

12. Industry (Advances) Act Amendment.  
Introduced by Mr. Brand (Treasurer).
13. Tourist.  
Introduced by Mr. Brand (Minister for Tourists).
14. Traffic Act Amendment.  
Introduced by Mr. Perkins (Minister for Transport).
15. Railways Classification Board Act Amendment.  
Introduced by Mr. Perkins for Mr. Court (Minister for Railways).
16. Health Act Amendment.  
Introduced by Mr. Brand for Mr. Ross Hutchinson (Minister for Health).
17. State Concerns (Prevention of Disposal).  
Introduced by Mr. Hawke.

### ROYAL COMMISSIONERS' POWERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Returned*

Returned from the Council without amendment.

*House adjourned at 12.59 a.m. (Thursday).*

## Legislative Council

Thursday, the 6th August, 1959

### CONTENTS

	Page
<b>QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :</b>	
Minerals, Government drilling programme	812
State Housing Commission, Bunbury staff	812
Merridin goods yard, provision of mobile crane	813
<b>QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE :</b>	
Railways Royal Commission, tabling of Report No. 9	813
<b>LEAVE OF ABSENCE</b>	813
<b>RAILWAYS ROYAL COMMISSION REPORT No. 9 :</b>	
Withdrawal of notice of motion	813
<b>MOTION :</b>	
Licensing Act, printing of parliamentary Committee's report	813
<b>BILL :</b>	
Supply Bill, £21,000,000, 2r.	815

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### MINERALS

#### *Government Drilling Programme*

1. The Hon. J. D. TEAHAN (for the Hon. J. J. Garrigan) asked the Minister for Mines:
  - (1) What amount of money has been allocated by the Government this financial year for drilling throughout the State for gold and other minerals?
  - (2) How many drills does the Government possess?
  - (3) In what areas are these working at the present time?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (1) Allocations are in the process of being decided. It is not my intention to evade answering this question, but the allocations of the loan funds are in the process of being determined, and I will not know in the immediate future what amount will be made available to the department.
- (2) Seven diamond drills, one rotary drill, and two percussion drills are owned by the Mines Department.
- (3) Ord River (2), Coolgardie (1), Day Dawn (1), Fremantle Bridge (1), Talling Peak (1), Badgingarra (2). Two machines are undergoing overhaul.

### STATE HOUSING COMMISSION

#### *Bunbury Staff*

2. The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON asked the Minister for Mines:  
Would the Minister please supply a list of the staff at the Bunbury office of the State Housing Commission showing their official titles and their particular duties?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

Clerk-collector, Mr. J. G. Gibson: Responsible for Bunbury office; all Bunbury rent collections, banking and returns, etc., to Head Office. Duties include tenancy and arrears investigation and inquiries installation of tenants, maintenance complaints and generally act as Commission's agent.

Junior clerk, Miss V. Stockins: Attends to office inquiries during absence of clerk-collector, answers telephone, and generally assists in the office.

The supervisors also based at Bunbury Office are—Mr. S. Major and Mr. R. Leitch (supervisors Grade 1). Mr. Major is responsible for the whole of the lower South-West, and the Bunbury area in particular. Mr. Leitch, under Mr.

Major, is responsible for the area extending to Augusta, Nannup, and Northcliffe, including Boyup Brook.

Mr. R. Littleton, who is based at Collie, is also under the control of Mr. Major. Mr. Littleton's district includes Brunswick Junction and north to Coolup.

The duties of these officers include supervision of new buildings, maintenance contracts and works, property inspections, land development, liaison with local authorities, and general inquiries regarding tenants, purchasers, property care, and arrears.

#### MERREDIN GOODS YARD

##### *Provision of Mobile Crane*

3. The Hon. J. D. TEAHAN (for the Hon. J. J. Garrigan) asked the Minister for Mines:

Will the Government give consideration to having a mobile crane located at the railway goods yard at Merredin for the handling of heavy goods and materials?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

Yes. The provision of a mobile crane for use at the railway goods yard at Merredin is listed for attention in conjunction with the needs of other centres throughout the system. The supply, however, is governed by the degree of priority having regard for the availability of loan funds.

#### QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE

#### RAILWAYS ROYAL COMMISSION

##### *Tabling of Report No. 9*

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Local Government:

Earlier in the session I asked whether the Minister would lay Railways Royal Commission Report No. 9 on the table of the House, and he replied that the Government had not considered the report as yet. I now ask the Minister: Has the Government given consideration to that report; and, if so, will he table it?

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN replied:

I can advise the honourable member and other members of the House that Report No. 9 by the Railways Royal Commissioner will be tabled next Tuesday.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by the Hon. A. L. Loton, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to the Hon. J. M. Thomson (South) on the ground of ill health.

#### RAILWAYS ROYAL COMMISSION REPORT No. 9

##### *Withdrawal of Notice of Motion*

**THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND** (North) [2.37] In view of the reply to my question without notice this afternoon, I ask leave to withdraw notice of motion No. 2.

Leave granted.

Notice of motion withdrawn.

#### LICENSING ACT

##### *Printing of Parliamentary Committee's Report*

**THE HON. F. R. H. LAVERY** (West) [2.38]: I move—

That the report of the Parliamentary Committee of 1958 on the Licensing Act be printed.

I think it can be said that in every session of Parliament much time is spent by members of both Houses discussing amendments to the Licensing Act. In addition, any question dealing with liquor seems to occupy a great deal of the time of members of this House. Because of that, I have made up my mind that I am going to interest myself in the Licensing Act; especially in view of the fact that last year the previous Government appointed a Parliamentary Committee to inquire into and report upon the administration of the Licensing Act. Some three members of this House were appointed to that committee, but for reasons best known to itself the Liberal Party did not nominate any of its members to sit upon this committee. Therefore, it could be considered to have been a Government committee.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Could it be regarded as not being a Parliamentary committee?

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I am making this speech. One question dealing with that committee was asked earlier in the session by Mr. Heenan, and the answer he received was that the cost of printing the report would be £150, approximately. The implication was that the Government considered no good purpose would be served in having the report printed. A few days after that a statement was made by the Premier (Mr. Brand) which appeared in *The West Australian*. We must take notice of the statement, because that newspaper is the Premier's mouthpiece. He gave the public to understand there would be several important amendments to the Licensing Act.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: If that is not his mouthpiece it is at least one of his organs.

The Hon. F. R. H. LAVERY: I agree with that. Some of the amendments he has hinted at will be far-reaching. It is

supposition on my part that the amendments could bring about an extension of trading hours and of the selling of liquor in restaurants and night-clubs. For that reason members of this House should be able to inspect the report of the committee, not at the time the amending Bill is introduced, but some considerable time before.

I understand that the members of the parliamentary committee studied this matter closely, and the recommendations arrived at are most important. Under those circumstances the cost of £150 for printing the report is infinitesimal when compared to the amount that is being spent on the Royal Commission which, in all probability, will fizzle out and the expenditure will be wasted. I therefore ask the House to support the motion I have moved.

#### *Point of Order*

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I would ask you, Mr. President, for a ruling. Twice during this session of Parliament committees have been referred to as being parliamentary committees. One was the committee set up by the Country Party to inquire into war service land settlement, and the other was the committee consisting of members of the Labour Party and Country Party that inquired into licensing matters. When a committee is described as a parliamentary committee is it one appointed by this House, or is it one which comprises members of Parliament?

The PRESIDENT: My ruling is that if this House had an opportunity of discussing the appointment of the members to a committee it would be regarded as a parliamentary committee. At times members of Parliament are selected by Ministers of the Crown and by the Premier to investigate certain matters; in such cases they are regarded as Government committees. This House has control over all the committees appointed by it; namely, the parliamentary committees.

#### *Debate resumed*

THE HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [2.45]: During the debate on the Address-in-reply I made some reference to the matter contained in the motion before us, so it will not be necessary for me to say much except to indicate my support. I recall that this committee was appointed, and when it was functioning its standing was criticised by some people because it did not consist of representatives of the three parliamentary parties. That is regrettable. That committee consisted of six members of Parliament and they studiously applied themselves, over a long period, to the investigation committed to them. In all modesty I can assure members that the report is comprehensive; it is the result of a careful analysis of the Licensing Act and of modern trends, not only in this State but in other parts of Australia.

The committee had the advantage of a great amount of evidence and support from the Licensed Victuallers' Association, various church organisations, and other parties concerned. Their evidence was dealt with. The report will be of considerable benefit to anyone who proposes to make a study of our licensing laws with a view to improving them.

The members of the committee travelled over the South-West, the Great Southern and the Eastern Goldfields. I myself visited all the other States where I had the opportunity of meeting the members of the various licensing courts. I had the opportunity of spending a whole morning with Mr. Justice Maxwell who had made an intense study of the licensing laws of this country and who went overseas on this subject.

To the limit of our ability, the result of that research has been embodied in the report. For that reason, I support the motion. I hope that the Government will—not by way of acknowledgment of the work done by the committee, but with a view to assisting members of Parliament who will be called upon to debate this subject later on in the session—have the report printed and circulated as soon as possible.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [2.49]: I cannot imagine any reason for a Select Committee being appointed by this House, unless its findings are made known.

The PRESIDENT: This was not a Select Committee.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It was a Government-appointed committee.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: If it was, then we are in order in assuming that its findings should be made known.

The PRESIDENT: I would remind the honourable member that had the committee been appointed by Parliament it would have had to report back to Parliament, and the report would be published.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: In the case of Government-appointed committees, are the reports to be made only to the Government; or should members of Parliament have the reports made available to them? I would say that if a Government appoints members of Parliament to hold an inquiry, it is because it wants information not only for itself but for Parliament generally. I think the same attitude should be adopted in regard to the publication of this report as is adopted in regard to Select Committees.

THE HON. A. L. LOTON (South) [2.50]: I believe this motion has much merit. The committee was appointed by the Government and it made recommendations. From a Press report I gather that the Government is, before it frames legislation to be

submitted to this Parliament, giving serious consideration to some of the contents of the report. Surely we—the members of this Chamber—are entitled to know the contents of the report! The Country Party had representation on the committee—for instance, Mr. Roche. But I have not seen the report. The Labour Party had representation in Mr. Heenan, as chairman. Surely we are entitled to see the report if the committee was appointed by a Government, and if a succeeding Government has given notice of its intention to submit a recommendation after studying that report!

**THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH** (Suburban—Minister for Mines) [2.51]: If members will agree, I feel the best method to deal with this particular motion will be for me to convey to the Government the views that have been expressed here this afternoon. I will report that the members of this House desire that this report be printed and I will obtain the Government's opinion on the matter. We all know, of course, that the Government is not compelled to take any notice of the motion even if it were passed in this Chamber. I have had that experience myself in the past. Nevertheless, I desire to bring this matter to a satisfactory conclusion one way or the other, and I suggest that some member obtain the adjournment of the debate until next Tuesday when Mr. Logan, who has not given his views, could inform members how the matter is regarded by the Government.

**The PRESIDENT:** That is entirely in the hands of the Council.

**The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH:** The motion is entirely in the hands of the Council. I am trying to be helpful to the honourable member; and he has nodded his head to show he is in agreement with my suggestion. I will resume my seat to give some member an opportunity to move the adjournment.

On motion by the Hon. G. E. Jeffery, debate adjourned.

## SUPPLY BILL, £21,000,000

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**THE HON. A. R. JONES** (Midland) [2.54]: I want to make one or two references to subjects which have already been discussed. No doubt some of the State's money will be spent on prospecting; and mention was made of that matter yesterday. It has been suggested that we must do something with regard to this worthy cause in order to try to discover new mines. I quite agree that what is being spent at present is totally inadequate to sustain prospectors in the Goldfields area.

I think I previously made reference to a scheme which might be given some consideration; that is to the establishment of a prospecting gang of two men who would be provided with reasonable equipment to go into the goldmining areas. If they had some good equipment, they would make far more progress than they would with the old shovel and pan which was previously the only equipment used.

By equipment, I mean that perhaps a truck could be provided with a small winch to haul the bucket out of the shaft. Also, a portable air device could be provided so that the drilling could be done by air thus obviating the laborious work which would otherwise be necessary. I do not know what this would cost, but I suggest that the Mines Department might go into the figures to see whether something can be done. An old prospector should be put in charge, because he would know the job. He should be given the assistance of a younger man for two reasons. One is that he would be trained in the art of finding gold; and the other is that he would, being young and able, be prepared to throw himself around and do the hard manual work.

While we know that there are plenty of old chaps who have been good prospectors and are still quite competent to do a certain amount of work, they might not be capable of accomplishing the hard manual work involved. If it were possible and practicable to set up an outfit which could be sent out into the areas for a nominal sum of, say, £2,000, I think it would be money well spent. The men should be given a reasonable wage while they were on the fields; and if they found anything, their mine could be drilled, proven, and put on the market.

If that were done the two men, whoever they might be, would retain a certain number of shares as their interest, and the Government would be repaid the money it had expended on the prospecting venture. It might even be possible to establish half a dozen of these gangs so that the various areas such as Sandstone, Wiluna, Laverton, and Leonora, could be prospected for new mines.

I make this suggestion to the Minister, but as he is not present at the moment, perhaps his co-Minister might ask him to have a look at *Hansard* and read my comments. I agree with those members who last night said that if we do not do something more than we are now, we will lose the benefit which this industry has so far bestowed upon us. I have myself chased the yellow devil, and I feel that there is plenty more to find if only an opportunity is given to someone to look for it. But we cannot expect anyone to go about 30 to 40 miles away from civilization and live on the £5 or £5 10s. which is being paid to prospectors.

Questions are asked in this House, and in another place, and in asking them members have some object in mind. Reference has previously been made to the answers given to those questions. I can well recall that when we were debating the closure of certain railway lines, I raised a question regarding the roads which would serve the areas where rail services were to be suspended, and the Minister of the day told me, after having made inquiries from the Main Roads Department, that the Geraldton-Yuna road—it was the one I had in mind at the time because the rail service to that centre was to be suspended—was in very good order and would be quite capable of carrying all the traffic necessary when the rail services were suspended.

I knew that the road was in bad order, and in answers to questions asked the other day I was given some illuminating information. I asked the Minister how much money had been expended on the Geraldton-Yuna road and on the Geraldton-Northampton road for the years 1957-58 and 1958-59. On the Geraldton-Northampton road, £21,740 was spent in 1957-58, and £62,270 in 1958-59. On the Geraldton-Yuna road, which was in such good order that it was capable of carrying all the traffic necessary to cope with the requirements of the district when the rail services were suspended, £68,000 was spent in 1957-58 and £25,730 in 1958-59. To top it off £99,100 is to be spent on the Geraldton-Northampton road this financial year, and £32,000 on the Geraldton-Yuna road, making a total for the three years, of £180,000 for the Geraldton-Northampton section and approximately £120,000 for the Geraldton-Yuna section.

It just goes to show that not much consideration is given to members' questions when one can receive an answer to the effect that a road is in good order and capable of carrying all the heavy traffic necessary, and yet £150,000 to £200,000 had to be spent on 40 to 50 miles of the road in three years. So I ask the two present Ministers to make sure, when questions are asked of them, that the departments concerned supply the correct replies. If we are given incorrect information we can be badly misled in our thinking, and we can say things in the House which, because they are based on the answer we have received, are wrong.

There is one other point. Yesterday I did not realise that the Minister was replying to the debate on the third reading of the Royal Commissioners' Powers Act Amendment Bill, because I wanted to make some observations in regard to it. I think we got off to a bad start, because a little bit of feeling was engendered during the debate. Perhaps the Minister may have been wrong in what he did by not mentioning a certain file during his second reading speech. But I ask members to cast their minds back to previous occasions when not

one Minister, but several, have, when introducing Bills, said about three dozen words and then, when replying to the debate, have spoken many hundreds of dozen words.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: It still wasn't right.

The Hon. A. R. JONES: It was not, but I feel sure that the Minister will pay due regard to what has been said. We must also realise that he has not been in his job for very long. I would like to say to those who may not have believed what the Minister said, when he made the statement that he did not have the file, that I know for a positive fact that the file was not in the Minister's hands until the morning of the day he used it in this House. I just point that out to members because I happen to be in a position to know about it. I support the second reading.

**THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (North) [3.5]:** I received a message from Mr. Jones that he did not desire to speak, but as he apparently changed his mind and decided to speak I would not like to have any misunderstanding on the point. The Supply Bill, involving as it does the expenditure of £21,000,000 is the normal sort of Bill introduced in the early part of sessions of Parliament. It is one of those measures that give to members, if they are feeling verbose; or are anxious to debate something; or wish to air a grievance, more than one opportunity of expressing their views or airing their grievances. It is a Bill of opportunity, except in regard to amending it.

To those of us who are students of parliamentary procedure, the Supply Bill is one of the most interesting of all Bills introduced into Parliament. The procedure involved in a Supply Bill could quite safely be said to be veiled in antiquity. The House of Commons and our own Assemblies must first form Committees before the Bill can even be introduced, so that in the Assembly, as in the House of Commons, there must first be a Committee of Ways and Means and a Committee of Supply to give proof that the money is available, if appropriated. Until the Committees have authorised the expenditure from State revenue, that is the situation.

That is a procedure that belongs to the Commons; or, in Australian Parliaments, to the Houses of Assembly. It is, without doubt, a Ministerial Bill and no private member may move an amendment to increase any sum for any purpose. It is obvious that if any private member had the right, responsibility or privilege to introduce a Supply Bill, it would not be for an expenditure of £21,000,000, as it is on this occasion, but for £2,221,000,000.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They would want the world.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: They would want to attend to all the local and parish pump matters, and they would put forward all their pet theories, whims, and fancies. It is unthinkable that a private member should have the opportunity of embarrassing any circumstance of Government finance in that way. This dates back to the time when the King had the executive responsibility, and the people's representatives had the right—and they exercised it—of airing their grievances before any tax to be imposed by the King would be approved, or any moneys that he required would be endorsed.

But now, as the executive has passed to Ministers, every member has the right, following on the ancient practice, to air his grievances. I can see by the way the Minister is smiling that he knows what I am leading up to—the airing of grievances before Supply is granted. That is a common right and it has been acknowledged through the ages. The Crown recommends; the Commons grants; and the Lords assent. That is the principle, and in this case the Bill was introduced by a Message. The Assembly has granted the money, and it is for the Council to assent. As it is a right to air grievances, I must say that while I wish to air a few, at some stage I also desire to be constructive.

I would firstly like to refer to the unnecessary evasion which takes place in answering simple questions. This has been the experience of all members. Although it is the Government's right to answer questions in any way it wishes, the evasion for non-answering of simple, properly-presented questions is quite unnecessary and gets no marks at all.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: That practice is about as ancient as the Supply Bill.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Almost; but where it is a case of a simple and direct question surely we can expect an answer instead of the wobbling about that we have experienced over the last week. In one instance I was referred to the Premier's Speech, in which it was said the matter was clearly stated as a matter of policy. In case *The West Australian* in its version of the Premier's speech was wrong I sought from the Premier's office a copy of the relevant matter, and I will show how clearly the policy was stated. The answer I received was to the effect that as the Government's policy had been clearly stated there was no need to say "Yes," or "No," to me.

I can see that the Minister has a copy of the policy speech. This is what the Premier said at Dongara—it is unnecessary to read the preamble because the matter in the copy is conclusive; which shows the efficiency of the Under Secretary of the Premier's Department—

It is not our desire to close these concerns down. We are anxious to make them payable, based on sound

business principle. Our policy aim will be to transfer them progressively to the field of private industry without loss of employment, and where their continued operation will no longer be a drag upon the economy.

It is abundantly clear that where concerns show a profit, or where their continued operations cease to be a drag on the community, they will be progressively transferred to the field of private industry. There can be no other conclusion than that; and this can be amplified by reading the statement of the Premier in *The West Australian* of the 13th March. He said—

We will fire nobody nor close any concerns down. What we intend is, first, to make them payable, based on sound business principles instead of departmental principles, and when this is done we will put them on their own as public companies with shares on the Stock Exchange, to continue their operations as free enterprise concerns. Their 6,300 personnel will remain in their jobs as far as the Government would be concerned.

The list of State trading concerns or business undertakings described in the schedules of the Public Accounts under those two headings, shows distinctly the category of the business undertakings that may be sold, if there is clarity in the Premier's statement. The undertakings are as follows:—

The Wyndham Meatworks, because it shows a profit. The State Engineering Works; it also shows a profit. The State Hotels; the W.A. Meat Export Works; the Metropolitan Markets; the Charcoal Iron and Steel Industry; the State Electricity Commission; and the Kwinana housing authority.

In the list of partially reproductive works which are close to being productive and self-supporting, there are many others such as the abattoirs and saleyards. They need a sum of only £662 to be paid up and they will be in the same list or category as those which are to be progressively sold; if one interprets words as meaning anything.

I will say, however, that if this Government dared to sell the Robbs Jetty works, and the Wyndham Meatworks, it would so burst itself wide open that it would not survive a month, because of the distinct cleavage in opinions and views on that subject between the two parties which form the composite Government. The Robbs Jetty Meatworks is something of which I know a great deal. The owners of the 1930's came to me when I was Minister for Agriculture and asked me to request the Government to take them over, because they could not carry on; they owed the people concerned £178,000; they were listed on the Stock Exchange; the shares were listed at 2s. 6d.; and they had their statements of accounts with them to prove their case.

I said to the three gentlemen—one of whom is still alive; namely, John Forrest—that provided no shares changed hands during the whole of the period of consideration by the Government, I would be prepared to recommend to the Government that it investigate the prospect of taking over these works at valuation. The result was that two valuers of high standing were appointed. One was a State valuer and the other a Commonwealth valuer. We found the assets were in excess of £178,000; and the shareholders were paid £1 for every share they held. From that time on I was associated with the food supplies of more than one district in this State, particularly the North.

We developed the Robbs Jetty Meatworks to their present flourishing position; flourishing, in spite of their making charges much lower than desired by private enterprise. Hundreds of thousands, indeed millions, of lambs have been treated; the storage capacity has been more than quadrupled; the capital value has been built up to over £2,000,000; the reserves are healthy, and yet it has paid large sums into Consolidated Revenue. If, as has been suggested to me, the Premier's policy speech, means that these works are to be sold, then, in my view, it would be a dreadful thing. I repeat, however, that they will not be sold during the life of this Government, as a composite Government, any more than will the Wyndham Meatworks be sold by that determinant.

The views of the pastoralists in the Kimberleys and the adjacent areas may be sought by the Government if this is what it contemplates. My interest has been sustained, and I have continued to endeavour to secure information, just in case there is somebody on the horizon angling—or "Anglissing"—to obtain either or both of these works. I repeat, it would be a dreadful thing for the rural community of this State if Robbs Jetty; or the metropolitan sale yards; or any of the instrumentalities which have so wonderfully served our rural community, were to pass from the hands of the Government.

The Minister for Local Government is a man with great knowledge of rural industry, and if he asks his colleague, the Minister for Agriculture, for the appropriate files, I feel sure he will find that more than one approach has been made by private interests to have charges increased for slaughtering rates; to have storage rates increased; and so on. So I repeat that if Mr. Brand's words mean anything, let him proceed to sell those two undertakings as a sort of trial run. Let us pass to the others; some of the partially productive enterprises. Let us indeed pass to some of the totally unproductive enterprises which, for the information of members, are to be found on page 32 of the last financial statement.

With the exception of a few hand-picked instrumentalities, which perhaps not even Parliament would cavil at—I mean Parliament as a whole—if it had the opportunity of discussing them, I venture to say that there is very little likelihood of their being sold, in spite of all the flamboyancy of the statements contained in the advertising and the policy speeches of the Liberal Party. I pass to another matter referred to prior to the election, and that is the question of advertising. I have only a small portion of it here, because, as you know, Sir, you would not allow me to wheel a barrow into this Chamber. I do not intend to use all these advertisement sheets, but prominent among them is a full page advertisement by the Liberal Party. Its poor relation, the name I think is the Country and Democratic League—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Country Party in the House.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I thank the Minister. As far as I am concerned, it is also the Country Party out of the House. I respect that party very greatly. But, I repeat, the poor relation—the Country Party—had no chance of vying with its compatriots in the expenditure of money for advertising. I watched the advertisements very carefully—I will show later that I have made a hobby of this—and I found that the Country Party had one advertisement, about four columns wide and about 10 inches deep, in which it stated its case. It is quite reminiscent of the previous election when the poor old Country Party was not mentioned at all in the Liberal and Country League advertisements which ran to 1,000 sq. ft., or whatever it was.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Come over into Macedonia and help us.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: In spite of the volume of the Liberal Party's advertising, the Country Party did not get a mention prior to the election. Why? Because the Liberal Party hoped either to swallow it up or destroy it completely. That is still the hope of the Liberal Party, and it reminds me of the election campaign of 1950 when the Country Party had to answer it. This is what the Country Party said in seeking its own preservation—

State Elections, March 25th, 1950.

Although the L.C.L. advertisements appear to have overlooked the fact, in the McLarty-Watts L.C.L.-Country Party composite Government there are five country members.

The names are then given. In case members would like to peruse these advertisements I am prepared to lay them on the Table of the House. This is what it said. "Although the L.C.L. advertisements appear to have overlooked the fact." That is a Country Party advertisement authorised by H. McLeod.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: You had better get a job as secretary of the Country Party.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I am trying to show what strange bedfellows the Government parties are.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: You are at least giving us some publicity.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The L.C.L.—including Mr. Mattiske—would be the last to give the Country Party any publicity at all. In not one L.C.L. advertisement in the last election was the Country Party mentioned. Can that be denied?

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: They did not have unity tickets.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Never mind about that. It is not just a split that exists but a gaping chasm; and the honourable member knows it.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You hope it is.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Let the Minister try to sell the instrumentalities to which I have referred and see how he gets on.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: We are waiting to see how the railways go.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It was said by the Minister for Mines last evening that a lot of public money was used for political advertisements by the last Government.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Would you deny that?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: No, because it was justifiably used in the defence of propaganda which was unfair and unnecessary. I would say there was a lot of Reddish money used in these advertisements—a lot of Reddish money.

The Hon. J. Murray: Red money or Reddish money?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Reddish money.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: Is it Readish or Reddish?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The honourable member can determine that for himself.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: In one of these advertisements—and I will take the top one—this aspect was paraded by the Liberal Party. No mention was even made of the full title for some reason. This is what the advertisement said, "Liberal Party. Vote Liberal Party. Go Ahead."

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: And the people did.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Of course. A very wise man once said, "You can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time." And that is what will happen, because the majority were fooled by these advertisements.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Oh no, because, "All of the time," had come.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Dr. Hislop knows full well that the wheel had turned full circle, as it will do again. By the Government's own acts the people will not be fooled next time with advertisements. I refer to the word "stagnation" and the words "no development throughout the State—stagnation." That is not true; but it was accepted with a lot of other rubbish. It was not true.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Did the Press point that out?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: If one had followed the financial page of *The West Australian* since the last election took place one would be amazed to know what a recovery had taken place because of the successful trading in the previous 12 months by many companies. A review of their well-being and their financial affairs made by the financial editor, shows they had, in the last year, enjoyed a greater volume of business than previously, even though some companies increased the interest rate and others reduced it. Generally the volume of business was greater than ever. There were unprecedented home-building achievements. More high schools were built than ever before in any period of the State's history, because none were built in the last three years of the previous Government. Does that suggest stagnation?

There were many new works; some of them have been opened by the present Government since its succession to office. That must happen. Works and businesses partly constructed at the time of the election will be completed. I do not cavil at that. The point is that the Premier finds himself paying tribute—he has done so twice recently—to the last Government for the things which it did.

The Hon. A. R. Jones: That is to his credit.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It does not correlate to stagnation.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think the honourable member should take any notice of interjections. They are undignified.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I do not mind whether they are dignified or not. I now wish to mention country water supplies. Is there any member in this Chamber who could say that there was not unprecedented activity and achievement effected in country water supplies during the last six years?

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: And metropolitan.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I am dealing with country matters at the moment. I would say that water supply achievements in the past six years outstripped anything in the past. Why, a mile of pipe-line each



week was the ultimate achievement in the construction of some of the reticulation works which country towns now enjoy.

I could delay the House considerably by giving details of the balance sheets of companies for their last year of trading. The Australian hire-purchase companies had, in 1958-59, an increased amount of £57,000,000 tied to hire-purchase agreements. In spite of that, company after company showed greater returns. However, the public had sufficient belief in these advertisements to think that stagnation existed throughout the State. I say it was not true then and it is not true now. I suggest that those words coupled with the many words of *The West Australian* in criticism of the last Government were not true and did a distinct disservice to this great State of Western Australia.

I would like to refer to the Narrows Bridge. *The West Australian* said in one observation that it was being hastened along ahead of need. Some members of the present Government were very critical of the bridge; of its design; of its location; of its need; and—

The Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Its name.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: —and its name. With a change of Government there occurred a change of name almost overnight. Perhaps if I may misquote Keats, "A thing of beauty is a joy for ever; it shall never pass into nothingness, its loveliness increases." So, from today's comment, it seems that the Narrows Bridge has passed from something unfitting for the Swan River to something of great aesthetic beauty; something which shows through its pillars beautiful vistas of parts of the city; and something above which, instead of obscuring the city, there appears the splendid structures erected in St. George's Terrace in those six years of stagnation—millions of pounds' worth. These buildings are seen through the arches of this beautiful bridge.

It is wonderful to know how opinions change as Governments change. I will not for a moment accede to the thought which has already been expressed by a Minister in this House that there is such an air of confidence, because of the change of Government, that everything is well everywhere. We shall see.

I now turn to matters affecting our great North-West. As one who has endeavoured untiringly to give even of his health in an endeavour to do something for Australia's empty spaces, I want to say I am not only keenly interested but, without qualification, pleased at the interest now being shown. I hope it will be sustained.

It has been suggested to me that the interest of Ministers is political. I do not agree with that line of thought at all. Time alone will test that suggestion. I was pleased to note the interest of the

Minister for Mines and the Minister for Local Government who, for the first time in their parliamentary careers, have, together with various other Ministers, had an opportunity to visit the North. Some of them we have seen only at election time; but not the two gentlemen mentioned.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I have been there but not as a Minister. I was there during the war.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: So was I.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: So was I.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I was there and was fired on during the war.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: From the air.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: That is true. You told me, Mr. President, to take no notice of rude interjections, but I was about to say that I was pleased indeed to notice the activity of Ministers. Some Ministers, it is true, we only see before or at election time; but that is politics. I want to divorce the welfare of the North from politics. This is my only grievance on the subject. The Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party was recently accompanied by a Federal Parliamentary group of men through the North. Before his departure I received—and no doubt I can assume my North-West colleagues did—a copy of his itinerary and advices.

I would say to the honourable gentleman that, courteous though that may be, it is useless unless some way can be devised to enable the members of the North-West districts to accompany through their own districts in the North, political or parliamentary parties. I agree entirely with what Dr. Hislop said the other evening on the point of visitations; namely, that it was the custom—and you will know this, Mr. President—for Ministers who represent the North to conduct annually a parliamentary group through the North. I was responsible for conducting three, partly by boat and partly by road, and occasionally all by road. When a party of members from both Houses could not be taken, individual members—especially southern members—were taken. It is a pity that practice died out.

Several members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I remember taking from this House a group of men which comprised the late Sir Harold Seddon, and many members, including the late Hon. P. D. Ferguson, from another place.

The Hon. A. R. Jones: I have received no invitation during the last six years.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I repeat that it is a pity this practice died out. The point I am endeavouring to make in regard to the invitation from Mr. Court is that it would be not only a nice gesture,

but it would be non-political in its objective. It would represent a desire to give to the visitors an opportunity to talk to people who are supposed to know at least something about that country.

It is almost a generation since a traverse of the North by visitors by road—not by air—has taken place. There is nothing new in the proposals now being put forward to Commonwealth interests; but there is a greater interest in the south than has ever been shown in the well-being of the North. If one cares to study population densities of the world—or of our near northern neighbours and of Australia—one finds many illuminating things to cause one to wonder what may happen unless we do something fairly quickly. We live in the most sparsely populated State of Australia with .066 people to the square mile.

In Victoria, there are 27.90 people to the square mile—still under populated; and 3.02 people to the square mile in Australia as a whole. In this State of ours, Perth has 1,825 people to the square mile, as disclosed in the last census. The Kimberleys have one person to every 40 square miles. That part of the State embracing the Kimberleys and all the North-West, including some of the Goldfields—529,000 square miles in area and more than half of the entire State—has but 11,000 people. Of these people, 5,000 are either in the ports or on the mining fields, and the balance are spread amongst the pastoral interests, small mining shows, stations and so on.

*Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.3 p.m.*

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I was mentioning the number of people in the total area of the North-West including the Kimberleys, the North-West itself, and part of the Goldfields. In that area there are 11,000 people; or a population density of 1 to 113 square miles. But I think the most significant density population figure in Western Australia is that which applies to the rural areas, particularly the South-West Land Division. The density of population for the agricultural divisions of the State—Northern, Central and Southern—is 2.08 people per square mile. For the South-West the density population is 6.22 per square mile. Surely those are very empty spaces in what is one of the most equable climates in the world!

While these spaces remain as empty as they are, it is almost accidental that attention may be drawn to the more difficult areas—the areas that have meant so much to me for a long time. These areas are difficult in climate, and in regard to living conditions. I refer to the areas in the North. But now there is spreading throughout Australia in more than one Parliament, a fever of anticipation in regard to what may be done with the North.

I have said many times that it is my firm belief that wherever the wealth of Australia exists, it should be taxed to develop the latent resources wherever they may occur. That is still my attitude in regard to the North. The problem there is such an Australian one, and is of such importance, that the nation of Australia cannot afford to allow it to remain as it is.

In the South-West Land Division the Government has, at great cost, provided amenities of all kinds. Successive Governments of all political colours have made it possible for people to live well and easily in the South-West. The various Governments have provided assistance which has given an incremental value to many thousands of acres of land; but the Government now gets little recompense or return for what has been done in the past. Some land worth today £30 and £40 an acre in the South-West was worth only just as many shillings per acre before the Government provided improvements, irrigation and other amenities.

There has been no recompense to the State Government, for what has been done, except to the extent of meagre compensation from water rates and other rates. I repeat that our far North, with its one person to 133 square miles, is very empty indeed; but, truly is our South-West empty also with its 6.22 people to the square mile, as shown by the last census. Is it any wonder that the United Nations are asking themselves—and I think are about to ask us—"What are you going to do about it? If your policy is not a white-Australia policy, it is certainly one of discrimination."

Well, I believe that the control of migration into any country is the right of the country concerned. In this respect I point out that Ceylon has imposed a limitation on the number of Tamils who may enter the country. At the same time, it is opportune that we should take notice of the interest evinced by other countries in our emptiness. Yesterday I took from the United Nations *Statistical Review* certain figures. These show that India has a population density of 360 people per square mile. That is for all India, including the arid parts. Indonesia has a density of 120 per square mile, including half-empty Sumatra. The whole of South-east Asia has a population density of 120 per square mile; and that includes the deserts.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that when some of our country, which has the best living conditions in the world—these conditions obtain in parts of Western Australia—are still empty, we attract the attention of these over-populated countries with their under-fed millions?

I return to the point where I opened my comments in regard to population density. Interest in the North is being evinced by

many parliamentarians and other public people. I say most earnestly to the Minister that we believe this interest is not political. But if the people of the North are expected merely to tag along—because that is all we can do; we get no invitation; are we to follow in a chartered plane of our own?—what will be the position?

In this Chamber we have many representatives of the North. My Leader—he is the Leader of the Opposition in this House—spent his lifetime—until he entered political life—doing hard work in that region. Such men as he, know those parts of the State well. Mr. Willesee was born there; and Mr. Rhatigan, who is a member in another place, was born in the North, too. It must be conceded that they know at least as much about that part of the State as a person who has gone there only in recent years, and who, because of his being in public life, has taken an interest in it.

I suggest that we should develop this activity with the same sort of inspiration that brought about the all-party delegation to Canberra. Let us deal with this question as a national proposition, and shear it of politics altogether. If the Government does not do that, there will be many—no matter how generous-minded they may be—who will at least suspect that what we do is political; and that will be bad.

I sharply point out that the local members—the local residents in an inter-district sense—should not be given the opportunity just to tag along, but should be included in all the representative parties who may visit that region. If there is to be real earnestness and not mere flamboyancy, we must act together as Australians and not as political partisans. There are problems and prospects well known to those of us who are sometime of the North; and it looks as though something is about to happen, and success is about to be achieved as a result of representations in the Federal sphere.

I think now, with the awareness of all the Australian States of our empty country, there never was a more opportune time for, not £5,000,000 to be spent, but tens of millions, to make the area livable for those who are there, and to make it attractive to others who would go there if encouragement were given to people to invest there.

I conclude on that note, with all the earnestness I can command. Having almost ruined my health in an endeavour to do something for the empty places of Australia; having seen a place like Darwin grow from a population of 3,500 to 10,500 people in the five years I was there; and having seen the Northern Territory change from a place dubbed as a failure to one of progress, I make the plea that I have put forward.

These things are worthy of consideration as a pattern for a kindred country with a terrain like that of our own State. In the Northern Territory, of course, one had the opportunity of making decisions involving the Commonwealth Treasury—much to the dismay of the public servants. That, however, was how it was done; and with the concurrence and support of the Minister.

Therefore, the opportunity is with us in this State to show that within Western Australia we have the ability—I shall not use an Americanism—and the knowledge of the country to achieve something. We have tried and proved many things; and we do not want to start again. But give us the opportunity, through the medium of the Commonwealth Treasury, to place in the hands of the State the responsibility for setting up an authority to control, recommend and direct development, and we can all achieve much.

**THE HON. J. MURRAY** (South-West) [4.16]: Before actually commencing my contribution to the debate on the Supply Bill, may I say that it is not usual for members sitting behind the Government to delay, further than necessary, the passage of such a measure; but there are many items which I and other members might wish to bring before the House; and so I take this opportunity of traversing some of them. Firstly, I wish personally to thank Mr. Wise for his contribution to the debate.

He will know, from his associations in another place, that I have always held strong views on certain matters to which he has drawn attention. I remember dimly—in the past—some effort being made in another place to set up a public works committee. My view was that, if the committee had been set up, it would only have been for the purpose of making jobs for certain political friends of the then Government; and I would not have a bar of it. I say that Mr. Wise has made a timely contribution to this debate; because if we are going on with the development of the North-West and are to persuade the Commonwealth to supply money for that development, not only will it be a difficult problem to decide overnight how best to spend that money, but also how to spend it to advantage in a matter of perhaps 12 or 18 months. That is going to be one of the greatest difficulties facing whoever develops the North, once the Commonwealth has provided the funds.

It is all very well to say that the Commonwealth should make available £2,500,000 or £5,000,000; but the spending of it; and the securing of workmen; and the providing of amenities such as housing for those men will constitute a first-rate problem. Mr. Wise's remarks were not exactly a warning—I did not take them in that way—but a showing of the yellow light to

the present Government, with the admonition, "Hesitate before you go on from here. Make sure that you get the green light, or you will find yourselves in heavy traffic." The honourable member's remarks have a strong bearing on what I desire to say.

He pin-pointed the fact that the South-Western portion of Western Australia is still under-developed, considering the climatic conditions and the availability of water supplies and electricity. It is, certainly, a very favoured portion of Western Australia; but it is still sparsely developed and will remain so unless certain people in the State recognise their responsibilities.

It is no use water and electricity being available, if we are to shut away from the people land that could be developed; and which is not in closed reserves. To illustrate my point: Members of this House who were here in 1953 will remember that I spoke at some length during the debate on the Address-in-reply; and I implied that I objected to the ruthless termination of the appointment of the then Conservator of Forests. In the final paragraph of my speech on that occasion I stated that, in my view, if the Government pursued the course it was taking, it would be doing the greatest possible disservice to Western Australia.

We had in Western Australia in those days a Conservator of Forests—as I said during that debate—who had fallen foul of certain people; because he was a man of great sincerity of purpose and determination along certain lines. He was one who preserved our natural forests for posterity, as well as for today. That was his mode of thinking; and he was most zealous in his work. I would not be surprised to know that he even woke up in the middle of the night to examine the problems with which he was faced. But the Government of that day decided in its wisdom, backed up by the previous Minister, to dispense with this man's services and appoint a new Conservator of Forests.

That appointment was made, I think, on the 19th October, 1953. Strangely enough, despite the fact that the Forests Act says that the person receiving this appointment shall be appointed for seven years and no longer without a renewal, I have been unable yet to find any *Government Gazette* gazetted this man's appointment. I am not disputing the fact that he was appointed in the right and proper manner. He was appointed by Executive Council, but it is unfortunate that there is no *Government Gazette* gazetted his appointment and fixing the date; because that is a most important matter from the point of view of the State. The appointment must either terminate on a certain date or the Government, in its wisdom, must decide to reappoint this man.

The appointment was made and, during the debate which took place, I think I went as far as to secure the adjournment of the House as a matter of urgency on

more than one occasion; because I felt keenly in the matter. But at no time did I suggest that I was making a personal attack on the man who had been appointed Conservator of Forests.

I objected to the method of his appointment; and I suggested that there were many men in the department—I might even have named them, although I hope I did not—who were better qualified than he for the position. By and large this man was appointed on the 19th October, 1953, and his appointment terminates next year. There is not much that has transpired between the date of his appointment and the present time which, on the face of it, shows that the desirability of the appointment could be established except on two grounds, one of which has reference to the bringing down of certain amendments to the Forests Act.

When that legislation was brought before the House for amendment, I found myself placed in the position of having to say that I wholeheartedly supported the proposed amendment, because I had been advocating it for many years. I think that on that occasion I said; "Do not deprive the Conservator of Forests of any powers but, if you can, build up his powers." That is, in effect, what I said; and it is what the Bill did.

When that amending measure was before this House, I expressed some amazement at the letter produced by the then Chief Secretary, which said that the Associated Sawmillers, after discussion with the Minister, were happy about the amendment. The Minister, when introducing the Bill, said it contained no major amendment to the Forests Act.

I protested then against the use of the term, "No major amendments to the Forests Act." At that time I suggested that the Associated Sawmillers would be the people who, at some future date, would plead with members of Parliament, and others, to protect their interests, because they would ultimately find that the Conservator, as a result of the powers given to him, would be all-powerful and could, in effect, make it extremely difficult for the Associated Sawmillers to continue their operations.

Strange as it may seem, up to this point the Associated Sawmillers have not made any approach to me to have their interests protected. In the letter they said they were not afraid of what might happen; and I would say that that has been proved by what has occurred since. If ever the Associated Sawmillers—that is, the private sawmillers attached thereto and not the sawmilling section of the State Building Supplies—had a friend operating in the South-West today it is the Conservator of Forests.

In view of what is happening in the mills conducted by the State Building Supplies in the South-West of this State, it

would not matter how good the man was who held the position of General Manager of the State Building Supplies or how efficient the men were who held the positions of manager, foremen and leading hands in the sawmilling section of that State trading concern. The State Building Supplies are cutting karri in that area; and jarrah is also produced there, although in those parts the jarrah is not of high quality.

With all the goodwill in the world, those men would find it impossible to turn the mills of the State Building Supplies into economic producing units. But I hesitate at this stage to say that the responsibility for that position should be on the General Manager of the State Building Supplies. The Conservator is the only man who is actually responsible. This matter goes a little deeper than that. The cause reverts to the raw material that has to be cut. I was amazed at the position last year; and I made a comment on it by way of interjection which, of course, the Minister of the day said he never heard, or words to that effect. However, that is by the way.

From the department emanated the statement—referring to timber generally—that the second cut had proved to be better than the first cut. For the benefit of the person who is uneducated in regard to the sawmilling of our hardwoods I point out that that statement might sound reasonable.

Being interested in this subject I delved into it a little deeper. I said to myself: "How in the world could the second cut be better than the first?" I decided, in my own mind, that it referred only to the karri country. I then read the leading article of *The West Australian* dated the 18th May, 1959. The heading of that article was, "Case for a Helping Hand With Timber Exports." I do not intend to quote the whole of the newspaper article. Members may peruse it later if they care to do so.

However, in that Press report it was suggested that because the export of timber had declined—and again the reference is only to karri exports—the Forests Department was finding reforestation difficult. That confirms the whole basis of my speech now. As a result of the ideas of the present Conservator, each mill operated by the State Building Supplies is following a policy instituted by the Conservator of Forests.

In referring to that, I remind members that I mentioned in my speech on the Address-in-reply debate that £600,000 is contributed by those in the sawmilling industry to the Conservator of Forests for reforestation and other forestry work. That is why I say, in regard to this particular matter, that he is making—and "making" is the correct word—the mills of the State Building Supplies, through

their bush foremen, do their job at great cost to the State Building Supplies. Over-mature trees must be felled. It is of no use a man who has the requisite knowledge taking an axe and striking the butt of a tree, and then saying it is no good. It has to be cut down.

Sometimes such a tree is felled in a most unorthodox way in an endeavour to prevent damage to saplings or immature timber. In any event, the mill bush boss has no option but to fell the tree. That is the first cost of the costs of production. The tree is felled by a faller; and I might add that it is not cheap to fell a tree today. The faller cuts the tree down, and before he crowns the log he has confirmed what he thought in the first place; namely, the tree is a dud, and he then calls the foreman to have a look at it.

The foreman then says, "If you long-butt that we might get a log out of it." Whether that work is done by day labour or by contract, it is still an added cost. If there is a bulge in a karri tree, most people in the bush know right from the start that it is pithy and will be a dud. However, because the tree has been felled and the major expense has already been incurred, the bush boss has to say, "Cut it off there and see whether you can get something out of it." Once again that work has to be paid for.

Then the log is taken to the mill. I want to stress here that this is over-mature timber. The log is then cut up. At present all the mills operated by the State Building Supplies are concentrating on the manufacture of crossarms for telegraph poles to fulfil an order by the Commonwealth Government, about which I had something to say last session.

The Forests Department, and no-one else, is responsible for compelling people to accept over-mature timber into their mills. As we go through the mills and examine the telegraph arms and other timber being produced, we find no less than 6 per cent. of the cross arms are being rejected by the forestry inspectors. What is the ground for rejection—undersize or because of dry rot? No; the bulk of the 6 per cent. of rejected timber is rejected because a brown streak shows through the timber.

According to the C.S.I.R.O. inspectors who have examined this timber, the defect is not detrimental to the strength of the timber. The discoloration has made its appearance because a stain from the bad wood goes through the over-mature timber in a streak, almost to the sap wood. That is what we find in the case of over-mature checked-grown karri.

I want to stress that the State Building Supplies, a semi-Government instrumentality, is penalised. From my knowledge of the sawmilling industry I know that the percentage of recovery of timber is the

basis of the profit of a sawmill. I know that what I am speaking of was a directive from the Conservator; I suggest that he does not mind how much timber is left in the bush as long as the over-mature timber is taken away and used.

The theory which he has adopted is correct in normal jarrah country, or even in some karri country; that is, to cut out over-mature timber so as to allow the young trees to mature; and then take them in their prime and have the second cut better than the first. Some of the country which I inspected, despite the presence of nice saplings and immature logs, is not natural karri country.

The policy now is to pick out over-mature trees and so allow the balance to develop. It will be found in the course of time that the young trees will take a very long period to reach a millable size. Time will prove my contention, because the trees are not growing on their natural land and the natural substances required by the trees are not in the soil. These trees tend to become, in the wood itself, over-mature before they have reached a sufficiently large girth size to become a millable proposition. That is what we find in that type of country.

I deplore the fact that the Conservator has been allowed to get away with his policy. I know what usually occurs when such a policy is in existence. If such an area is to be cut out, then another area of good bush is made available to sweeten the timber from the two, so that the average will become a payable proposition. That is what is being done by the Associated Sawmillers—the private sawmillers connected with the Associated Sawmillers. They have only to protest that the quality of the timber is below an economic standard and other timber is made available to sweeten the output.

What I have said is borne out by what the previous speaker has stated. The South-West portion of this State cannot be developed thoroughly, because in the main it contains a large tract of country of State forest, and a large tract which is shown as State forest reserve; and then there is the rest. Included in the rest is some very valuable producing land. Up to this point of time the Conservator has been permitted to continue his policy, so that when the Lands Department refers applications for the grant of land to him he is able to put a blanket coverage over the land.

Close on to one year remains before that officer's appointment expires. He should, therefore, face up to his responsibilities to Western Australia—responsibilities to one section of the people covered by the Forests Act. I do not want to deprive him of those responsibilities, because they are essential to the preservation in perpetuity of the hardwood forests of this State. Those responsibilities are safeguarded in the Forests Act.

The Conservator has also responsibilities to other sections of the people. He has an overriding responsibility to the people who use, as raw materials, forests products, whether they be tannin extract, bark, sandalwood, jarrah, karri, blackbutt or other merchantable timber. He owes a responsibility to the industries set up in this State which use forest products. He has a responsibility not only to the owners of those enterprises but also to the employees therein. The more difficult he makes the position—as he has in the case of the State Building Supplies—the more he undermines the pride of a person in his work, because such a person knows that from an inferior log which goes to the mill there is no chance of producing the article required by the public.

The Conservator is responsible also to the South-West portion of the State in respect of agricultural development. For many years to come this State will—as it has in the past—depend on primary production. Although the dairying industry may be in the doldrums, and although wheat and wool may be on the downward trend, our economy is tied to primary industry. If the Conservator is to continue to use his power to put a blanket coverage over land, in addition to State forests and forest reserves, then the South-West can look forward to a stage of stagnation.

I want to touch on one final matter. The present Conservator is loth to accept another responsibility; and his predecessor was also loth to accept it. Sooner or later Parliament will have to make a stand and weigh up the position in regard to country towns which are dependent on sawmilling. This point has not been stressed very much, but the Conservator should ensure that towns which have been built up by the sawmilling industry in State forest country are soundly based economically. No one can say that Pemberton, which was built up as a result of the sawmilling industry, is soundly based economically.

The Conservator has indicated by a shrug of his shoulders at various times that he was only carrying out Government policy. That may be so, but he might also have been passing the buck. One should realise that a town has to possess more than one industry to keep it alive, especially if one of the industries is a Government concern. The shortage of Government funds could result in the closing down of such an industry. Pemberton is a town in a critical situation; its inhabitants do not seem to realise that they are sitting on a very dangerous time bomb.

That is what it is. Just a time bomb. Up to date they have had two disastrous fires. Employment has been maintained by working a second shift in one mill. That is very uneconomic employment at this time because there is no market for timber; but it is much better than paying men sustenance and closing down all the

businesses in Pemberton. Another fire, which could occur in the obsolete plant there, would terminate, overnight, the employment avenues for the people of Pemberton. There is no alternative in the district at all. The people would have to be shifted from Pemberton; and from the point of view of those men who have homes and such like, the situation would be grim.

Therefore I venture to suggest that they are the four items which the present Conservator of Forests should be concerned about in regard to his responsibility in connection with the perpetuity of the saw-milling industry and those industries associated with it. It is only by his gaining an understanding of the problems of the towns that sufficient country will be released for settlement, and the problems will be overcome.

I shall leave the subject of forestry now, as I have spent much more time on it than I had intended and there are a couple of other items I wish to touch upon. In my Address-in-reply speech I mentioned one matter about which I did not expect to receive a reply from the Minister. I knew the answers that I would get.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You are lucky; intuition.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is a wise member for you.

The Hon. J. MURRAY: The Minister in his wisdom, or otherwise, decided he would use the departmental answer in regard to the Serpentine Dam.

The Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: That is not unusual.

The Hon. J. MURRAY: I cannot remember a year since I have been in this House when I have not stressed this problem. When I have asked the question or mentioned the matter in the Address-in-reply debate, I have not been interested in just the departmental reply unless it is based on fact. Other than such a reply it would be better to say "No" straight away, or something like that.

If the Minister will peruse *Hansard*, he will find that in my Address-in-reply speech I expressed the hope that this Government would, in connection with the Serpentine River, give certain people a better deal than did the previous Government. I can only assume from the departmental answer that this Government is not going to act any differently from the previous Government; because that, of course, is the sum total of the answer. I am sorry if that is going to be the case. The local people in that district protested that those on the lower part of the stream were in a bad way because the water had ceased to flow. The department replied that it was not the department's fault. It did release some water but unfortunately the people upstream it was alleged, pinched the lot; but that is not exactly true. The

people higher up did receive some water, of course, but that was only due to an act of God, more or less. The bed of the Serpentine River has catchment areas right along it, so that once the water was released, all those catchment areas—or water holes, if members like to use that expression—filled up. It was impossible that anyone could have drunk all the water that was released. As a result of those water holes filling, the people higher up received the water but those lower down did not get any at all. That is the real position.

Let me add that I do not want people in the metropolitan area to think that I am trying to deprive them of water that is necessary to them, but I still say they use more than they need and that the water table would not be raised in the metropolitan area if they did not waste so much.

In regard to the situation at the Serpentine River, the department stated that it would not have mattered whether the river was dammed or not, because, owing to the particular season, the people would still not have received water. That is again one of those hit-and-miss answers, because it is not true. Right along the Serpentine River there are what we might call nature-made catchment areas, and had the water been allowed to flow without interruption these would have been filled.

One of the best Directors of Works we have had in this State, did not always see eye-to-eye with everybody, but from my experience I found that if ever he felt that something should be investigated, he would go and look at it. I might say to the present Director of Works that he might find it would pay him to do the same. I know he did a very good job when Commissioner of Main Roads, but the personal touch is necessary when dealing with many of the problems that will be submitted to him. If he would write up on his wall in large letters so that everybody could see them the words, "See your own State first," it would be helpful for the other people in Western Australia.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Was he on the parliamentary trip to the North last week.

The Hon. J. MURRAY: I do not know whether he went North on that trip but, if he did, I would say that there is information on the files of the department about most of the problems he could have examined; but there are many matters affecting other portions of the State that could well be examined.

There are problems in the North in relation to smaller water supplies, and so on; but I venture to suggest that he did not examine those, even if he went on the trip mentioned. I wish to stress that this is the Supply Bill, which is being debated, and Supply, by and large, must pay for all the things that the Government decides to do or undo. So it is comparatively easy

to tie up speeches on almost any subject with the Supply Bill, should anyone wish to challenge that aspect of the debate.

As one of those in this Chamber who voted for the betting control legislation, I did so, as I said on that occasion, not because I believed it was the complete answer to the problem with which we were faced, but because I thought the Government had a certain degree of courage in bringing the measure forward; and I felt that the legislation should be given a trial. I suggested that we should give it a trial and then get a report from the Betting Control Board on a certain question. When we got that report we received a majority decision; and the only people who knew anything about the question had to supply a minority report, which was a bad thing.

I repeat that I supported that legislation. In order to indicate that I have been interested in what has gone on since then, I have watched the position as closely as I could, and I have passed remarks about it. I was concerned when I heard in another place, as well as in this Chamber, and in the streets and almost everywhere, the fact that American gangsterism—I think that was the term used—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It has not done the fellow who said it much good.

The Hon. J. MURRAY: At this stage I do not want to listen to interjections, because they are unseemly. If I could have passed some of my notes around I might have been able to secure more suitable interjections, had I wished to have them. I do not agree wholeheartedly with the Minister's interjection—that it did not do that man much good.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: He has gone down in the esteem of many people.

The Hon. J. MURRAY: That may be so. I have wondered what was meant by "American gangsterism." I began to check up on the matter, and I read some of the reasonably cheap literature available. Being Scotch, I did not want to spend too much on it; so I looked up some reference dictionaries and found that they did not contain the word "gangsterism." I suppose that "gangsterism" is a colloquial term in America. Having read some of those publications I asked myself, "What does gangsterism amount to?" Let us forget that in an entirely civilised country we do not have gangs and admit that we have one gang only. In this country one does not have double-shooters under each armpit and a rubber truncheon in one's hip-pocket. My summing up of what gangsters are is that, in effect, they are people who group together—

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: To diddle the other fellow!

The Hon. J. MURRAY: Not necessarily; but who are grouped together by pressure—

The Hon. F. D. Willesee: From whom?

The Hon. J. MURRAY: They are people who are grouped together—not being political parties—by devious means to affect parliamentary elections and the results thereof, either by the expenditure of money or by effort. If such efforts are directed towards protection for the industries of the people concerned that, in my view, is a type of gangsterism. In full consciousness of the fact that I supported the original legislation, I believe this man was not far wrong when he said that we had set up a condition which could well develop into gangsterism in Western Australia.

When we realise what a huge sum of money is involved, not only by a natural sequence of events, but also on account of the regulations made under the Act—regulations which I have here—I say that if the provisions to which I refer had been placed in the original legislation, it would never have passed through this House. However, this regulation was passed and it has brought a lot of small legally-registered bookmakers into the position where they are more or less agents for the big bookmakers; and that is bad.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Would not the Crown Law Department know that when the regulation was framed?

The Hon. L. A. Logan: They have always been the agents of the big fellows.

The Hon. J. MURRAY: Despite the highly disorderly interjections, I must say that I have been interested in the evidence that has come forward. Being one of those who, during various debates on this question, has suggested that people other than the Crown Law officers had something to do with the production of the Act and of this regulation, I reaffirm that view.

I am fully conscious of my responsibility in the matter but I still believe that outside people have had some say in this business. I noticed the evidence given by the then Minister for Police (Mr. Styants) in regard to the question. He flatly denied that he had any contact with S.P. bookmakers on the subject of the betting control legislation before it was brought before the House. But in the same breath he turned round and said that he did not prepare the legislation; it was prepared, read and approved by the Hon. A. R. G. Hawke, the Hon. J. T. Tonkin and the Hon. H. C. Strickland.

Why did the ex-Minister for Police deny that he had contacted these people and then turn round and say, in effect, that he had nothing to do with it but that three other prominent people had everything to do with it. Some members may have read that a gentleman by the name of Styants is anxious to know where certain Press publicity came from as regards the suggestions that all was not well with the way S.P. licenses were issued. I think the



newspaper representative replied, and rightly so, that most of the statements or suggestions emanated from debates in Parliament. So they did; I made several of them, and I still hold to the views I expressed. All was not well with the original issue of the licenses, nor with the re-issue of licenses.

When the person who has raised this matter was questioned, he said, in effect, "I do not think the recommendations of the Chairman of the Betting Control Board would be attached to the files." There would be nothing written; all the recommendations would be verbal ones. If ever there was a hit-and-miss method of issuing licenses that was it. What opportunity has anybody to check up and see the basis on which the licenses were issued. Some people might say, "You would expect them to discuss it at a round-table conference." I heard that suggestion put forward during the debates last year or the year before.

But on the board, the chairman is the only one who is really on a full-time basis—all the other members are really supernumerary—and one would expect him to report in writing on every application before the board. It was said that 70 licenses were dealt with in one day—70 applications for licenses for S.P. bookmakers were dealt with in one day without any written reports from the chairman! Does that, or does not that leave a loophole? The self-same chairman, in relation to the issue of licenses for the shops themselves said that the issue should not be based, as was suggested before the Royal Commission, on the requirements of a district as expressed by a vote of the people, but should be on the amount of turnover; and when the turnover in an establishment had reached double the original figure the board would decide that another shop was necessary.

Let us visualise an area like Hay Street East, or some other little place, and then compare it with an important part of the town, such as in the vicinity of the Wentworth Hotel—I do not like to advertise freely like that—where there are two of the big-three operating within 400 or 500 yards of one another, with one small man jammed in between. What scale did the chairman use in assessing whether another shop was desirable in that case? Surely he does not want the turnover of £400,000—as it would be in that instance—doubled before a license is issued for another shop in that locality; or does he want to keep that particular area as a close preserve?

I have followed the evidence very closely, and I am not satisfied that all the things that I thought could occur have not occurred. I was instrumental in bringing this Act into being; and I heard one member say that if he had the chance to vote on the measure again in the same circumstances, he would still support it. But I, having seen what goes on, and having proved to

my satisfaction that we have set up in this State a very dangerous set of circumstances, would not only vote against the measure, but would do everything I could from now on to defeat any continuing Bill which was brought forward.

Because of this legislation, we have established a set of circumstances in this State such as we have never had to face before. During the debate when the last amending Bill was before us we tried to force the issue and get a sliding scale on the turnover tax in this State. But it was said, not only here but also everywhere else, that if the turnover tax was increased these people would go underground. They threatened the Government of the day; and they should have been brought to book then—when they made the threat. They talk about going underground. If our Police Force would do its job, they could be cleaned up and stamped out in next to no time.

Before I sit down I want to stress one point. Much has been said about the Government's undertaking and the Government's policy to set up this Royal Commission. The Government just as clearly stated that it would introduce a Bill to provide for some sliding scale of taxation on betting in Western Australia. I hope that when the Government introduces this proposed legislation it will closely examine Regulation 132 under the Betting Control Act with a view to repealing it, because this is how it reads—

For the purposes of these regulations a bet for a win and a place or a double or a treble or other similar bet is to be regarded as one bet only.

Because of that regulation, the State of Western Australia has been deprived of turnover tax—to which it would have been entitled if that regulation were not in force—equal to one-third of the tax already collected. The reason for that is that one of the principal ways the man in the street invests his few shillings on a horse today is by what is known as the cumulative bet.

I will cite only one illustration to show how it affects the turnover tax. A punter invests £1; all up one horse in the next race; and all up a horse in the following race. That is the system used. It is called treble betting. Turnover tax is collected only on £1; the original bet. However, if that £1 is placed on a horse which pays 33 to 1 it produces £33 plus the original wager of £1, making a total of £34, which goes on the next leg of the treble. What happens is that it goes on the horse in the next race on paper in the bookmaker's office, but no turnover tax is paid on it by him, because of Regulation No. 132. I admit that it is not real money, but turnover tax is imposed on very little real money. That amount of £34 could then be on a winning horse at ten to one.

The Hon. G. E. Jeffery: You would then be betting like the Watsons!

The Hon. J. MURRAY: The return from that bet would be £340, which is a large sum of money. That amount then goes on the third horse, and yet only 1d. stamp duty and turnover tax on £1 is collected by the State on the whole transaction. The "big boys" among the book-makers can carry such a bet, but not so the small bookmaker in the country or in the suburbs. Under this regulation the small man is forced to become an agent of one of the big boys in the bookmaking game, because when the first horse wins the small bookmaker is chary of carrying the bet because of his small amount of capital. However, if the second horse wins it is imperative for him to lay the money off. He has to put up real money to lay that bet off, and has to pay stamp duty and turnover tax on it.

The big boys, however—those book-makers who are running the show and who have run it ever since the Act was brought into force and even before that—get away with paying 1d. stamp duty and a turnover tax on £1. That is a shocking state of affairs! If the Government intends to bring in a sliding scale of taxation, it will be well advised to repeal Regulation No. 132 under the Betting Control Act. I support the Bill.

On motion by the Hon. E. M. Davies, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 5.36 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 6th August, 1959

### CONTENTS

#### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :

	Page
Reliance Manufacturing Company, tabling of files re partnership .....	830
Betting Royal Commission, proceedings against offenders .....	830
Eaton townsite, water from Wellington Dam .....	830
Brentwood School, construction of additional classrooms .....	830
Port Hedland, deep-water port .....	830
Housing Commission homes, type, rental and maintenance costs .....	830
Ferguson River Bridge, widening .....	831

### CONTENTS—continued

#### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE—continued

	Page
Unemployment, weekly number receiving payments .....	831
Civilian land settlement, Government policies and areas opened for selection .....	831
Chase Syndicate, negotiations and termination of lease .....	832
Civilian land settlement, decision of Narrogin Zone of Farmers' Union .....	832
Collie coal, tonnage, cost, etc. ....	832
Shipping liaison officer, provision in metropolitan area .....	832
Lupinosis, cause of stock losses .....	833
Native Welfare Act, amending legislation .....	833
Broome, provision of deep-water port .....	833
Government employees, dismissals .....	833
Motor-vehicle licenses, increase in fees .....	833
Local authorities, number constituted under appropriate Acts .....	833
State Government Insurance Office, financial details .....	834
Fruit-fly, eradication in metropolitan area .....	834
Homes for natives, erection on reserves .....	834
Natives from the north, doctor's report on condition .....	825

#### BILLS :

State Electricity Commission Act Amendment—	
2r. ....	835
Message .....	847
Museum—	
2r. ....	836
Message .....	847
Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund—	
2r. ....	837
Message .....	847
Art Gallery—	
2r. ....	838
Message .....	847
Parliament House Site Permanent Reserve (A 1162) Act Amendment, 2r. ....	839
Filled Milk—	
2r. ....	840
Message .....	847
Police Act Amendment, 2r. ....	841
Justices Act Amendment, 2r. ....	842
Judges Salaries and Pensions Act Amendment, 2r. ....	843
Traffic Act Amendment, 2r. ....	843
Industry (Advances) Act Amendment—	
2r. ....	844
Message .....	847
Fire Brigades Act Amendment—	
2r. ....	845
Message .....	847

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