Education will agree that with the modern requirements of a good school today a little more than 5 acres is needed.

The Minister for Education: Is there any other land which the Education Department could use for school purposes?

Mr. ROBERTS: There is quite a lot of land.

The Minister for Education: It is very low lying.

Mr. ROBERTS: No. If the Government required it, there is a considerable area of land between St. Clare's and the ocean. The Minister has not been in Bunbury recently; but quite a number of the sandhills have been levelled off and, in that area, he could possibly find a site for a school greater than that of St. Clare's hospital.

The next matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the Government is the fact that at long last we have got the Australian steamship owners to agree to at least two regular direct shipments to the port of Bunbury from eastern seaboard ports.

The Minister for Transport: What does the member for Vasse think about that?

Mr. ROBERTS: I am sure he would support Bunbury to the full on this.

Mr. Bovell: Goods are sent to Busselton with option of discharge.

Mr. ROBERTS: The point I am making is that there are two definite sailings proposed each year. The first of such sailings is scheduled at the moment to arrive in Bunbury at approximately the end of October; the second at the end of March. The point I wish to raise in reference to these direct shipments is that I would like the Government to take this opportunity of at least bringing some of its requirements from the Eastern States to the port of Bunbury; because, to date, practically nothing has been brought in through the port of Bunbury for any Government work in the South-West.

Surely there must be at least one machine, or some steel girders required for the Government project at Wellington Weir, or the Bunbury Power Station. So tonight I would like to stress to the Government that it should support these shipments to Bunbury, by bringing directly to that port any items the Government may require during October next, and March, 1959. These direct shipments are most important, not only to the residents of Bunbury, but also to the residents of the South-West in general, because the railway freight on lots of grocery lines alone from Fremantle to Bunbury is in the vicinity of £6 per ton. So, even if an individual merchant, or retailer, in shall I say Manjimup, brings in a total of 20 tons of goods on the October shipment, he will save £120 in freight alone which is not a bad saving on such a small consignment. Therefore, I trust that the member for Warren, who is new in this House, will go back to Manjimup

and get the traders there to support these shipments through the port of Bunbury next October because it will be a saving to the district of Manjimup and all other South-West centres.

Mr. Marshall: Are there groceries from the Eastern States?

Mr. ROBERTS: Maybe.

Mr. Marshall: You quoted groceries.

Mr. ROBERTS: As the member for Wembley Beaches well knows, a lot of groceries manufactured in the Eastern States are not manufactured in Western Australia. I think the traders of the South-West are just as keen supporters of the Buy W.A. Goods Campaign as are those of the metropolitan area. However, there are certain lines that at present are not produced in Western Australia, and the public demands that the retailers purchase them.

The next item with which I want to deal is the export of apples through the port of Bunbury. It has been said that apple exports are made only on the larger type of ship, and that it is impossible for such ships to come into the port of Bunbury. I have figures here which are rather interesting from the point of view of apple shipments, because apple shipments during 1957 from Western Australia, were, in fact, only made from Fremantle and Albany.

The total number of ships that took apples from Western Australia is 16. Of these 16 ships, 11 called at both Fremantle and Albany; one only called at Albany; and three only called at Fremantle. However, it is interesting to note the draft of these vessels when they left their various ports after completing loading. The "Aden" left Albany with a mean draft of 26 ft. 3 ins. The "Nottingham" left Albany with a mean draft of 21 ft. 10 ins.; the "Coolgardie" 22 ft. 10 ins.; the "Pipiriki" 23 ft. 4 ins.; the "Port Townsville" 27 ft. 4 ins.; the "Clan McDougall" with 28 ft. 6 ins.; the "Royal Star" 24 ft. 11 ins.; the "Devon" 21 ft. 9 ins.; the "Coolaroo" 23 ft.; the "Helenus" 26 ft. 2 ins.; the "Empire Star" 28 ft. 5 ins.; and the "Canadian Star" 26 ft. 8 ins.

Of that total number of ships which departed from Albany with a shipment of apples there are only three that could not have left Bunbury, because there are three of those vessels over 26 ft. 6 in., which is, at the present moment, a working draft in the port of Bunbury. Of the vessels that departed from Fremantle there are six with a mean draft of under 26 ft. 6 in. Therefore, it is not always the big ships that call into Western Australian ports to load apples. In Bunbury last year, there were 56 overseas vessels which called at

that port to load various products for all parts of the world, and amongst those 56 vessels was a number that had cool storage facilities.

I might mention at this stage that one vessel which left the port of Bunbury only a few days ago was the first to come on to the Western Australian coastline on a new regular monthly service. I refer to the m.v. "Ashun," a vessel which is owned by the China Navigation Company, and which will run from Western Australian ports to Indonesia, Malaya, Hong Kong, Shanghai and Japan.

The shipping companies concerned realised that there is a tremendous potential so far as exportable cargo from this State is concerned. Otherwise, they would not have set up this service. They took on asbestos from Point Sampson and loaded ilmenite at Bunbury. At Fremantle they loaded all manner of cargo. They will call at Albany and Geraldton if the cargo is offering; they will take general cargo and refrigerated cargo.

Therefore, I feel that this vessel is opening up a new market for the goods produced in this State, and I hope the Government will take cognisance of the fact and wherever possible encourage markets in the countries I have just mentioned. I have no doubt that an apple shipment could be forwarded to Indonesia and those other countries.

At the present moment, apples, in the main, are exported from Western Australia on what is termed "conference line vessels," and the policy is that these apples are sold to overseas buyers at an f.o.b. price at port of shipment. The growers concerned—as far as I know—are paid for on an f.o.r. at-loading-siding basis. What I am going to point out to hon. members probably does not affect the growers, but it does affect the sale of apples, because here is an opportunity to make some saving in the landed cost at overseas ports.

As I indicated previously in this House, apples shipped from the Boyup Brook area to Fremantle are charged a freight rate, on a five ton minimum, of 69s. 6d. From Boyup Brook to Bunbury the freight rate is 45s. 8d., a saving of 23s. 10d. per ton. In all, something like 76,141 bushels of apples were produced in the Boyup Brook area in the 1955 season, according to the figures I have from the Government Statistician's office. That number of bushels represents approximately 1,700 tons and therefore the saving in freight alone, if those apples had been exported through the port of Bunbury, would have been in the vicinity of £2,025.

I am not going to weary the House with detailed particulars, but would point out that 142,290 bushels of apples were produced in the Manjimup district in the 1955

season and the saving, as between the respective freight rates, would in that instance have been £3,250. For the Bridgetown area the saving would have been in the vicinity of £13,750; for Donnybrook the saving would have been £10,400 and, for Capel, £2,300, so members can see that by shipping the apples through the port of Bunbury a considerable saving in freight alone could be made. I realise that there are certain difficulties at the present stage; but I want to emphasise that they do not include the depth of water or the port facilities in Bunbury.

One finds that a considerable quantity of the apples shipped through Albany are stored in the Mt. Barker cool stores and are railed, I believe, in insulated trucks to the port of Albany for loading. There are cool storage facilities at Donnybrook, Argyle and at Bridgetown and I feel that if the shipping companies would agree in the next apple season to try one shipment, it could be proved successful with the co-operation of all concerned—the growers, the exporters and the shipping companies. I know there would be full support from the Bunbury port authority and from the Bunbury members of the Waterside Workers' Federation and the W.A.G.R.

Mr. Potter: Wait until the Government makes a port of it!

Mr. ROBERTS: I grant that, and will deal with that matter if time permits. The Premier is well aware that at present it is not possible to take motor trucks down to the berths along the Bunbury jetty and even were that done, as has been suggested by a number of people who really do not know the working of the port, and if the jetty was decked, I am afraid it would not be a working proposition, because it would be impossible for motor vehicles to manoeuvre alongside a ship's side if other vessels were loading and railway trucks were being shunted.

One of the main drawbacks in Bunbury some years ago was the lack of inspection facilities and shelter facilities for the apples. Now, as the Premier well knows, we have a magnificent transit shed there, in which the apples could be stored and protected pending the arrival of the ship. I am confident that, with the co-operation of the Railway Department in the running of special trains from apple-producing areas, a shipment of apples through the port of Bunbury is not only possible, but also essential. It was done pre-war, when they shipped apples through Bunbury and I am confident that it can be done now.

If only the Government would be big-hearted enough—I know what the Premier will say to this—to assist in the establishment of a cool storage shed in Bunbury, that would be of considerable help to the port facilities there.

The next point with which I wish to deal—I am sorry that the Minister for Education has just left the Chamber, as I wanted him to be present when I brought this matter forward—has to deal with the schools in Bunbury.

The Minister for Transport: He can read.

Mr. ROBERTS: On the 23rd of July, 1957, as recorded at page 372 of Hansard of that year, I mentioned the lack of accommodation in schools in the Bunbury area. I said that I would like the Minister to visit Bunbury to inspect the accommodation in the schools, including the high school, and the Minister interjected and said, "I have visited all of them." I pointed out to the Minister then that he had not visited Bunbury since I had been a member of this Assembly.

Since then a most responsible body, entitled the South-West District Council of the Parents and Citizens' Association, has approached me and has asked that I arrange for the Minister for Education to visit Bunbury, in order to see the congestion and lack of facilities at the various schools in that centre. On the 11th of March, 1958, I approached the Minister by letter, inviting him again to Bunbury, but although there has been considerable correspondence on this subject I have so far been unsuccessful in my efforts to get the Minister to visit Bunbury.

Mr. Evans: How many primary schools have you there?

Mr. ROBERTS: I do not think time will permit me to go through them all, as I have a lot of matter with which I desire to deal—

The Minister for Education: There are 11, including Rathmines, I understand.

Mr. ROBERTS: I wish to point out to the Minister that accommodation this year at Carey Park school, when the term started immediately after the New Year, was shocking. I realised that although the Government had let a contract to a contractor to build an additional two classrooms he had not completed the job when the school re-assembled.

The Minister for Police: You will have to get the P.W.D. to do the work next time.

Mr. ROBERTS: I feel that the Minister must watch the position during the next holiday period and make sure that additional classrooms are completed for the schools in Bunbury which require them. No doubt the Minister is well aware that at the Bunbury high school the position has been reached where some children are stood down, or sent home, during certain examination periods, for the simple reason that there is not sufficient accommodation at the school to cater for the students who are there at present.

I appreciate that it is contemplated that six additional classrooms will be built at the Bunbury high school during this financial year—I hope! But I would like the Minister, in all seriousness, to visit Bunbury and see the position for himself; because he must admit that for many months now I have appealed to him to do just that.

The Minister for Education: You sent only one or two letters so you need not make a song about it. That takes only about five minutes to do.

Mr. ROBERTS: If the Minister would like me to read the correspondence in detail I will do so; but I do not think it will reflect any credit on the Minister and that is why I have, so far, refrained from reading the correspondence.

The Minister for Education: I will table the file. I waited six weeks for a reply from you.

Mr. ROBERTS: I beg your pardon? If the Minister cares I can read the correspondence. It is not a joking matter, as the Minister appears to think it is. What I want him to do is to spare half a day, and I will do my level best to arrange a closely-knit itinerary so that he does not have to waste a minute in Bunbury, and he can inspect every school there.

As the Minister for Housing well knows, the population of Bunbury has increased considerably over the last few years, and is still increasing. He still has a lot of housing worries in that district; and therefore the Minister for Education must surely realise that there are children in the Bunbury area who require educational facilities; and they require them just as much as the children in the metropolitan area. Therefore I hope that the Minister will give serious consideration to my request and visit Bunbury in the not-too-distant future.

The Minister for Education: You are making a mountain out of a molehill!

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member's time has expired.

On motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson, time extended.

Mr. ROBERTS: I thank members for the opportunity of being able to continue. There are a number of items I wanted to discuss, but I will not have the opportunity of going through them all tonight, and I will not delay hon. members much longer.

The Premier: I thought you were going to say that you were getting exhausted and I intended to say, "So are we."

Mr. ROBERTS: While I am speaking of problems connected with my electorate I will never get exhausted. I asked questions as to whether it was the Government's intention to abide by the original plans for

the Bunbury Harbour submitted by Mr. Tydeman. I understand that it is the Government's intention to stick to the principles outlined in that plan.

The Premier: Despite the opposition of the ex-member for Albany.

Mr. ROBERTS: Be that as it may, there is one aspect of the future development of the port of Bunbury which I would like to see expedited, and I refer to the provision of a land-backed quay. As hon. members realise, with modern shipping it is necessary to have a land-backed quay for the efficient handling of cargo.

Mr. Potter: The land would have to be pretty well backed.

Mr. ROBERTS: Not necessarily. The member for Subiaco has just shown his ignorance as far as the Bunbury Harbour is concerned, because there are certain sites where a land-backed quay could be built and could be operating in the very near future if the Government made available sufficient funds for the project to be proceeded with. It is all-important to a port such as Bunbury, which has a hinterland, as hon. members well know, second to none in Australia. It is only right that the outlet port for such a hinterland should have the facilities to handle the cargo or the produce of that port zone. If members have read the Tydeman report they will see that Mr. Tydeman points out that 86 per cent. of the productivity of the Bunbury port zone bypasses that port. It does not go through the port of Busselton; and so I will leave hon. members to work out for themselves where it goes.

Mr. Heal: Through Albany.

Mr. ROBERTS: I feel that the Government must make the funds available, at a very early date, for the provision of a land-backed quay.

Mr. May: You have no land there; it is all sand.

Mr. ROBERTS: It is still good sand; I was coming to the point where approximately 85,000 tons of that sand was exported to overseas countries this year.

Mr. May: You ought to tie it up.

Mr. Potter: Where does it come from?

Mr. ROBERTS: It was ilmenite that came from the North Shore at Bunbury, as well as from the Capel area. Last year the total tonnage of cargo handled increased by something like 60,000 tons over the preceding year, to make a total of 355,377 tons handled in the Port of Bunbury; and, in all, 85 vessels called there. I might mention that included in that tonnage was 85,255 tons of ilmenite. This mineral is

attracting vessels to trade at this South-Western seaport and to carry the ilmenite to countries north and north-west of this State. So I suggest that the Government should leave no stone unturned to do all it can to encourage exporters to ship goods from this State on these vessels which are new to this coastline and which are carrying cargo to countries north and north-west of us.

On the one other matter that I will deal with tonight I hope the Government will spend some money, because the expenditure will not represent a great sum. I refer to the provision of a slipway at the port of Bunbury in order that fishermen can effect necessary repairs and attend to the regular upkeep of their boats. A rather large fleet of fishing boats operates from the port of Bunbury. That fleet has not even scratched the fishing potential in the surrounding waters and if the member for Gascoyne was present in the Chamber now I am confident he would agree with me when I say that the potential of the fishing industry in this State is colossal.

The Government has recently erected a fish landing jetty in Bunbury, but I feel that at the earliest possible date money should be spent on the provision of a slipway to enable professional fishermen in that area to maintain their boats. I grant that the Government supported the Busselton fishermen in 1945 I think it was—

Mr. Bovell: It was in 1947.

Mr. ROBERTS: Thank you! Although the Bunbury fishermen supported the Busselton fishermen when they were pressing for the provision of a slipway in Busselton, the reason why they did so was that at that time they had access to the slipway in the estuary of Bunbury. They could go there and use their own slipways that were provided along the banks of the estuary. However, in 1951, the plug was put at the mouth of the estuary which sealed it off, and, of course, the fishing vessels could not enter the estuary mouth.

The Bunbury fishermen, and in many cases, fishermen from the Fremantle area, must have some facilities in order to service their boats in Bunbury. I think it is the responsibility of this Government to make a slipway available at the earliest possible date within the precincts of the Bunbury Harbour because these fishermen spend a great deal of money on diesel fuel and petrol and I consider that they are rightfully entitled to some funds being expended on a slipway in the Port of Bunbury.

As the hour is getting late I do not intend to delay the House any longer. I have many other matters that I wanted to discuss tonight, but I must now leave them

until my next opportunity which will be during the debate on the Estimates which will be held at a later period during the session.

On motion by Mr. O'Brien, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 10.56 p.m.*

## Legislative Council

Wednesday, 20th August, 1958.

### CONTENTS

	Page
Questions on Notice :	
Lands, release for settlement .....	240
South Perth Community Hospital, new maternity wing .....	242
Education, use of junior and leaving certificate fees .....	242
Onslow hospital, finalisation of plans, etc. ....	242
Address-in-reply, sixth day .....	242
Speakers on Address—	
The Hon. R. C. Mattiske .....	242
The Hon. F. D. Willmott .....	250
The Hon. J. G. Hislop .....	256
The Hon. A. R. Jones .....	262
Adjournment, special .....	269

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

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

#### LANDS.

##### *Release for Settlement.*

1. The Hon. J. MURRAY asked the Minister for Railways:

In connection with the report of the Forests Department for the year ended the 30th June, 1957, where the Conservator states, on page 7, that over the past 12 years the department had agreed to release 1,327,235 acres of Crown land and State forests for settlement and leases, will he inform the House—

- (a) the yearly total of releases?
- (b) what area was—
  - (i) Crown lands;
  - (ii) State forests?
- (c) what area was released for Government land settlement schemes?
- (d) in which areas was land made available each year?