

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 16th October, 1958.

CONTENTS.

	Page
AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT, 1957-58	1530
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :	
Albany regional hospital, details of construction schedule, etc.	1530
Licensed fishermen, scale of fees	1531
Ports of Bunbury and Albany, imports, exports, and total revenue	1531
Rural and Industries Bank, new premises, plans, drawings, etc.	1531
Used-car dealers, amending legislation	1531
Long service leave, accumulation by railway officers	1531
Salt and brackish water, conversion to fresh water	1532
Causeway, alleviation of peak-period congestion	1532
Liquor industry in Western Australia, excise paid during the year ended 30th June, 1958	1532
Sleeper production, manufacture of English machine in Western Australia	1532
Public Works Department, dress requirements, on building jobs	1532
Police, night-beat duty in metropolitan area	1533
Salary of Mr. R. E. B. Lee, date of cessation	1533
Lake Gwelup school, legal action re septic installation	1533
Orange Grove school, future plans	1533
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE :	
Salt and brackish water, conversion to fresh water	1533
Victoria Park swimming pool, approach by Councillor Hawthorne to Premier	1534
ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1958-59 :	
Com. of Supply, general debate—	
Speaker on financial policy—	
Mr. Court	1534
Speakers on amendment to reduce Vote—	
The Hon. A. R. G. Hawke	1555
Mr. Wild	1582
BILLS :	
Bank Holidays Act Amendment, 3r.	1534
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment (No. 2), Council's amendment	1563

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

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT, 1957-58.

The SPEAKER: I have received from the Auditor-General a copy of his report on the Treasurer's statement of the Public Accounts for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1958. It will be laid on the Table of the House.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

ALBANY REGIONAL HOSPITAL.

Details of Construction Schedule, etc.

1. Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Works:

With reference to my questions on the Albany Regional Hospital, on the 8th October, 1958—

(1) (a) Does the answer to question No. (4), mean that no part of the hospital will be in use until all buildings are completed?

(b) If not—

(i) what is the time-table for each phase of the buildings;

(ii) what is the nature of each phase;

(iii) what is the date each phase will be occupied for use and for what part of the hospital's functions?

(2) Does the answer to question No. (5) ("Number of men employed will be governed by available funds") indicate that the completion date of 1961 may be extended?

(3) (a) Does the figure of £19,690 given in answer to question No. (11), as the cost of temporary structures, include all labour, materials and overhead?

(b) What is the residual value of re-usable materials in these buildings as distinct from labour costs for demolition and re-erection?

(c) What is the estimated demolition cost?

(d) What is the estimated cost of transport of such materials to an appropriate store or site after demolition?

(e) What is the estimated re-erection cost?

Mr. TONKIN replied:

(1) (a) Yes.

(b) (i), (ii) and (iii)—See (a).

(2) Possibly, but not likely.

(3) (a) It includes all labour and materials, but no overheads.

(b) £7,768.

(c) £3,327.

(d) This would depend on the locality of the new project to which the temporary building would be transferred.

(e) £7,984.

LICENSED FISHERMEN.*Scale of Fees.*

2. Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister for Fisheries:

(1) Does each person comprising the crew of a professional fishing boat have to be a licensed fisherman?

(2) If so, what is the licence or scale of licence fees paid by—

(a) the owner or owners of a fishing boat; or,

(b) the employee of such owner or owners?

Mr. KELLY replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) (a) (i) For boats of whatever length propelled solely by oars—£1.

(ii) For boats propelled by motor or sail—

(a) not exceeding 25 feet in length—£2.

(b) exceeding 25 feet but not exceeding 35 feet in length—£5.

(c) exceeding 35 feet but not exceeding 55 feet in length—£7 10s.

(d) exceeding 55 feet in length—£15.

(b) Fee for fisherman's licence—£2.

Every licence expires on the 31st day of December next following the date of issue. For licences issued on or after the 1st day of July in any year one-half of the prescribed fee is payable.

PORTS OF BUNBURY AND ALBANY.*Imports, Exports, and Total Revenue.*

3. Mr. ROBERTS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Supply and Shipping:

What was—

(a) the total tons of cargo exported;

(b) the total tons of cargo imported;

(c) the total revenue received from all sources

through the port of Bunbury and the port of Albany for each of the years ended the 30th June, 1957, and the 30th June, 1958?

Mr. BRADY replied:

Bunbury.	Albany.
Tons.	Tons.
(a) 1957—243,858	1957—141,407
1958—282,605	1958—136,900
(b) 1957— 55,257	1957—116,302
1958— 72,776	1958—144,806
£	£
(c) 1957— 47,338	1957— 92,431
1958— 73,811	1958—103,573

No. 4. This question was postponed.

RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK.*New Premises, Plans, Drawings, etc.*

5. Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Works:

(1) When were the preliminary and final decisions made to build new Perth premises for the Rural and Industries Bank?

(2) To what stage have plans, detailed drawings and specifications progressed?

(3) How much time is needed to complete such plans, detailed drawings and specifications to a stage sufficiently advanced to call tenders?

Mr. TONKIN replied:

(1) Preliminary decision — September, 1956. Final decision — August, 1958.

(2) Plans and specifications are almost complete. Preparation of quantities is proceeding.

(3) Eight weeks.

USED-CAR DEALERS.*Amending Legislation.*

6. Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is it still proposed to introduce legislation this session to amend the legislation passed last session with reference to used-car dealers?

(2) If so, is it to be introduced at an early date?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE.*Accumulation by Railway Officers.*

7. Mr. COURT asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) How many officers of the W.A.G.R. have more than two periods of long service leave accumulated?

(2) How much is accumulated in each case and what positions are held by these officers?

(3) What are the reasons for the accumulation, and is it proposed that the officers concerned will reduce the accumulation immediately?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

(1) Three officers, including one now clearing annual leave and one term of long service leave.

(2) Commercial Agent—Balance of one term and two full terms. Superintendent of Refreshment Services—Three terms.

(3) The accumulations originated during war and post-war periods and because of shortage of suitable relief. Officers concerned have been rostered to clear long service leave during the current leave year.

SALT AND BRACKISH WATER.

Conversion to Fresh Water.

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

Having regard to the great benefits there would be for Western Australia—and indeed, Australia—from an economically successful process of converting salt and brackish waters to fresh water, and the widespread interest in this problem, will he, in view of:—

(a) his (Mr. Tonkin's) statement in the issue of the "Geraldton Guardian" of Tuesday, the 7th October, 1958, that, "within the next few months, it was likely that sufficient information would be available to enable the construction of (water) treatment plants in centres such as Kalgoorlie and Geraldton", and later

(b) the view expressed in the issue of "The West Australian" of Tuesday, the 14th October, 1958, by the Chief Engineer, Metropolitan Water Supply Department (Mr. F. M. Kenworthy), on his return from overseas—"that considerable progress had been made overseas with methods of converting brackish and salt water into fresh but it would probably be a considerable time before these could be used economically in Australia",

state what positive action he proposes to take to have a suitable unit or units brought to Western Australia in the near future?

Mr. TONKIN replied:

Arrangements have been made with the Permutit Co. Ltd., which is at present engaged in carrying out large-scale developmental work which it considers of sufficient volume to prove the success of electro-dialysis plants, to keep Western Australia advised of the results obtained. Conservatively, it is estimated that it will be about a year before sufficient running experience has been acquired to say whether or not the process is suitable for commercial application.

CAUSEWAY.

Alleviation of Peak-period Congestion.

9. Mr. BRAND asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) What consideration has been given to alleviating the extreme peak-period congestion on the Causeway at present, in view of the further delay in the completion of the Narrows bridge, which is now not expected to be available for use until September 1959?

(2) To what extent is it expected that the congestion will increase between now and September, 1959?

Mr. HAWKE (for Mr. Graham) replied:

(1) Peak-period congestion on the Causeway has recently received consideration, but alleviation measures would require a substantial expenditure at the rotaries and the widening of Canning Highway, which expenditure is not considered warranted at this stage.

(2) Although motor vehicle registrations in the metropolitan area are increasing at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum, the most recent traffic counts have shown a reduction in evening peak-hour traffic flows at the Causeway.

LIQUOR INDUSTRY IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

Excise Paid during the Year ended the 30th June, 1958.

10. Mr. BRAND asked the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

Will he obtain from the Bureau of Census and Statistics, and state for the information of Parliament, the amount of excise paid by the liquor industry in Western Australia during the year ended the 30th June, 1958?

Mr. HAWKE replied:

The sum of £7,995,535.

SLEEPER PRODUCTION.

Manufacture of English Machine in Western Australia.

11. Mr. I. W. MANNING asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Has the Government offered any inducements similar to those offered to industries overseas, to the English engineer, Mr. Richard Short, of Cobham, Surrey, to manufacture in Western Australia the machine referred to in the article in the issue of "The West Australian" of Thursday, the 9th October, 1958, which it is claimed may revolutionise the production and cost of sleepers?

(2) Are any reports available on the demonstration of the machine which was to have been given at the Forests Department station at Dwellingup?

Mr. HAWKE replied:

(1) No.

(2) The demonstration has not yet been completed.

Nos. 12 and 13. These questions were postponed.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Dress Requirements on Building Jobs.

14. Mr. JAMIESON asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Does he agree with the circular re suitable clothing to be worn by P.W.D. building employees, which implies that the wearing of a singlet without a shirt constitutes a breach of common decency?

(2) If so, would he request the Minister for Police to take action against the numerous persons on metropolitan beaches who must also be considered to be offending common decency to a greater extent than P.W.D. employees?

Mr. TONKIN replied:

(1) Inquiries made following complaints received have shown that the wearing of shorts only, on buildings in occupation—particularly girls' schools—can be offensive and below a standard which common decency requires.

(2) This can be safely left for decision by the Minister for Police.

No. 15. This question was postponed.

POLICE.

Night-Beat Duty in Metropolitan Area.

16. Mr CROMMELIN asked the Minister for Police:

(1) How many police are provided in the metropolitan area for night-beat duty on foot?

(2) Of this number, how many would be located in—

- (a) City of Perth?
- (b) City of Fremantle?
- (c) City of Subiaco?
- (d) Municipality of Nedlands?
- (e) Municipality of Claremont?
- (f) Municipality of Cottesloe?

Mr. BRADY replied:

(1) Six sergeants, thirty-seven constables.

(2) (a) Three sergeants and eight constables.

(b) Two sergeants and four constables.

(c) One constable, 4 p.m. to 12 mid-night.

One constable, 6 p.m. to 2 a.m.

(d) One constable, 4 p.m. to 12 mid-night.

(e) One constable, 3 p.m. to 11 p.m.

One constable, 6 p.m. to 2 a.m.

(f) One constable, 4 p.m. to 12 mid-night.

One constable, 7 p.m. to 3 a.m.

SALARY OF MR. R. E. B. LEE.

Date of Cessation.

17. Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

On what date did the former Assistant Commissioner for Railways (Mr. R. E. B. Lee) cease to draw salary from the Railway Department?

Mr. GRAHAM replied:

The 22nd of November, 1957.

LAKE GWELUP SCHOOL.

Legal Action re Septic Installation.

18. Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Has legal action been taken against him yet by the Perth Road Board for his failure to comply with an order served by the Perth Road Board to install a septic system at the Lake Gwelup school?

(2) What is the reason for his failure to comply with the order?

(3) Under what Act or regulation has the Perth Road Board taken action?

(4) What penalty would be incurred by a non-Government school which failed to comply with such an order?

Mr. W. HEGNEY replied:

(1) No.

(2) Lack of funds for septic installations.

(3) See reply to No. (1).

(4) Not known.

ORANGE GROVE SCHOOL.

Future Plans.

19. Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Education:

(1) In view of the non-access road from Beechboro to Gosnells passing through the school grounds at Orange Grove, what are the future plans for this school in view of the fact that by far the greater number of homes in the district are to the west of this road?

(2) Is it proposed to continue on the existing site or is there to be an alternative site?

(3) If the school is to remain in its present position, how will children living west of the road be able to proceed to school?

Mr. W. HEGNEY replied:

(1) When the controlled access road is constructed, an access way to the school will be provided.

(2) It is proposed to continue on the existing site.

(3) Answered by No. (1).

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

SALT AND BRACKISH WATER.

Conversion to Fresh Water.

1. Mr. BRAND asked the Minister for Works:

In view of his reply to question No. 8 on today's notice paper, can it be assumed that he was incorrectly reported in the "Geraldton Guardian" of Tuesday, the 7th October, 1958, when he is reported to have said that, within the next few months, it was likely that sufficient information would be available to enable the construction of water treatment plants?

Mr. TONKIN replied:

If the statement quoted was actually made in the paper, I was incorrectly reported, because I made no statement, myself, to that newspaper, and the information which it published must have been obtained from another source. I well recall that when I made the initial statement regarding this matter, I quoted from some notes which I had prepared on board ship, and those notes very definitely set out that I did not anticipate any results in under 12 months. So it is quite clear that whoever published the statement in the first instance misunderstood what I said; and subsequently, if the Geraldton paper copied that statement it also committed an error.

The fact is that our inquiries revealed that it will be, at a conservative estimate, approximately 12 months before the experiments now being carried out in South Africa on a very large scale can be regarded as successful. It is expected that that will give sufficient experience to enable a judgment to be formed as to whether those plants will be commercial propositions. I might add that the Permutit Co. Ltd. is very hopeful of results, and confidently expects that the decision will be a satisfactory one.

VICTORIA PARK SWIMMING POOL.

Approach by Councillor Hawthorne to Premier.

2. Mr. ANDREW asked the Premier:

Apropos the statement he made on Tuesday re the offer of Cr. H. Hawthorne that if he (the Premier) advanced £100,000 towards a pool in Victoria Park, Cr. Hawthorne was willing to name the pool Howard-Hawke pool—

(1) Did Cr. Hawthorne convey to him that he was speaking on behalf of the Olympic Pool Committee formed in Victoria Park?

(2) If the answer is in the affirmative, is he aware that Cr. Hawthorne has not been authorised by that committee to approach him, or to make any such offer?

The PREMIER replied:

Cr. Hawthorne's first approach was on behalf of the Victoria Park-Carlisle Amateur Swimming Club, as its hon. secretary. Cr. Hawthorne's next approach was on behalf of the W.A. Olympic Pool Appeal Committee and at the request of rate-payers in the No. 8 ward of the City of Perth. In this approach he asked the Government to inspect Perth City Council endowment land at the rear of the Kent-st. High School.

I should have said, when previously answering a similar question, that my natural modesty impelled me not to accept the offer made by Cr. Hawthorne on behalf of the Victoria Park-Carlisle Amateur Swimming Club.

BANK HOLIDAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Third Reading.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1958-59.

In Committee of Supply.

Debate resumed from the 25th September on the Treasurer's Financial Statement and on the Annual Estimates; Mr. Sewell in the Chair.

Vote—Legislative Council, £9,675:

MR. COURT (Nedlands) [2.33]: I rise to speak on the general Estimates introduced by the Treasurer. Having heard the introduction, and subsequently re-read, two or three times, the speech the Treasurer made, I must confess I do not find it very inspiring. As a matter of fact, I think it is typical of most State Budgets today. Their introductions lack colour and, in many cases, the merit that used to characterise the introduction of State Budgets throughout Australia in the days when the respective State Governments had to raise a large proportion of their income through income tax.

It is an inevitable product of the uniform tax system that has been introduced into Australia, and which has continued for much longer than the original supporters of the scheme anticipated. One of the most colourful references to this system that has grown up in Australia, is that published in the lecture given by John A. L. Gunn to the Taxation Institute of Australia. Mr. John Gunn is one of the foremost authorities on taxation law and practice in Australia, and he has a very colourful turn of language which adds a little spice to some of his lectures which might, otherwise, be a trifle dull. In a paper headed, "The Income Tax Needs a Face-Lift" he had the following to say about the uniform tax:—

Like so many sinners I have kept the bad wine to the last. I hold most strongly to the belief that the present uniform income tax system must end, and end soon. If not, it will destroy Federalism, and the States will sink into inept, irresponsible departments. At the moment the States enjoy a limited power, but without corresponding responsibility—

and he adds—

—power without responsibility, the sought-after privilege of the harlot throughout the centuries. This harlot's progress must cease and it can only do so by restoring the taxing powers to the States.

The point I want to make is that in introducing the Estimates we would have thought that after five years of government, and after five years in the Treasuryship, the Treasurer would have made some positive recommendation to Parliament as to the revision needed in respect of the Commonwealth-State relationships.

With the experience he has had from attending numerous Premiers' conferences, one would have thought he would have formed some very firm ideas in his mind as to how best the situation between the Commonwealth and the States could be revised, to stop the present political wrangling that has characterised the existing situation. But if we examine his speech closely, we find it is a series of rather serious inconsistencies. He calls on the Commonwealth to make a bigger portion of its income available to the States so that the States can spend more. He makes no secret of that, of course. He made a positive statement in that regard. He calls on the Commonwealth to reduce its spending and he accuses the Commonwealth of raising more taxation than it needs in spite of his first accusations. He also criticises the Commonwealth Government for supporting the loan programme through advances from Consolidated Revenue to the State at interest.

These allegations, if one takes them altogether, and considers the inconsistencies in them, are either irresponsible, or they are the result of a failure to give proper consideration to the problem or, alternatively, they are ill-informed; and any one of those things is most undesirable from a State Treasurer, particularly in these days when finances need such careful watching.

Mr. Johnson: The mote might be in the eye of the critic.

Mr. COURT: The consideration of the Estimates should always be at least an annual time for stocktaking by members of this Parliament. It should also be an occasion for, perhaps, a little soul-searching. I suggest that the responsibility today is even greater for hon. members to spend time and effort in studying the Estimates and expressing their views in this Chamber, because we have not the natural brake that used to be imposed on members in State Parliaments through the imposition of income tax by States.

I suggest that, if we had to introduce income tax on a State basis, there would be a dramatic change in the attitude of Governments, and a dramatic change in the attitude of many hon. members—and I refer to hon. members on both sides of the House—because with taxation legislation before Parliament each year, individual hon. members, as well as the Government, would have to accept their share of responsibility in the electorate, for income tax being imposed by the Government. But we, as members of Parliament, escape

all that today. The whole brunt of the battle, as it were, is absorbed by members of the Commonwealth Parliament—and particularly by the Government members of the Commonwealth Parliament—irrespective of which party is in power.

The situation now is that the Estimates that we consider are virtually a series of hand-outs to the various departments, and they are usually based on the theme, "Why can't we have more to hand out?" It does not matter which State Budget speech one reads, that theme seems to permeate all the introductions of State Budgets.

As is customary in introducing the Budget, the Treasurer prefaced his remarks with a commentary on the seasonal outlook, which, from a purely seasonal point of view, is in many respects very good. However, he made this point: That Governments have great anxiety about the seasonal outlook each year, and placed great emphasis on world price trends and international supply and demand for primary products. This is true testimony of our continued reliance on primary industries; and, in Western Australia, this will continue for many generations yet to come, probably with greater emphasis than in some other States in Australia.

Colouring our thoughts at the moment is, of course, the very steep decline in wool prices, and it is the fervent hope of all Australians, and particularly Western Australians, that this is only a temporary phase. My own view is that to a certain extent the trend in world wool prices is a reflection of an unavoidable transition period that is being experienced, not only with wool, but with many other products on a world basis.

I would like to think—I believe there are signs of it—that if the action taken in the next few months is bold enough, not only in respect of wool but in respect of some other commodities, we shall see that this year is the bottom of the trough so far as many basic commodity prices are concerned and that there will be a steady return to prices which are economic to the producer and reasonable and satisfactory to the consumer.

Mr. Andrew: What bold action would you suggest?

Mr. COURT: I will come to the question of marketing in a few moments. The need in the final analysis is not only so far as the bulk sale of the commodity is concerned, but the form in which it is sold to the consumer, because therein I think lies the end-result or the end-effect. In the meantime we all have a duty—and the Leader of the Country Party has taken action along these lines—to highlight both to the public and to Governments, both State and Federal, the significance of the present lesson that is being learned so bitterly by Australia in respect of wool price trends.

The weakening effect in the decline in the price of wool is obvious, whether it be industry, commerce, primary production, professional, or the wage-earning groups. In fact, it goes further than that, because it is having a very serious effect on the Treasury. Year after year in Australia, Commonwealth Governments, in preparing their Budgets, have had a comparatively easy time. There has been an increasing pool of income available from which they could derive their revenue, and it is only in the last year or two that they have started to feel the cold blast of changed conditions which, in turn, has made it necessary for them to take a much more careful look at their financing, budgeting and spending.

Mr. May: You do not think wool should go back to the price it was.

Mr. COURT: No, and I do not think the wool producer wants it to.

Mr. May: Do you think the buyers are trying to find a price between what it was and what it is now?

Mr. COURT: It should be the objective of all to get to a price which is not only economic to the producer but at the same time acceptable to the consumer. When I say "the consumer" I mean the end-user of the product, whether it be clothing, blankets or the like.

Mr. May: You think the buyers are trying at the present time?

Mr. COURT: It is not a question of buyers; there are more than buyers in this argument.

Mr. May: They control the prices.

Mr. COURT: I am not going to be side-tracked into a full-scale debate. The hon. member had his chance when the Leader of the Country Party introduced his motion on wool.

Mr. May: I want your opinion, that is all.

Mr. COURT: I do not wish to keep the House until 6.15.

Mr. Lawrence: We will stay with you.

Mr. COURT: I am sure the hon. member would. I am satisfied that the experience of the last year or two, and particularly of the last few months, will have shaken a lot of people in responsible positions out of their complacency in respect of wool. We know that wool has certain advantages—inherent advantages—over synthetics, but it has been amply demonstrated that no longer can we be smug about it.

I am compelled to think on occasions that in spite of the amount of money being spent or reported to be spent in connection with publicity on wool consumer goods, there is not the degree of imagination and vigour being shown in that publicity as is being shown by the marketers of the synthetic products. I have in mind

a regular weekly publication that comes out on an Australia-wide basis—a woman's journal—and if one turns over the rather colourful advertisements in that particular publication one is struck by the imagination and the attractiveness of the advertisements used by the marketers of the synthetic product. They manage to create a popular appeal to the public as compared with the advertisements in respect of the advantages of wool.

For instance, the synthetics have captured the imagination, to a large extent, in respect of non-creasing fabrics, which appeal to the community who want to do as little work as possible in respect of their own personal chores. I think that has had a serious impact. The answer, if we are going to increase the consumer demand, is to create a similar impact on the public mind in respect of the products of wool.

It appears to me that the most obvious prospect of increased consumption of wool is in the countries of large population and low living standards. Let me make this point: that I consider that the long term outlook for wool is as sound as ever it was. This is no time for panic. We have to look to the places which have the capacity to increase their demand. We cannot look to the countries with a high standard of living to have a spectacular increase in their demands, because they have made such advances in achieving a high standard of living. So we have to look to the less developed countries with their vast populations, where even a small increase in the standard of living could have quite a dramatic effect on the consumer demand.

Obviously I refer to the Asian countries where there is a terrific mass of population, most of which is subjected to a low standard of living. It is the objective of the world powers, at this time, to set about the task of increasing their standard of living. Surely a minor increase reflected there, with their hundreds of millions of people, must have repercussions in both food and clothing.

Properly merchandised, the wool industry must achieve an end-advantage from the increased use of clothing, blankets and the like by those people. Once we can create that demand, the inevitable result is that the price will go up to an economic and satisfactory level because wool is no different from any other commodity in this respect. If we have not got the demand, we just cannot expect the price to go up above depressed levels.

Mr. May: The demand is there all right, but not the finance.

Mr. COURT: That is very true. The hon. member for Collie has recently had experience and close contact with these countries and he knows that they would gladly lift their present standard of living, given the financial resources. However,

I think he would agree that world powers are actively working towards the end of making it possible for these people to increase their standards of living.

The Treasurer went on to touch on two important regional matters which, I think, merit the attention of hon. members, be they metropolitan or country members. He referred particularly to Albany and Esperance. Of course, there are other regional areas with problems, but he referred particularly to those two. I agree that the establishment of wool sales at Albany has been an important step in the development and expansion of that region. It is also gratifying to know that the policy, implemented by the previous Government—the McLarty-Watts Government—in connection with the development of the port of Albany, and continued by the present Government, is paying off. The increased use of that port by shipping, has been most gratifying and a sure sign of the regional development.

I am certain that the most practical form of decentralisation is for the increased use of these ports by such areas as the Great Southern, South-West and Esperance; and for the northern agricultural areas to use Geraldton as their main port. The more one travels about these districts, the more one is impressed with the need for far-seeing and active men in those parts—men who actually reside in those areas and who have substantial interests in them—to be prepared to come together on regional committees and fight tooth and nail for the interests of their districts. It is only through these committees that we can have properly co-ordinated regional effort, and get the full impact of the brains and experience of the people concerned; and it is only in this way that we can realise the aims and ambitions of those people with a personal knowledge of the various regions.

The battle is not an easy one, as all these regions have found, because there is a degree of selfishness on the part of most metropolitan areas, whether they be the metropolitan area of Perth, Sydney, Melbourne, or any other capital city. It is only by having people with great determination and energy representing those regions, that we can make an impact on this problem of decentralisation.

As far as the regions are concerned, there is no doubt in my mind that transport is the key to decentralisation. It behoves central Governments to insist that there be a fair and equitable distribution of the funds available, so that the regions receive their fair share of development aimed at greater decentralisation on a State-wide basis. There is a severe temptation to central Government to favour the areas of greater population concentration. We see this at both State and Federal levels. One test of a Government is whether it can resist the temptation to

favour, in its spending, the areas closest to the existing centres of population—in our case, the metropolitan area of Perth.

The way in which Governments can encourage decentralisation is, firstly, by giving a degree of preference to the regions in the spending of money and, at the same time, devoting more time, energy, and effort to guiding and helping regional committees and generally assisting regional development. The nature of rail and road transport, and the incidence of freights in relation to outports, are the key to decentralisation. It is my experience that the cold hard economics of transport costs will produce a much greater impact and a much greater practical result than will all the local loyalties that one might like to preach about a particular regional outport.

The Esperance region, which the Treasurer touched on, is in a different stage of development from that of Geraldton, Albany, or Bunbury, but nevertheless the potential is there. The distance from the metropolitan area to Esperance makes it all the more important, for a regional outlook basis, if Esperance is to be quickly developed. The transport-cost problem of the Esperance region is well known, and there is no doubt it must be vigorously attacked. For this reason, I was surprised at the reference to this matter made by the Treasurer, in his speech. He referred to the fact that the State and Commonwealth Governments "might give closer consideration from now on" to the shipping problem.

I would have thought the question of transport cost from Esperance was so red hot that, if we were going to give this area the maximum opportunity to expand as quickly as practicable, it would be of paramount consideration. We have seen that the Federal Minister for Transport and Shipping has given consideration to this matter in an effort to increase the supply of shipping tonnage, on a regular timetable basis, to the outports of this State. I would like to know just how far the Treasurer has already gone in negotiating with the Commonwealth Government to ensure that there is a regular and economic flow of shipping to the Esperance port as distinct from the other outports.

I must admit that I was perturbed at the Premier's suggestion that this might be a matter for closer consideration from now on by State and Commonwealth Governments. I would have thought it would be a matter of immediate concern and active negotiation between the two Governments, if not with other interests as well. The point that impressed me, as a result of the last visit I made to the Esperance region, was the great importance of early and advanced planning and organisation, if we are to avoid the expensive errors that have been made in other parts—errors which are almost incapable of correction at this late stage; or, capable of correction only at very large cost.

It is important that we should think big in this matter. A properly planned region at this point of time can save millions of pounds in the future; and such planning can have a wonderful impact not only on the next generation but on the next 100 years of development of the region. In considering the Esperance region, it is important that we just do not think in terms of the port of Esperance, because the hinterland is just as vitally concerned as, if not more so than, the townsite of Esperance itself.

Here I touch on the goldmining centres of Kalgoorlie and Boulder, which have a practical interest in the success of the Esperance region, as a region; and particularly in the success of the port of Esperance. I think it would be in the best interests of the whole of that region, including Kalgoorlie and the rest of the Goldfields area, to make use of the best brains that are available in the district; and for the people concerned to meet regularly with senior Government representatives to give technical advice.

This is a wonderful opportunity—probably one of the few that may be presented—available to the Government to assume the role of governing and guiding as distinct from that of direction and dictation; and of meddling in trading enterprises. Here is a case where we have a region, just about to commence its real development—and with many natural attributes, starting from the port itself—which lends itself to an outstanding exercise, as it were, in forward planning to ensure that everything done now, in the basic development, is going to stand the test of time. I would say that that region, and the townsite itself, are almost a town planner's dream; and particularly starting on the area at this stage.

The next point touched on by the Treasurer in his comments was world economic experience. He referred to the ups and downs of world economy and touched on the problems which occur through stockpiling for defence and other reasons. I am afraid it was ever thus; once people fear that they will be cut off from any commodity, for whatever reason, there is a natural instinct to hoard, and with the threat of war hanging over their heads that trend is much more pronounced than in times of peace. However, in respect of the problems of the world today, we must give credit for the fact that considerable advances have been made in economic thought, theory and practice.

If it were not for the advances made in the last 50 years, and particularly in the last 30 years, I think we could say that the world, at this point of time, would be in a first-class economic mess; but we must be fair and admit that there is nothing like the privation and upheaval being experienced at present that there was about 30 years ago, when there was an

almost similar development in respect of the major commodities such as wool and the like, which so greatly affect world economy.

Unfortunately, in economic practice, as distinct from economic thought and theory, anticipation of a situation is extremely difficult for Governments, whether the Western Australian State Government, the Commonwealth national Government, or that of the U.S.A., the U.K., or any other country for that matter; and particularly in a democracy, where the rights, feelings and interests of individuals have to be taken into account. The bigger these Governments become, the more unwieldy becomes the problem, and the more difficult it is for them to anticipate.

A private individual can make quick changes in his business and can change his methods of production and distribution almost overnight, in order to achieve the desired results; but Governments have not been and never will be in a position to make those dramatic and sudden changes. There are several practical reasons for that and the difficulty is sometimes one of local political expediency. There are sometimes other reasons also, related to the difficulty of reorganising colossal production and merchandising programmes. Just as a ship needs trimming periodically, so does a nation need trimming periodically, both internally and externally; and I do not think there is any foolproof system yet devised, or likely to be devised, which can avoid these periodic upsets in the economy. The main thing we can achieve is to level out the seriousness of these economic upsets.

If a fool-proof solution were found to the problem—I know some people have claimed it throughout the ages, but the claim has always been disproved and debunked—Federal and State Treasurers and members of Parliament would probably find that half their services were unnecessary, because someone would wind up the machine and that would be the end of it. Whichever way we look—whether on the State, the Federal, or the international level—the final answer comes from increased consumer demand and, as I said earlier, the only real impetus that can be given to that is by an increase in the standard of living.

We cannot deny the great contribution which has been made by the U.S.A., the United Kingdom and, to a lesser extent by Australia—as a smaller nation—to a policy of giving not only money but also know-how and equipment to help some of the other nations lift their standard of living. If we go into some of the South-East Asian countries, we feel proud of the contribution made by Australian scientists, agriculturists and the like, in assisting the people to improve their

standard of living through improved techniques and a better use of their natural assets.

Mr. Johnson: Isn't that work being all done by Governments, and not by private companies?

Mr. COURT: That is what Governments are there for, but there are people who are making their own contribution. Some private firms in the world are making an amazing contribution to the increase in the standard of living of the individual in these places, but there are programmes of international co-operation, which must be on a Government-to-Government level.

Mr. Johnson: Don't tell us that you are getting around to believing in Government action!

Mr. COURT: The hon. member for Leederville is trying to interpret into my remarks something foreign to what I am discussing.

Mr. Potter: Did you see the cartoon in this morning's Press?

Mr. COURT: I am afraid I did not. The hon. member for Leederville well knows that we cannot barge into Indonesia or India and simply say that we are sending them a thousand scientists or oil technicians. That has all to be done on the Government-to-Government level.

Mr. Johnson: You are always against Government action, but now you are saying that Governments do good things. You are speaking with two tongues.

Mr. COURT: Some Governments do some very good things. The hon. member for Leederville is upset to think that I am prepared to say that the Government of the U.S.A. and the Governments of the United Kingdom and Australia have made a contribution to the uplifting of the standards of some of these backward countries. There are some Western Australians who have done their part, in a commendable way, in conveying knowledge to those people; and we should be very proud of them.

At a quick glance some people are inclined to be critical of America—people within America and within the United Kingdom and Australia—for sending experts and money and goods and equipment to these countries; but that, of course, is a short-term view. This is a long-term investment not only in humanity, but also in long-term economics, because it is hoped that these countries, through increasing their standards of living, will be able to make greater use of their own productivity and, at the same time, have the wherewithal to trade with the people who have been their benefactors. I think we are entitled to hope that, when they have the wherewithal, they will remember their benefactors in this respect.

I will now touch briefly, while on the question of world economic trends, on the change that has taken place in the Australian scene over the last 30 years. Australia presents one of the best examples in the world today, of the levelling out of the economy to avoid its being so vulnerable to variations in one particular section of the national income. The fall in the price of wool, the equivalent of which we have had in the last few months, back in the 1930's would have precipitated a depression of first-class magnitude. Part of the reason for offsetting the devastating effect of this reduction in income has been the steady concurrent development of manufacturing industries with our primary production.

These extracts from the Commonwealth Statistician's report are revealing. In 1954, we had 12.8 per cent. of the total occupied persons employed in rural industries. That is the latest figure I could get, because the years I am quoting are the census years.

As I have said, 12.8 per cent of the total occupied persons were employed in rural industries in 1954, compared with 14.4 per cent. in 1947; and the most significant figure is 22.3 per cent. in 1933.

Another point arising directly from this is the trend in national income. Despite the fluctuation in wool prices, the national income in the last decade has risen every year with the exception of 1957-58. In this year there was a drop of 3½ per cent. in rural incomes; but it was accompanied—according to the official figures—by a reduction of only 1.2 per cent. in national income.

Unfortunately, since these figures were extracted—these being the last official figures I could obtain—there has been a further serious decline in the price of wool, which must have an adverse effect on them; but the trend will still be apparent. On the question of mining, the Treasurer dealt at some length with the effect of the world price of gold. Some people are inclined to brush off the importance of gold in the modern economy; but I think that for as long as we are here, and for a long time afterwards, gold will still be an important factor in our economy.

It is significant that the gold industry is probably the most cost-conscious industry that we have in Australia. The cynics, of course, will say that the cost-consciousness has been forced on that industry by the world price; it has no alternative but to be cost-conscious, or else go out of business. In many respects it might have been easier for some of the companies to go out of business, but it is to their credit that they have faced up to ever-increasing costs and achieved a remarkable result. If the rest of Australian industry had been as cost-conscious as

the gold industry, our position in world markets would have been infinitely better than it is today.

There is no doubt that we are dragging our feet as far as the reduction of costs is concerned; and if other Australian industries had the same success as the gold-mining industry in being conscious of costs, we would not be dragging our feet in the way that we are.

Mr. Kelly: That is very true.

Mr. COURT: The annual reports of the goldmining companies could be studied by the leaders of many other industries in Australia, because the goldmining companies have been never-ending in their efforts to defeat costs and at the same time retain—in fact, improve—industrial conditions. It is quite apparent to me that with the decline in other basic commodities the Commonwealth Government will have to address itself more to the question of gold. A country like Australia, of necessity, is dependent on the production of overseas income, and I think we will find—now that income is declining from other commodities—the Commonwealth Government will have to address itself to other means of producing overseas currency, and hard currency at that; namely, gold.

We would like to think that there are prospects of a change in the world price of gold, but I am afraid all our hopes and desires along those lines have been shattered in the last few days. America has spoken officially and has stated that she is not prepared to amend the world price. Therefore, any relief to our goldmining industry—and not only relief to keep it going, but relief to give it impetus—must come from within Australia. In other words, it must be internal relief instead of external. Naturally, we would deem it much better to have the natural impetus brought about by an increase in the world price; but I think we should make all our representations on the basis that it will have to be an internal relief to stimulate, rather than just maintain, the gold income of Western Australia; and that, virtually, means the gold income of Australia.

I was hoping that America might be forced to make an adjustment; but she has now spoken in very forthright terms, and the Minister for Mines would know whether that is the very last word from the United States Government or whether it is just a semi-official declaration of that country's attitude towards an increase in the world price of gold. An adjustment of the world price by a reasonable figure would have been a shot in the arm to many nations with which America must trade, and particularly to some of her Allies.

Should it occur that an adjustment of the gold price is made on a world basis, it would be nothing more than a shot in the arm to the gold-producing countries. It would not represent a cure-all for our

economic ills, but it would give some of these nations that are faced with financial difficulties time to be ready to cushion the blow of some of the economic trends that can be so disastrous, as demonstrated by the statement that the American Government has made in recent weeks concerning lead and zinc.

I think it is a risk that America could take, even if some strings were attached to it, in respect of the countries that were to benefit from the adjustment in the price of gold. That is my view.

In the modern trend of industry, and in the light of technical advances that are being made in industry, and the greater use of previously unknown minerals, it is important that government should give an increasing amount of attention to minerals other than gold. Normally, the sources of mineral wealth lie in rather inaccessible places; and mining has the disadvantage—and, at the same time, the advantage—that it makes it necessary to provide quickly, economic and adequate transport, together with many other amenities.

The general trend today is for huge mineral deposits to be worked on a highly mechanised basis, and this mechanisation follows through from the actual mining itself to transportation and right up to the actual loading of ships and the transportation in the bulk loaders. The trend is more and more towards the bulk carrier as a means of defeating the heavy cost of transportation.

Therefore, it is necessary to think on a large scale in respect of all minerals, such as manganese. We have to think in terms of a highly mechanised basis. One of the most important factors in the mining of minerals—it is axiomatic, but we are inclined to overlook it—is the quick rate of development that surrounds mineral findings and mineral exploitation.

I can think of no other industry which is followed by the same quick concentration of population and the provision of amenities and transportation as the mining industry, where there is a mineral find of reasonable size. In recent days we had circulated among members of Parliament by the Atomic Energy Commission its September, 1958 publication, in which it gives the Mary Kathleen story. One cannot help but be impressed with the transition there from such a forbidding piece of country to an area which is being vigorously worked by the most modern methods, with provision of townships, adequate water supplies and the like. I refer to page 5 in particular, on which is pictured the Corella dam which supplies water to the Mary Kathleen townsite.

It would be interesting to know just what that area looked like before the dam was built, and how long before that particular area would have had large concentrations of people and, consequently, the

amenities that have now been created in such a short space of time for the purpose of winning the wealth from that locality if the project had not been started.

With mining, of course, the clever thing is to try to ensure that, while there is the advantage of having the quick build-up to what is essentially a wasting asset—whatever way one looks at it, a mineral deposit, once it is exploited, must be a wasting asset—there is something to complement it to absorb the population or at least retain a fair portion of it.

The next point with which I wish to deal is the section of the Treasurer's speech that touched on the question of local products. There was a certain amount of good-natured banter about who was wearing what, and so on; but I would now like to strike a more serious note. To say the least of it, much of his language was unfortunate and ill-chosen, because it is my view that you will never convert the people to a greater natural use of local products by trying to browbeat into them the acceptance of local products.

This is one of the statements the Treasurer made when introducing the Budget. He said—

The only reason they cannot do that now is that members of Parliament and other people in the community are either so careless or so stupid or so disloyal as to buy goods which are similar to those which these factories and workshops make, but which are imported from other States to Western Australia, instead of buying goods which are produced in our own establishments. Surely there is nothing more stupid for a community to do than what the people of Western Australia do in that regard.

I hasten to make it clear that, so far as the Opposition is concerned, we are behind any practical move to increase the consumption of locally-made goods. It is the commonsense thing to do. We take one look at the adverse trade balance and find it is very disturbing, particularly as in 1957-58 there was an overall adverse balance of £8,600,000; unlike 1956-57 in which there was a favourable overall balance of £21,000,000 for Western Australia.

However, in considering this, there are some important reservations which should be read into those figures, because the higher trade surplus for June, 1957, compared with the deficit for 1958 is misleading. I am not saying the figure is satisfactory; but it is important, when considering those two years, that we have a proper balance of the figures. It makes the trend a more logical one than the original figures quoted appear superficially, to do. Two reasons why there are reservations in respect to these figures are: firstly, that the 1957 surplus reflects exceptionally large shipments of wheat

carry-overs from previous seasons. This was approximately £12,000,000. Secondly, the 1958 deficit excludes some of the annual shipments of gold out of the State. I understand the figure is about £8,500,000 less than the figure for 1956-57.

It is very easy for the incidence of these figures to fall one side or the other of the balancing date. These adjustments preserve a more healthy-looking picture so far as those two years are concerned, but I readily concede that the figures are not good. I think that in introducing this subject, the Treasurer touched on the real sore when he referred to local prejudice. 'Twas ever thus. I would suggest that he is appreciated, as Premier, probably more in Western Australia than he may be in the State of South Australia from which he came. They probably read about him now in Western Australia, and they might have a soft spot for him; but had he stayed in South Australia, he would have been confronted with having to overcome all the problems of local prejudice that one finds anywhere. As I have said, 'twas ever thus.

I think it goes back to the Bible days where they tell us about prophets not being without honour except in their own country. We must acknowledge the reality of this matter. When we try to push people around, and tell them what they should do, they are inclined to become stubborn; indeed, some of them become mule-like. There must be other ways to encourage and induce people to use these local products. The local products campaign is but part of the overall picture, if we are to stimulate our own industries.

Let us face the reality that Western Australia must adopt the same attitude as other countries which have a comparatively small consuming public, and who have to get other people to use their goods. If we just keep harping on the local products campaign, it will only achieve a certain degree of success; even though it may be completely successful in itself so far as Western Australia is concerned.

Therefore, we must go on the offensive. Trade missions, such as we have had, are all very necessary to attract new industries; but the new industries themselves will further aggravate our disposal problem. It follows they are going to produce more goods. We want more factories; we are great advocates of that on this side of the House. But we must look at the other side of the picture; we must be aggressive in our approach in selling our goods. I suggest we are not as aggressive as we should be in trying to seek avenues for the disposal of our goods outside Western Australia, and, indeed, outside Australia.

I would say that even more important at this time than the actual attraction of new industries, is the attraction of markets for the disposal of these goods that we can produce, and which expanded and new industries will produce. We have

a classic example within our own British Commonwealth. I refer, of course, to the United Kingdom. That country has for generations imported terrific masses of raw materials and re-exported them to the world as manufactured goods. It has achieved great fame and wealth as a result of its capacity to import, manufacture, and re-export.

If it had to rely on its own consuming public it just would not exist for another generation as a manufacturing, and highly industrialised nation. The main factors for any such country as the United Kingdom, Switzerland, and countries like the European States, are that they should firstly get their manufacturing costs down so that they are competitive. The next item of importance is their transportation costs; and the next, to ensure that their products are of a type and style that the consumer wants. Fourthly, and just as important, they must ensure that they have the correct marketing techniques.

We have a lot to learn about marketing techniques. When we look at the South-East Asian countries we are amazed at the importance they place on the merchandising aspect of their goods. They lay great stress on labelling, and the type of packs that they use; the shape of containers for milk; and so on. For instance, any container which, once its contents are used, makes a useful utensil around the place, for cooking things in, etc., has a much greater demand than something whose shape has no utilitarian purpose and which, once the commodity has been used, has to be discarded. They are sensitive to that. Some of these merchandising countries have seized on that very point, and have been most conscious of it with great effect.

I would now like to make the observation that the Government in Western Australia has a role to play in encouraging industry to be more aggressive in its attitude. It is not a question of dictating, or of direction, but of encouragement. This is the sort of thing that gets under my skin, because I think it reflects a wrong frame of mind. In all good faith and sincerity I asked the Government certain questions about an effort being made to establish a shipping line between Australia and South America. The nations of the world are appreciating more and more the potential markets in South America. If we had direct shipping with South America, it would be an important key. If we could load ships at Fremantle or some other ports with goods and have them transported to South America without two or three transshipments, then obviously we would be on a competitive basis of transport costs.

I asked the Premier the following question on the 8th October—

(1) Has the Government made any approaches either to shipping services or to the Commonwealth Government

to obtain more particulars regarding the Commonwealth's negotiations with shipping companies for a direct shipping service between Australia and South American ports?

I was told "No". In answer to a further question, I was told that the appropriate members of the Government would be willing to discuss the matter with representatives of industry and commerce.

If the Government is anxious to foster this extra trade—and we need this overseas trade just as badly as, if not more than, we need the local trade—it should say, "We will get hold of industry and nudge it along".

Mr. Johnson: You are criticising private enterprise. You are out of form again.

Mr. COURT: The hon. member does not seem to give thought for one second to what he is going to say about these things. This is a question not of Government interference, but of the Government doing a real job of governing. This is where Governments can do a real job of governing—

Mr. Johnson: I agree; but that is contrary to your political platform.

Mr. COURT: It has never been contrary to our platform.

Mr. Johnson: You have never believed in government.

Mr. COURT: I do not know how silly the hon. member can get. The mere fact that I seek to get into Parliament means that I believe in government; otherwise, I might boycott the institution, like some people who refuse to vote.

Mr. May: That does not mean that you would not kick this Government out if you had the opportunity.

Mr. COURT: The hon. member knows that it is the ambition of the Opposition of today to become the Government of tomorrow; just as hon. members opposite want to keep us here as the Opposition. We want the members opposite to be over here, and the Opposition to be over there.

Mr. May: That is silly.

Mr. COURT: It is not as silly as the hon. member thinks. We had a further example in connection with the Japanese trade mission. Publicity was given to the matter. I asked the Government whether it had any information on this particular point, but the Premier came back and attacked the Commonwealth Government. This is not a matter for attacking the Commonwealth Government. If the Commonwealth Government has been discourteous, inconsiderate, or thoughtless, that does not stop the Government of this State from grabbing hold of the trade mission and saying, "We have something we can sell you."

If we are going to sit back just because of discourtesy on the part of the Commonwealth Government—or, for that matter, anyone else—we will get precisely nowhere. The Government can do a wonderful job in this respect. Instead of meddling in trade itself, it should go out and say, "Have you got what is wanted for these markets? How can we help you? What have you got to sell in South America?", and so on. That is the correct approach. In sitting back and saying, "You come and see us, and we will talk to you", is, to my mind, to adopt the dead hand which encourages no-one.

Mr. Johnson: You are wanting us to subsidise private enterprise with taxpayers' money.

Mr. COURT: I am not suggesting any subsidy. I do not seem to be able to make the point clear to the hon. member that I want the Government to do something. This does not require money; this takes effort.

Mr. Brand: When Dr. Evatt is finished there will not be any money left to hand out.

Mr. Hawke: The hon. member must think he is very witty!

Mr. COURT: We have the opportunity to sell both in the Eastern States and abroad. There are manufacturers here who produce products which they send over to the Eastern States and which are sold very well. In fact they can sell all their production in keen competition with the so-called named brands with which they have to vie in the Eastern States. This policy can be carried abroad. We are not helpless in this matter, and we should go after those markets. I say that Western Australia has not been sufficiently aggressive in the representations which it has made abroad in respect of keen merchandising, as against attracting industry to this State.

It is strange—and this is a criticism of industry—that industrialists will cheerfully spend hundreds of thousands of pounds on plant and buildings to set up a factory or business of some sort, but appear to be very reluctant to spend a few thousand pounds on something equally important to ensure the disposal of their production; namely, on aggressive merchandising.

Mr. Potter: Do you suggest sending overseas our ships plying to the North-West?

Mr. COURT: That is not the answer. Does the hon. member want to send them overseas empty? The point is that we want the markets. They have to be created, and then the goods can be shipped all right.

Mr. Sleeman: Sending the ships to Japan with iron ore would be one way.

Mr. Roberts: Plenty of ships from this State go to Japan now, loaded with ilmenite.

Mr. COURT: It is extraordinary that Labour Governments in this State have a great urge to sell iron ore to Japan.

Mr. Hawke: The B.H.P. sells steel to Red China.

Mr. COURT: I do not want to get into an argument about the attempt of the Willcock Government to sell iron ore to Japan in unlimited quantities, without any of the ore being used for manufacture in Australia.

Mr. Potter: Japan at least buys our wool.

Mr. COURT: What has that got to do with this matter?

Mr. Potter: Everything to do with it.

Mr. COURT: I am not going to be sidetracked into an argument on the Japanese trade agreement—if the hon. member wants to bring forward the argument that we want to export other commodities to Japan,—but that country's complaint is that Australia should buy more from it.

Mr. May: That is fair enough.

Mr. COURT: The hon. member is putting his feet into it this time! The Federal Labour Party has been very critical about the Japanese trade agreement and has referred to the crushing of Australian manufacturers and the like, when in point of fact the agreement was cleverly negotiated and Australian manufacturers were adequately protected.

Mr. May: You used the right word when you said "cleverly".

Mr. COURT: It was cleverly negotiated by the Commonwealth Government. On the question of the Government's attitude towards industry, it is important that between the Governments of the day, industry, and commerce in any State, there should be harmony, co-operation, complete understanding and trust.

Mr. Potter: That is what exists in this State.

Mr. COURT: I am telling the hon. member that it does not exist here.

Mr. Potter: I am asking you for some suggestion as to what the Government should do.

Mr. COURT: The Treasurer could not resist the temptation to show his deep and bitter resentment to certain interests in private industry; and this is what he said in one of the bursts of extraordinary language he uses from time to time, and for which he has achieved a reputation. He said during his introduction of the Budget—

I understand the hon. member for Nedlands (the Deputy Leader of the Opposition)—who is trying hard to think out a pertinent interjection—was a member of a Royal Commission appointed by this House.

I do not know why he often says that I am trying to think out a pertinent interjection. I do not know whether my brain ticks outwardly or not. He went on—

I think it started as a Select Committee and finished up as a Royal Commission; and if I remember rightly, that commission unanimously recommended that legislative action should be taken to deal with collusive tendering.

Yet if one Government department, or State enterprise, or socialistic concern in Western Australia has been more battered, and plundered, and robbed by collusive tendering than any other, it has been the Railway Department; and all the battering, plundering, and robbing to which it has been subjected has been inflicted upon it by some of the high priests of private enterprise in Western Australia.

What chance is there of achieving industrial co-operation in a State when the Treasurer says that, not once but on every possible opportunity in this House—

Mr. Hawke: I shall be doing so again.

Mr. COURT: It is not the type of language the Treasurer uses when he opens factories and Timber Development Week. He strokes those people and tells them how fine they are; but he comes here and tells us how those same people have been battered, plundered, and robbed a Government instrumentality by collusive tendering.

Mr. Hawke: Some of the big boys are certainly doing that.

Mr. COURT: I interjected at that stage by saying—

You are doing a good job of plundering private enterprise at the moment with your restrictive practices so far as the Government trading concerns go.

Mr. Sleeman: Said by whom?

Mr. COURT: I said that myself; and I was quoting from the Premier's transcript.

Mr. Johnson: Do you realise this would not hurt anyone with a clear conscience?

Mr. COURT: We will come to that in a minute; because if we want to extend the Soviet system, which is growing rapidly in this State, the Government will only need to keep going the way it is going. I will deal with that in a minute.

Mr. Johnson: We will be here for an hour and a half.

Mr. COURT: I have a fair way to go. On the subject of attitude to industry, let us examine a question asked by the hon. member for Geraldton in connection with superphosphate. It might

have been an innocent question—I doubt it—but it had all the ingredients of a first-class Dorothy Dix.

Mr. Hawke: Or Charlie Court!

Mr. COURT: He asked—

(1) How many reductions have taken place in the price of superphosphate since the passing of the Unfair Trading and Profit Control Act in this State?

The Premier replied to the effect that there had been three. The 1st October, 1957—4s. per ton in new bags; a further 18s. per ton in new bags on the 1st July, 1958; and a further 4s. per ton in new bags on the 22nd September, 1958. He went on to add this little bit, which was meant to be a palate tickler—

These reductions represent an annual saving of approximately £596,000 to farmers in Western Australia.

Prices were increased on the 1st July, 1957, in all States except Western Australia.

If one takes that question at its face value—

Mr. Potter: It is a good question.

Mr. COURT: —the inference is that these reductions were made because of the activities of the Unfair Trading Commissioner; but it is nothing of the sort.

Mr. Hawke: Who is to say they were not?

Mr. Norton: It could have been because of his existence.

Mr. COURT: That is supposition by the Treasurer, but he does not realise that this particular industry—

Mr. Hawke: It is supposition on the part of the hon. member for Nedlands.

Mr. COURT: —had a good record in regard to the passing on of costs movements downward when they occurred.

Mr. Hawke: I would prefer to hear the practical farmers on that one.

Mr. COURT: The hon. member for Geraldton did not go on to ask if there had been any increase in prices since the Unfair Trading Commissioner came into operation, but only asked if there were any reductions. The Treasurer was therefore quite right. In response to my question without notice, the Treasurer replied that his answers were factual answers to questions which were clear-cut. They were, so far as they went, but it was what was left unsaid that did the damage. The inference was that these reductions had been as a result of the activities and directions of the Unfair Trading Commissioner, which is not so.

This industry passed on price decreases in the period of no control, when the price control legislation disappeared in 1953; and up to the time of the coming into

operation of the Unfair Trading Commissioner on exactly the same basis. In fact, it is an industry which was subjected to more or less a formula type of control by the Prices Commissioner which was thoroughly understood both by the industry and by the Prices Commissioner himself.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 p.m. to 4.7 p.m.

Mr. COURT: I want to state, for the purpose of record, regularity, and fairness, the actual trends that have taken place in the superphosphate prices both during the period when there was no price control or Unfair Trading Commissioner, and subsequent to the appointment of the commissioner. These are the prices, or the movements, in 1954-55; hon. members will appreciate that that was immediately following the cessation of price control in 1953. There was a movement downwards of 18s. 6d. per ton, and a further reduction of 3s. per ton, making a total of £1 1s. 6d.

In 1955-56 there was an increase of 5s. 3d., making a net reduction, during the period between the cessation of price control and the enactment of the unfair trading laws, of 16s. 3d. per ton. The movements in price have been as follows:—In 1956-57, there was an increase of 12s., which was not covered by the questions to which I referred earlier; in 1957-58, there was a reduction of 4s.; in 1958-59, there was a reduction of 18s., and a further reduction of 4s., making a total of £1 6s., less the increase of 12s. This brings about a net reduction during the period of the Unfair Trading Commissioner of 14s. per ton, as against a net reduction of 16s. 3d. per ton during the period of no control.

There are very good reasons why the price of superphosphate moves. It is a very cost-conscious industry, and those who have studied it will acknowledge that to be a fact. The ownership of the industry is most unusual. It is not like an ordinary private enterprise industry; and to imply, as these answers do, that the reductions were during this period of the Unfair Trading Commissioner's regime, and were as the result of his activities, is unfair, because I am reliably informed that it has nothing to do with the commissioner. It has occurred because of the normal operations of that industry. Just as they made greater reductions before his appointment, so they have made normal reductions and variations, including one substantial increase, during the operations of this particular officer.

The Treasurer might think this is of no consequence; but it is. It is one of those things which bites into the very spirit of the community when people find themselves being attacked—and that is what it amounts to, being attacked, and unfairly—on an issue, even if only by inference; and I think there was a definite duty in the interests of goodwill between

the Government and industry, for the Treasurer to say, in answering the question, that it was not due to the operations of the Unfair Trading Commissioner; but that, in fact, it was only coincidental that the price movements occurred during the period of that appointment.

The latest bombshell which has hit the community is in the most recent report—No. 6—of Royal Commissioner Smith. Unfortunately this is the only place where these words can be said; but if ever there was a report of convenience, it is this one.

Anyone who reads Royal Commissioner Smith's report No. 6 must be appalled by the methods which have been used in publicising this matter—methods foreign to all we understand as being fair, just, and reasonable—when people are vilified and criticised in a report which is made public and which is accepted as fact by the average person in the street, simply because the average person does not understand all the implications of the report and its background. This is one of those things which cause a rift in the community; and if hon. members studied that report, they would be appalled at the fact that this document has been let loose on the community, unsupported by any evidence as we normally understand it in a British community.

The report makes statements; and if one studies them one can drive a horse and cart through them; and I say that the publication of this report has brought about an all-time low in the Royal Commission reports that we have had in this State. For that reason I say this is a report of convenience, and that there is a great deal more in it than meets the eye, when it is let loose on the community by the Government—

Mr. Jamieson: You are reflecting on a very good Royal Commissioner.

Mr. COURT: Someone has to say something about this matter, and Parliament is the only place where it can be said, simply because the author of the report is a Royal Commissioner; but if we were to remain silent in regard to this document, we would be committing a grave dereliction of duty.

Mr. Andrew: Isn't documentary evidence far better, in many instances, than verbal evidence?

Mr. COURT: The hon. member for Victoria Park has apparently not read the report paragraph by paragraph. The report itself says that the commissioner has not taken evidence from the people criticised in it.

Mr. Andrew: The Royal Commissioner may not have taken evidence, but he has had a lot of correspondence and documents—

Mr. COURT: Perhaps. But we would not try a man for a criminal offence simply on the strength of correspondence. We

would want someone to prove the facts. No matter whether it is evidence, documents, or anything else, the fact in this instance is that the people who have been vilified in the community by means of this report were never consulted; and surely, in ordinary common justice, they should be entitled, whether they were the lowest workmen in the establishment or the most highly paid officials of the organisation, and whether connected with a very big or very small enterprise, to a fair hearing! No matter who they might be, the principle is the same, and it does not apply only to a large-scale industry, but to all enterprises, large or small.

This document has been interpreted as fact by people in the street; and members on the Government side of the House know better than I do that it has caused a great deal of feeling within the railway system itself. Today it is timber, globes, or tyres; and tomorrow it could be the workmen in the Railway Department themselves; and they are not so silly as not to appreciate the significance of what might lie behind this type of investigation.

The Treasurer, when introducing his Budget, gave his views on the question of the money received from the Commonwealth Government, from its Consolidated Revenue—and on which it charges interest and sinking fund, it seems to me, in rather a cavalier fashion, seeing that it is such an important matter—

Mr. May: Can't you find a good word for him at all?

Mr. COURT: We have given our fair share of commendation, early in the piece. This is a matter of great significance between the Commonwealth and the States, and I feel that we should all understand the position thoroughly. Any Government, whether Liberal-Country Party or Labour, is always seeking to get as much as it can from the Commonwealth Government; and it is only natural that Governments should do that. I am not suggesting that a Liberal-Country Party Government would not make demands on the Commonwealth; but I think the time has arrived when the States have to make their representations for more money on a sound and practical basis, instead of continuing to ask for more money just for the sake of getting more.

Mr. Lapham: Haven't they made their representations on a sound and practical basis before this?

Mr. COURT: The representations have not been made on a constructive basis by any State Premier for a rearrangement of the Commonwealth-State relationship.

Mr. Lapham: That is a different question.

Mr. COURT: They have made no submission except that the Commonwealth is holding too much money; and the time has

come when someone must demonstrate how the Commonwealth can give the States more money without increasing the burden of taxation, because the Commonwealth has the job of raising the taxes—

Mr. Potter: And they do it pretty well, too.

Mr. COURT: The hon. member for Subiaco says that, with the back-drop of the speech last night of his Federal leader; and at that point I must say that never before have we had such a windfall given to us on a platter prior to a Federal election. Here is a man who we were told publicly had been taken in check by a committee, to prepare his speech, so that he would not be as irresponsible as he was last time—

Mr. Potter: It was a very sound speech; and if you only knew something about finance, you would understand how sound it was.

Mr. COURT: He outsmarted himself that time. I do not know who were the members of the committee; but the Leader of the Opposition in the Federal sphere has certainly out-Evatted Evatt in this particular instance, and the Treasurer must be horrified, because if he looks at the figures published this morning he will find that a great deal would have to come out of the allocation made to the States in excess of the tax formula—

Mr. Potter: That is not accurate.

Mr. COURT: I suggest that the hon. member for Subiaco do a bit of pencilling tonight and work it out for himself.

Mr. Norton: Were not the representations made by the all-party committee reasonable?

Mr. COURT: I am not dealing with specific requests, but am referring to the whole of the Commonwealth-State relationship.

Mr. Hawke: Read p. 18 of tonight's "Daily News."

Mr. COURT: I will read from pp. 1970-71 of Federal Hansard—

Mr. Hawke: Read p. 18 of tonight's "Daily News."

Mr. COURT: What I am about to read is far more enlightening than anything that appears on p. 18 of tonight's "Daily News." Members should read this comment by Sir Arthur Fadden on the question of funds by the Commonwealth to supplement the loan programme from Consolidated Revenue. At p. 1970 of Commonwealth Hansard, 1957, Sir Arthur Fadden is reported as saying—

I turn now to the overall position of the States in their loan programmes. From 1951-52 to 1956-57 the States have spent an amount of £1,175,882,000. Where did that money come from? The States obtained it

because we left the whole of the loan market, both internal and external, to them. In addition, in order that they could obtain the maximum amount to finance what we considered were their inescapable developmental programmes, we paid out of revenue, by unorthodox methods so far as accountancy principles are concerned, for the whole of our capital works and services, postal services, the Snowy Mountains scheme, war service homes, war service land settlement and so on. But who carried the stigma for raising that revenue? Why was it raised? Why did we adopt that particular method? The loan market could not yield the requirements of the States. The amounts raised were less than were necessary for their indispensable and inescapable loan programmes and, being the National Government with a national outlook and a national responsibility, we could not allow the States to stagnate.

Mr. Johnson: Did he say why the loan market could not yield any more, or why he destroyed the loan market?

Mr. COURT: I will not be sidetracked by something irrelevant, because he never did destroy the loan market—

Mr. Hawke: Not much!

Mr. Johnson: The policy of high interest rates did it, and that was deliberate.

Mr. COURT: He goes on to explain; but in order not to weary the House, I will skip some of the next part of the speech.

Mr. Hawke: No; read the lot!

Mr. COURT: If the Premier wishes it, I will read the lot.

Mr. Kelly: Skip the mistakes he made.

Mr. COURT: Continuing this quotation—

So we had to come to the party to the extent I shall point out in a moment, and we had courageously to adopt politically unpopular methods in order to help the States. Despite the fact that we left the loan market to the States and that the whole of our capital expenditure was paid out of revenue, the Australian and overseas loan markets yielded only the sum of £587,000,000. Who supplied the remainder? The Commonwealth found the huge sum of £588,351,000, or practically half the total amount of £1,175,882,000. Yet honorable members opposite say we are starving the States and have no regard for them.

This Government has done all the unpopular things, yet the States have been the beneficiaries. What thanks have we had from any State as a consequence? But that has not deterred us. We have a national outlook and realize that the people of

any State are Australians. This Government in its broad fiscal, domestic and economic policy does not consider artificial boundaries. We consider the Australian people as a whole, and our actions have proved the extent to which we have faithfully and in a practical way adhered to that policy.

Honourable members opposite have said that the Commonwealth charges the States interest on loan moneys. I want to put the record right. Honourable members will agree that had the loan market available in Australia and abroad been able to yield the £1,175,000,000, the States obviously would have had to pay the bond rate of interest on the total amount, but because the Commonwealth provided half that amount the States have the audacity to think they should have the money free of interest. This Government actually paid the amount by cross entry because it is taken into account in arriving at the special grant which this year, amounts to £23,800,000.

This supplementary grant, which is made each year, and for which the State Governments do not express very great thanks—and that goes for Governments of all colours—includes consideration for the costs that are incurred by the States in respect to interest-bearing money. We cannot have it both ways and we never hear that side of the story. To continue—

The honourable member for Chisholm (Sir Wilfrid Kent Hughes) said that the special grant this year was less than that for the previous year. I point out that the grant for this year is £4,500,000 more than that for last year, and is £8,500,000 more than the grant for 1955-56. The States would be on a lovely wicket if the loan market failed to such an extent that the Commonwealth would need to find more than £588,000,000 and if interest was not charged on the amount made available to meet the deficiency. In those circumstances, the States would encourage the maximum amount of deficiency. What sort of co-operation to obtain the maximum amount from the loan market could we expect if that situation existed? That is the psychological effect of charging interest.

Despite the Treasurer's entreaty, I do not propose to read the rest of it.

Mr. Hawke: I think you should read the lot.

Mr. COURT: The significant point is that, as it is the National Government, the Commonwealth takes its money from the taxpayers of Australia. If it did not preserve some degree of responsibility, the State Premiers would go back year after year and say, "You gave us £100,000,000 of that money last year free of any

interest and sinking fund. This year we want £150,000,000." But we never hear any concrete proposal coming from any of the Premiers as to how the matter could be more equitably handled.

Mr. Johnson: Are you going to make one?

Mr. COURT: Yes, I am.

Mr. Johnson: Then make it clear.

Mr. Wild: It would have to be for you to understand it.

Mr. COURT: Too often people complain about things, and do not put their heads out by submitting a solution. I have sometimes submitted a suggested solution to this House and experienced the ridicule one receives. I have enjoyed that experience on many previous occasions, and I do not suppose this will be any exception.

Mr. Tonkin: How long do we have to wait for this solution? I am getting curious.

Mr. COURT: If the Minister will relax I will tell him about it all in good time.

Mr. Potter: I am anxious, too.

Mr. COURT: The Premier, and his fellow Premiers, would be on safer ground, and would have more reason for complaint if they said to the Commonwealth Government, "We will take the responsibility for raising some of the revenue." I know that involves a terrific lot of complications—complications which it appears both Federal and State Governments are anxious to avoid. But there is another method which I suggest is worthy of consideration, although it might present some practical difficulties.

The suggestion is this: If, say, one-sixth of the income tax revenue of the Commonwealth is being diverted to the States by way of loan moneys, on which they are being charged interest and sinking fund, and the States were prepared to raise that proportion of the Commonwealth income tax in their own name, but through the Commonwealth taxing machinery, they would have a good case for saying, "We can have this money interest-free and free of sinking fund"; in other words, free of repayment.

I have not heard any State Premier put that suggestion to the Federal Treasurer—that when taxation assessments are issued they be in two parts, one part showing the Commonwealth portion—say, for the sake of argument, that is five-sixths—and one part showing the State's portion. That would be one-sixth raised on behalf of and at the request of the several States of Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania, South Australia, and Western Australia.

Mr. Lapham: What is the advantage of doing that?

Mr. COURT: There is a great advantage. The Commonwealth Government can publicly say, for the sake of argument, "We have reduced our income tax by one-sixth"; and that is a pretty mighty decrease. The State Premiers could then turn around and take the stigma of saying, "The Commonwealth vacated that field to the extent of one-sixth and we have entered it and are taking it in its place."

Mr. Lapham: Purely political expediency.

Mr. COURT: It is nothing of the sort; it puts the responsibility where it fairly belongs. I think the clamour for this money, on a basis of straight-out hand-outs would cease overnight if that proposition were applied.

Mr. Hawke: But the hon. member would vote against the State taxation which he proposes.

Mr. COURT: I do not know how the Treasurer arrives at that peculiar conclusion.

Mr. Hawke: You vote against the Government getting funds through the land tax, or any other form of taxation that the Government wants to levy.

Mr. COURT: I voted against the inequitable land tax.

Mr. Hawke: What about the entertainments tax?

Mr. COURT: That is a similar thing. That is not income tax; it is entirely different.

Mr. Hawke: It is State taxation.

Mr. COURT: Let us be fair about it. The Treasurer, when he introduced the entertainments tax, was trying to tax the people twice; because under the Commonwealth formula, introduced by Mr. Chiefly, it included a reimbursement for entertainments tax. The Commonwealth decided to discontinue the entertainments tax but include the amount in the formula. The Treasurer said, "Let us grab this now while the iron is hot." He made the observation at that time, "If you don't put the tax on straight away there will be a much greater outcry if you try to reimpose it later on." But the Treasurer cannot deny that under the formula the State was being reimbursed by the Commonwealth for entertainments tax that it had taken from the States.

Mr. Hawke: Do you now support the idea of an entertainments tax?

Mr. COURT: I did not support it at the time, and I do not support it now.

Mr. Hawke: Do you support it now?

Mr. COURT: I do not like that sort of taxation.

Mr. Hawke: But do you support it? Don't answer!

Mr. COURT: We opposed the Bill when it came before the House, for reasons which I gave then; those reasons still apply.

Mr. Johnson: But you would like to see the State deducted under the Grants Commission formula, because of the State not applying entertainments tax.

Mr. I. W. Manning: You would like to nationalise the banks.

Mr. COURT: The hon. member for Leederville introduces the most extraordinary sidetracks. If the State Government had to take the responsibility for levying a certain proportion of the income tax, we would find a complete change of attitude. At the moment they talk about the Commonwealth Government being unfair and unjust in its methods. If the State had to take the blame for taxation assessments, there would be a different view altogether. The States would say, "Let the present system prevail". I have never noticed any State Premier, apart from the Premier of Victoria, raising objection to uniform taxation; and, of course, we know that Victoria—

Mr. Hawke: I have always taken the opposite view.

Mr. COURT: I know; because the Treasurer is a unificationist.

Mr. Hawke: So is Menzies.

Mr. COURT: No he is not! He has offered the Treasurer the breaking of uniform taxation so as to give him back his own taxing rights.

Mr. Hawke: Yes, after the Commonwealth has had the first grab!

Mr. COURT: I read with interest the Treasurer's remarks—

Mr. Lapham: Has he offered the State a portion of the receipts from sales tax, payroll tax, and all the other taxes which, in my opinion, are unfair?

Mr. COURT: I do not have to go into the details of that this afternoon; but if the hon. member desires to initiate a debate on uniform taxation, we would be in it.

Mr. Johnson: You made a suggestion on uniform taxation before.

Mr. COURT: I have made a suggestion, but the hon. member was not listening.

Mr. Johnson: I was. But go on, and let us hear more of your suggestion.

Mr. COURT: The hon. member can wait till Hansard is printed, and he can read about it then. I was going to deal with the North-West; but in view of the hour, I propose to skip it, because it will be dealt with in detail on the individual items.

Mr. Johnson: Let us hear more about your suggestion on payroll tax.

Mr. COURT: I suggest that hon. members should read the Treasurer's speech in regard to the Budget figures. It is interesting to compare the efforts that have been made for a reduction in expenditure both by the Commonwealth and the State. It is rather interesting to read that part of the Treasurer's speech.

Mr. Potter: That is for the Commonwealth to do.

Mr. COURT: The Commonwealth formulates its own policy; and if the Treasurer disagrees with it, it is up to him to speak up and say where it should be corrected. He is the one who was present at these discussions. We do not go to the Premiers' Conferences or the Loan Council meetings. There is a terrific lot to be done by this Government if it is going to put its own house in order, and before it starts criticising the Commonwealth Government.

For instance, we find that the State budgeted expenditure for this year is going to increase by something in excess of 6 per cent.; but Commonwealth expenditure—which most of us criticise from time to time as being on the extravagant side—is going to increase by some 5 per cent. Therefore the Treasurer wins by a short head in that regard. Having castigated the Commonwealth Government for spending too much and having said that it should spend less and should give it to him to spend—

Mr. Hawke: Can you give us the additional expenditure in millions of pounds?

Mr. COURT: It is all pro rata.

Mr. Hawke: Can the hon. member give us those figures?

Mr. COURT: I will give the Treasurer the Commonwealth figures. They show a drop of £9,000,000 in the Commonwealth's expenditure this year from Consolidated Revenue from £1,311,363,463 to £1,302,145,000; but if the Treasurer will look at the figure he should know that the Commonwealth Government has taken off £78,000,000 which it will take from loan funds towards financing defence expenditure, and therefore we will have a real expenditure by the Commonwealth in 1958-59 of £1,380,145,000, an increase of £68,000,000 in order to make a fair comparison. It all comes down to proportions.

Mr. Hawke: Are you going to give us the State total figures?

Mr. COURT: Yes, if the Treasurer is anxious to hear them.

Mr. Hawke: Show us the difference between 5 per cent. and 6 per cent. which is the convenient way you were trying to get away with it.

Mr. COURT: It is not a question of being a convenient way; it is a question of fact. The Treasurer's increase in expenditure is going to be £3,590,000; that is, using his own figures.

Mr. Hawke: Thank you.

Mr. COURT: On looking through the Commonwealth figures which the Treasurer has criticised so severely, we find that some of the increases are very interesting. I have my doubts whether the Treasurer, in the light of the speech made by his Federal leader, would want to reduce these figures. There is an increase of a couple of million pounds in war and repatriation services; there is an increase of £26,000,000 in payments to national welfare fund; there is an increase of £1,000,000 in bounties and subsidies; there is an increase in the payments to or for the States of £17,000,000; and there is an increase in capital works and services of £5,000,000.

With the exception of the last item, I cannot imagine the Treasurer deducting one penny from any one of those amounts, because they are directed to the welfare of the people in all the States. I cannot see how those figures can be reduced; and, if that is so, there is nothing of any great magnitude which can be reduced by the Commonwealth Government. Whilst I suggest—and I agree with the Treasurer wholeheartedly—that there is room for economy to be effected in the Commonwealth expenditure, there is also room for similar economy to be effected in our State expenditure. We cannot point the bone at the Commonwealth without putting our own house in order.

Let us have a look at some of the avenues along which we could get better value for our own money. Out of 46 Government building works, tenders were not called for 41. No-one can tell me that a substantial sum of money could not have been saved by calling tenders for those jobs. The Deputy Premier let the cat out of the bag two days ago in answer to a question when I was pressing for information as to whether the Rural and Industries Bank was going to be built by day labour or by contract.

Mr. Jamieson: You want to watch out that the cat does not scratch you.

Mr. COURT: The Deputy Premier was very frank in his observations. His reply was as follows:—

I would remind the hon. member for Nedlands of something that one would expect him to know without being told: That there are other considerations which might determine the question, such as the length of time taken to have a building constructed if one were to call tenders, as against the length of time taken by day labour. For example, in a large building it is necessary to have complete specifications drawn up before tenders are called; and that takes, in some cases, as long as three, four, or five months.

and I added the observation—

And saves a lot of money.

To continue with Mr. Tonkin's answer—

As the time taken might be a considerable factor, it is one which must be taken into consideration.

There is the very root of the trouble, when a building is constructed by day labour instead of by contract; because it is true that if tenders are to be called for a large building such as the Rural and Industries Bank, proper plans and specifications have to be drawn up if the contractor is going to build it on a definite contract basis. Money would thus be saved as a result of the building work not being held up because of lack of detail.

One of the criticisms that can be levelled against the day labour system is the fact that the details of construction are not clarified before the building starts. It is not the fault of the workmen. The workmen on such a job are not less capable on day labour than they would be if they were employed on a contract job. It all boils down to direction and the control from above.

The reason why these jobs are running up terrific costs is the lack of construction details. The Deputy Premier was right when he said that the job could be held up if tenders were called. But what is three or four months' delay if it is going to save thousands of pounds in a building of that nature? In a construction that is to be built by day labour, there must, of necessity, be a terrific waste of money because of the failure to have available, before the job is commenced, detailed plans and specifications. In effect, it means that the Government would get less for its money.

Mr. Potter: Can you say that with a degree of certainty?

Mr. Hawke: It is time the hon. member for Subiaco realised that the hon. member for Nedlands can say anything.

Mr. COURT: The hon. member for Subiaco well knows that what I say is true; and if more detailed plans and specifications were made for these jobs and the instructions were then issued to follow them with the utmost despatch without interference and delay, a terrific amount of cost would be saved. It would mean that with the same amount of money we could have more schools, hospitals and other public buildings.

Mr. Hawke: Pure guesswork!

Mr. COURT: It is not!

Mr. Hawke: Of course it is!

Mr. COURT: Well, let the Treasurer examine the history of the Commonwealth Bank in making arrangements to construct the building on the corner of William and Hay-sts. What happened there? They did not bother to build that by day labour.

Mr. Hawke: Anything could happen under Menzies.

Mr. COURT: Of course, the Treasurer's beloved Commonwealth Bank is involved; and I do not think the Board of Directors of the Commonwealth Bank would agree with the Treasurer, because they had complete control of that building job. What did they do? They did not go to the Commonwealth Department of Works and say, "Will you build it for us?" They waited till the market was propitious and then called tenders, and, I would hazard a guess that it resulted in the saving of a hundred thousand pounds. Before we start criticising other Governments for extravagance, it is time we put our own house in order; it is time we saw that we got good value for our money.

The railway question was covered by the Treasurer in his introduction of the Estimates, and he derived a lot of satisfaction from the fact that his total deficit which is the effective one so far as the overall State finances are concerned, is going to be £100,000 less, approximately, than it was in 1957-58. In other words, he is going to have a total deficit of £5,426,000, as against £5,549,000 last year.

Mr. Johnson: After paying nearly £1,000,000 in interest.

Mr. COURT: If we examine the position we find that for 1955-56 the cash deficit was £2,610,000, while the total deficit was £4,639,000; for 1956-57 the cash deficit was £2,574,000, and the total deficit was £4,933,000; in 1957-58 we find the cash deficit was £3,017,000, and the total deficit was £5,549,000. For the current financial year the cash deficit is estimated at £2,737,000, as against a total deficit of £5,426,000. A more correct way to look at the figure is that the Treasurer has budgeted for a deficit of approximately £5,500,000 as against a deficit of £4,639,000 for 1955-56, which is approximately £800,000 more than it was for that year.

The Government has made many claims of its attempts to introduce greater efficiency, and generally to clean up the railway system; but all we have got out of it is what appears to be a full-time Royal Commissioner who is going to turn out reports until Kingdom come. Of themselves reports never solve problems. They may provide the basis on which to work; but, in the final analysis, somebody must get down to the job of cleaning up the mess; the hard grind of introducing efficiency.

Every time anybody tries to introduce something more efficient he runs up against trouble, because somebody's interests are affected and he is inclined to buck. I would refer the Committee to return No. 51 where we find that in 1954 the number of people employed in the railways was 13,465. The next year shows a figure of 13,554. In 1956, we find 13,856 people were employed, while the labour force for 1957 was 14,102. In 1958, however, the figure is shown as 13,398. I think that

the Government has made a very effective effort within the last 12 months to reduce the labour force from 14,102 last year down to 13,398, without causing an upheaval.

There was never any suggestion that the labour force should be reduced on the basis of causing an upheaval. The Minister for Transport said that somebody on this side wanted 5,000 people sacked; but that is not true. We know that we cannot have mass sackings in these jobs; there must be a transition period, in which the labour force is reorganised. Commendable though this drop is from 1957-58, we still must acknowledge the fact that the labour force of 13,398 in 1958, is almost the same as in 1954, when it was 13,465.

The railway deficit is the greatest single fact in the financial problems of this State; and, in the Treasurer's speech, he did not commit himself in any way to a Government policy in respect of a planned reduction of these railway deficits. The Opposition would be completely unrealistic if it demanded that the railway budget be balanced overnight. I do not think there is any person alive who could, with a stroke of the pen, balance the railway budget overnight.

There are certain established practices that must be broken down, and it takes time. We are realistic enough to accept that. However, it is reasonable to demand from the Government a statement of its policy as to how it proposes to progressively reduce, by substantial amounts, this large total deficit, over a period of years, even if Parliament accepts the proposition that the elimination of railway deficits is completely impracticable in the immediate future.

For instance, it would not be unfair to expect a proposition to the effect that the Government would implement a policy to reduce the total deficit by, say, £750,000 per annum for each of the next five years, by which time it would be down to roughly £2,000,000 annual deficit, as a controlled deficit; and at that point of time a review could take place as to what would be an acceptable deficit in the operation of our railway system, having regard for the demand of our rural areas and the general stage of development throughout this State, and also the state of economy in Western Australia. But we have not had any proposition like that. All we have had is the statement that this year the Government is planning to have a deficit of £100,000 less in total for the railways than for the previous year.

The security of the workers themselves is tied up with this conversion from its present state of affairs to an economic unit. When I say an economic unit, I mean one based on a deficit which this State can afford and is prepared to accept as a developmental commitment. But we have had no declaration whatsoever along those

lines. The Treasurer has not said that he hopes to reduce the deficit next year, or the year after, or progressively over a period of time.

I repeat that the hard grind of implementing the findings of Royal Commissions is yet to be attempted. That is a tough job, and a real test of government. In revenue-raising the Government is not seeking to tap any new sources by way of legislation.

Mr. Johnson: Aren't you going to tell us how the railways can make this reduction?

Mr. COURT: If I dealt with every item in the Estimates I would receive more criticism than I am getting at the moment for taking up so much of the time of this Committee.

Mr. May: Nobody has said a word on that.

Mr. COURT: In its attempt to raise revenue the Government does not propose to tap any new sources by introducing legislation. It is, however, working to death the administrative machinery of revaluation. I refer particularly to land tax and water supply. Under the heading of water supply, we find that 17 districts in the metropolitan area were revalued for 1957-58, and 16 more are listed for revaluation over this year. Those people who are receiving their assessments are far from being amused; because, on the 14th May, the Deputy Premier made a statement, which he acknowledged the day before yesterday as being correctly reported and which said—

No Increase in Water Rates.

The State Cabinet decided at its meeting yesterday not to increase water rates—

I emphasise the plural—

—in the metropolitan area. Deputy Premier Tonkin said that after lengthy consideration the Cabinet decided that the financial position was sound enough not to necessitate the increase.

This is simple and straightforward language, and it was interpreted by everybody that they were not going to pay any extra water rates this year.

Mr. Tonkin: Are you in a position to say that it was interpreted by everybody? That is an extravagant statement.

Mr. COURT: Every ratepayer in my electorate and in other electorates which have been revalued, and they run into dozens.

Mr. Hawke: The whole two of them.

Mr. COURT: The people in my electorate and in the electorates of other hon. members who are feeling a similar impact, are all complaining about the impression given by the Minister that there was to be no increase in water rates. The nicety as

to whether the rate is struck as a rate in the £, or overall, does not enter the mind of the average person. People are entitled to take the statement of the Minister as one of fact.

Mr. Tonkin: The Leader of the Opposition made precisely the same statement when he was the Minister for Works.

Mr. COURT: He did not.

Mr. Tonkin: He did.

Mr. COURT: He did not say the rates would not go up. The Minister read out the answer to a question asked by the hon. Mr. Styants, but he did not read out the subsequent debate which took place at the instigation of the hon. Mr. Styants, recorded on page 2698 of the 1952 Hansard, when he was very critical—

Mr. Tonkin: Before you put yourself too far in on this matter, I suggest you get hold of the Metropolitan Water Supply Act and examine it.

Mr. COURT: I have done just that.

Mr. Tonkin: You go ahead and do so.

Mr. COURT: If the Government had made no statement about the buoyancy of funds in regard to the financial position of the Water Supply Department, people would not have the same cause for complaint; but the Minister made a public statement, and the people are entitled to be annoyed, just as the hon. Mr. Styants was annoyed in 1952.

Mr. Tonkin: He was annoyed, was he?

Mr. COURT: If the hon. member were to read the debate, he would see that Mr. Styants was annoyed.

Mr. Tonkin: What made him annoyed?

Mr. COURT: He was annoyed because the assessments went up, although the rate was not changed. They went up as a result of revaluation.

Mr. Tonkin: Was he annoyed at the statement made by the then Minister for Works?

Mr. COURT: I think he was. He was cross when he got his assessment, call it by whatever name one will—whether it be a revaluation or a rate in the £. It meant more money to be paid by the people. This process is going on throughout the Government's income-raising programme.

Mr. Tonkin: What process?

Mr. COURT: This is a form of taxation increase through administrative means, without having to come before Parliament for legislative authority. I agree that authority to revalue is in the legislation, but the property owner gets the impact of the increase by paying a rate in the £ on the higher valuation.

Mr. Tonkin: You are arguing there should not be any revaluation.

Mr. COURT: The Government should have called a halt, or adjusted the rate in the £. The statement made by the Minister for Works was interpreted by me and by others that he had decided, as a manoeuvre during pre-election year that no more revaluations would be made, and thus hold back the water rates for this particular year. Does the Minister realise how much the rates have been increased?

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest the hon. member address the Chair.

Mr. COURT: It is very frightening to contemplate where the increases in respect of water rates, local authorities rates, and land tax will end. A special tax in the form of the Argentine ant rate is being imposed, and the hon. member for Wembley Beaches is advocating a beach trust rate. Last year we had legislation which envisaged a town planning rate.

It is getting to the situation when ordinary home-ownership is becoming a luxury which the home-owner will not be able to afford much longer. If that is the policy of this Government, as indicated by the Labour Party Federal conference, it should be declared publicly in this State, so that the people will know when they go to the polls next year what they are voting for.

Mr. Hawke: They will know.

Mr. Johnson: Are you making any comment on the Perth City Council's revaluations?

Mr. COURT: The hon. member knows that local authorities make revaluations, but if the increases are severe they also consider altering the rate in the £.

Mr. Johnson: I know a lot more than that.

Mr. COURT: Central Governments do not indulge in these niceties. They just whack up the valuations.

Mr. Johnson: Doesn't the Perth City Council do that?

Mr. COURT: It does; but it also reconsiders the rate in the £ every year.

Mr. Johnson: Doesn't the Minister for Works reconsider the rate struck by his department?

Mr. COURT: He did not say that the rate in the £ was to be unchanged. He said the water rates would not be increased.

Mr. Johnson: If you take everything that is reported in the newspapers as the gospel truth you are more naive than I think.

Mr. COURT: The Minister for Works does not dispute the statement he made. He said that water rates would not be increased, and the people are entitled to accept that as a statement of fact. The viciousness of these valuations is such that I am amazed the Treasurer has only

budgeted for an increase of £70,000 for the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department; because if the electorates which I have checked on up to date are any indication, the Treasury will get infinitely more than that amount when these assessments have their full effect during this financial year.

Mr. Tonkin: How much more will that be?

Mr. COURT: My estimate is that the Treasurer will get another £100,000. These assessments are much more severe than he realises, when we take into account the fact that some assessments are up by 60 per cent., and increases of 40 and 45 per cent. are quite common. When he is dealing with the large estimated total sum of £1,179,000 one can readily see where another £100,000 can go into the coffers of the Treasury.

In regard to land tax, the Treasurer anticipates a reduction of £43,000, assuming he gets the land tax on improved agricultural lands, as compared with the amount last year. The explanation given was that last year's figure included arrears of £130,000. Unless he calls a truce and has no revaluations effected during the election year, I do not see how he can miss getting another £100,000, in addition to the £43,000 reduction which he estimated, under the system of revaluation. The machinery is on the go all the time. With the graduated rate in land tax the people are pushed into a new bracket. The extra revenue obtained is much more than just pushing up the valuation by 10 or 20 per cent., because the people are pushed into a higher taxation bracket, and this will have a greater impact on revenue.

Mr. Tonkin: Do you think the State is getting too much revenue?

Mr. COURT: I am not suggesting that the Government cannot spend it all. No Government ever gets enough, but there is such a thing as spending the money wisely. It makes strange reading that the Premier is prepared to do battle to obtain more land tax; it seems strange that he is prepared to do battle to increase water rates; but he is not prepared to do battle to increase the revenue derived from s.p. operations. From the latter source £426,000 was derived this year, and the estimate for this year is £429,000 or only a slight increase. He is aware of the great turnover in s.p. betting. But he is not prepared to assist the people who own homes, factories and farms, and those who are primary producers.

On every occasion the Government has criticised us because we opposed increases in land tax, water rates and the re-imposition of the tax on improved agricultural land. It is very strange that these essential, desirable and productive people on the land are being bombarded with further taxation and increased

rating, when the s.p. bookmakers receive no mention so far as an increase in their tax contribution is concerned.

Mr. Tonkin: Have you given this question of taxation on bookmakers' turnover much study?

Mr. COURT: I have. I thought the Minister and I were involved in quite a bit of argument over that matter.

Mr. Tonkin: What extra rate do you suggest?

Mr. Watts: The s.p. bookmakers can stand another half per cent as much as primary producers can stand the tax on improved agricultural land.

Mr. Tonkin: The Leader of the Country Party thinks half per cent. What is your idea?

Mr. COURT: I know what the Minister has in mind. We will tell him at election time.

Mr. Tonkin: You are running away from it.

Mr. COURT: I did not say to the Deputy Premier anything about what the extra tax should be. I was most careful. I said it was very strange there was no mention of taxing these people further.

Mr. Tonkin: You cannot make a statement like that unless you have an idea in your mind that the present s.p. tax is too low.

Mr. COURT: When the time comes we will deal with that matter.

Mr. Tonkin: You are running away from it.

Mr. COURT: We are not.

Mr. Tonkin: Yes you are. The Leader of the Country Party was more sincere. He gave us his opinion about the increase. Surely you should have an opinion, and should not be afraid to express it.

Mr. COURT: We have our opinion and will declare it at the right time.

Mr. Tonkin: That's it. Continue to run away!

Mr. COURT: The Minister is not going to force me into this situation. What I want to say is this: Why are these people sacrosanct? It is amazing that once one mentions this subject, the Government rushes to the defence of these people. But it is willing to stack taxes on to property-owners.

Mr. Tonkin: I am asking your opinion. You do not know my opinion.

Mr. COURT: The Minister rushes to the defence of these people at any drop of the hanky.

Mr. Hawke: Was not the tax on s.p. bookmakers' turnover increased recently?

Mr. COURT: Not so recently. I think we dealt with it two years ago. I forget the exact date, but it was a fair while ago and there was quite an acrimonious debate in this Chamber.

Mr. Tonkin: They are no higher in South Australia.

Mr. COURT: The incidence in South Australia is entirely different, as the Minister knows. The division between the Government and race-clubs in South Australia bears no comparison to the position in this State.

Mr. Tonkin: The rate of tax on the individual?

Mr. COURT: The incidence of the tax as it affects the race-clubs and the Government, and the end result of Government revenue, is entirely different.

Mr. Tonkin: That was not the point you were dealing with. You were dealing with the rate of tax.

Mr. COURT: I am dealing with the rate of tax and want to know why this type of tax is sacrosanct while the home-owner and industrialist, who are producing in this community, are subject to increases.

Mr. Hawke: This type of tax is not sacrosanct; it was increased fairly recently.

Mr. COURT: Not so recently.

Mr. Hawke: Fairly recently.

Mr. COURT: Although land tax was increased recently, and will continually increase, this has not stopped the Treasurer severely criticising and almost threatening hon. members in another place in regard to the land tax on improved agricultural land.

Mr. Hawke: Reimposed land tax.

Mr. COURT: It was on a temporary basis, but the Treasurer wants to make it permanent.

Mr. Hawke: The same as every other State of Australia.

Mr. COURT: It does not mean we have to follow their example.

Mr. Hawke: It proves it is reasonable.

Mr. COURT: The outstanding features of the Budget are these: Increased revenue £2,759,000; increased expenditure £3,590,000—an increase of expenditure over increased income of £831,000. Having regard to the current economic conditions, I would not expect the Government to come down now and budget for a surplus; but I do suggest there is scope for a lesser deficit than has been put forward by the Government in these Estimates.

It comes down again to the very thing the Treasurer chastised the Commonwealth Government for—namely, the rate and method of spending. We have to take expenditure incidence in its proper perspective with the figures disclosed in returns

Nos. 3 and 4 covering a period of 10 years, which are submitted with the Estimates. I commend these returns to hon. members because they are well prepared and show a wealth of information going back, in some cases, for a whole decade.

The Budget position must be reviewed in the light of the Commonwealth contribution to our revenue, and these are the figures:—Income tax reimbursement 1957-58, £14,956,427; 1958-59, £16,165,000; Commonwealth special grant, last year, £10,150,000; this year, £11,100,000. The Commonwealth supplementary grant was £315,062. This year none is provided for. As hon. members know, the supplementary grant, if any, comes later in the year. Commonwealth interest contribution is the same in each year, £473,436. The total Commonwealth contribution to our Consolidated Revenue is £25,894,925, against £27,738,432; an increase this year of £1,843,507.

There we have a contribution by the Commonwealth Government for the State to meet the inevitable cost increases that follow government these days with increasing population and increasing responsibilities. However, it is quite apparent that the Government has made very little, if any, effort to see whether it could achieve a closer balance of income to expenditure. If one reads the Treasurer's speech through, one comes to the conclusion that all he has to offer is the suggestion that the Commonwealth should give us more money.

In this morning's paper we have read the speech delivered by the Federal Leader of the Opposition (Dr. Evatt) and the chances of the State's getting more money are just nil. He wants to mortgage the future of Australia, so there will not be anything left.

Mr. Kelly: There is far more judicious spending in his method than with the present method.

Mr. COURT: It is interesting to note that on the question of charging interest on loan supplementation from Commonwealth Consolidated Revenue, Dr. Evatt does not say he will abolish that; he will have it investigated.

Mr. Kelly: That is better than at the present time.

Mr. COURT: What he overlooks, and what his colleagues and our Treasurer overlook, is that the Commonwealth Government has already set up a committee to investigate and report on Commonwealth-State financial relationships before the next meeting of the Premiers.

To summarise, I feel that the Government is deserving of censure because of—

- (a) Its failure to achieve a better balanced financial position;
- (b) its failure to use funds at its disposal to the best advantage of the State;

- (c) its failure to declare a railway policy designed to increase the efficiency of the W.A.G.R. and systematically reduce the railway deficits;
- (d) its insistence on land tax on improved agriculture land;
- (e) its failure to honour its 14th May, 1958, pronouncement that there would be no increase in water rates;
- (f) its actions in extending its socialist undertakings and using unfair methods of trading;
- (g) its administrative directions and actions to discourage and weaken established private industry;
- (h) the division it has caused within the community which is detrimental to the general well-being and rapid development of the State.

I move an amendment—

That the vote be reduced by £1.

THE HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Treasurer—Northam—on amendment) [5.9]: Whenever the Deputy Leader of the Opposition makes a speech one requires either to have a pencil and paper or a retentive memory. My memory is not as good as it was 25 years ago and therefore I have used a pencil and paper somewhat; otherwise it would have been impossible to remember what the hon. member said some four hours ago. He started off on a strong socialistic basis. I wondered whether by some terrific upheaval of conscience he had re-embraced the principles which he deserted not so many years ago.

He told us that the problem of wool marketing was one which was easy to solve; that a price somewhere between the present price and the boom price of 1954 should be established. The hon. member for Collie questioned him very logically about this. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition suddenly realised that he was on thin ice and ran quickly away from it and moved on to his next subject.

Mr. Court: Fair go! I did nothing of the sort.

Mr. HAWKE: He gave us no indication of how he would establish this price for wool on a more or less permanent basis on figures somewhere between the boom prices of 1954 and the much lower prices of 1958.

Mr. Court: You must have failed to listen for the next 10 minutes.

Mr. HAWKE: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition had something to say about the policy of supporting goods made in our own factories and workshops but he wiped this off as more or less insignificant. He

gave us to understand that he did not regard this as very important at all in relation to the total problem.

Mr. Court: I did not say that.

Mr. HAWKE: He went on to urge that we should, in regard to the sale of our manufactured goods, look more to peoples in countries some 12,000 miles or more away. I was reminded of the old saying that the eyes of the fool are always on the uttermost ends of the earth.

At the present time, as is well known, the people of Western Australia are sending a net amount of hard-earned cash of £50,000,000 every year to eastern Australia to buy manufactured goods from those States; and the £50,000,000 a year which we are thus sending away more than equals the credit overseas balance which Western Australia has. In other words, we are giving away more than our credit overseas balance to the manufacturers in eastern Australia—

Mr. Court: No one has disputed that.

Mr. HAWKE:—to make goods for us. We are sending £50,000,000 to them over there, enabling them to employ their people, instead of spending a reasonable proportion of it in Western Australia to employ our own people. However, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not regard that as very important.

Mr. Court: That is not fair comment, and not correct.

Mr. HAWKE: It is right on the beam.

Mr. Court: It is not.

Mr. HAWKE: And I will say here and now, with all the frankness in the world, that we have had no assistance of any practical account at all, from the Liberal Party in regard to the campaign now going on to encourage the people of Western Australia to buy locally-made goods, thus supporting our own manufacturers and workshops.

Sir Ross McLarty: This is not new. The late Sir James Mitchell strongly advocated the support of local products years ago.

Mr. HAWKE: Then the Deputy Leader of the Opposition set out, fairly gently. I admit, to criticise private enterprise in this State. He has the answer to every problem—in words. I have never known a problem to exist in this State, in Australia, or in the world, for which the hon. member for Nedlands has not had the complete solution; but unfortunately, only in words.

Mr. Court: That is a bit extravagant.

Mr. HAWKE: So the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, as I say, went on to criticise private enterprise in this State, in regard to that section of it which is engaged in the manufacture here of various classes of goods. He gave us to understand that they did not do enough about obtaining new markets for the sale of their products. He said they did not do

half enough in the way of putting up goods in the right sort of containers, and all the rest of it. It is no use the Deputy Leader of the Opposition telling us these things. Why does not he go along to the Chamber of Manufactures and put the individual manufacturers on the spot down there?

Mr. Court: I do not hesitate to talk there if necessary, but I am asking you to co-operate and get this message over to the people. There is so much that you could do about it but you just fob them off.

Mr. HAWKE: And so, as I say, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wipes aside as of little or no importance, the main solution to this problem, and that main solution is to encourage increasingly more people in this State to support the products of our own local factories and workshops.

Clearly, if we could save £25,000,000 of the £50,000,000 net which goes over to eastern Australia each year for manufactured goods, we could very greatly, and in a comparatively short period of time, increase industrial development in Western Australia and wipe out whatever unemployment exists here.

Mr. Court: We agree with all that, but two methods have to be used. You are dealing with only one.

Mr. HAWKE: I say, without any hesitation, that the best method; the most effective method; the method we can ourselves control and which is easily at hand, because it is local, is to encourage more people in this State to do as I have said.

Mr. Roberts: The Government itself buys, from the Eastern States, goods that are manufactured in this State.

Mr. HAWKE: I have no doubt that the hon. member for Bunbury has done a great deal of that himself through the years and has done it to a far greater extent in proportion to his total business, than this Government has ever done, or is ever likely to do.

Mr. Roberts: I doubt whether that is anywhere near correct.

Mr. HAWKE: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition had something to say about the Railway Department, and about things which I have said in regard to some business interests in this State grossly exploiting the Railway Department through the years. I repeat that. It is unfortunate that a member of Parliament, who should have some degree of responsibility in protecting Government instrumentalities and Government departments should line up with those who engage in this exploitation.

Mr. Court: I have not done anything of the sort. I have criticised the method of presenting that report, which you must admit is a disgrace.

Mr. HAWKE: I have admitted nothing of the sort and will come to that later. I say here quite frankly that some business firms in this State regard Government departments as organisations to be exploited to the greatest possible degree. As a matter of fact, we know only too well that some private companies try to extract every possible penny they can from Government departments, and hate like hell to pay even a penny to the Government for services which the Government renders in the normal course of events.

Mr. Court: They pay their taxes and rates and so on—

Mr. HAWKE: We had the same story today from the hon. member for Nedlands, in regard to superphosphate prices, as we had the other day. Everyone in this Chamber knows that the hon. member for Geraldton asked certain questions in regard to superphosphate prices, and the answers given to him were factual. The hon. member for Nedlands, in an endeavour further to ingratiate himself with big business concerns in this State, interprets the answers given in the way he wants to interpret them; but other people in Western Australia will interpret those answers in their own way. The vital angle of the whole situation is that the answers given were absolutely factual in reply to the questions asked.

The hon. member for Nedlands completely overstepped the bounds of decency, political or ordinary, in his endeavour to make himself even more popular with some big business interests, in what he said about the Royal Commissioner who is conducting inquiries in connection with the railways. He said—it is in Hansard and every hon. member who heard him will know that this is true—that the latest report of Commissioner Smith was a report of convenience.

Mr. Court: And I repeated that.

Mr. HAWKE: Yes, and the hon. member repeats it again. If anyone in this Chamber can imagine a greater slur than that on a Royal Commissioner, I would like to hear of it. It is a miserable, dirty, low-down slur for the hon. member for Nedlands to cast upon Magistrate Smith, who stands very high in the esteem of the people of this State who know him; and it is a matter for extreme regret that the hon. member for Nedlands, in an endeavour to play party politics and in an endeavour to build himself up more and more with some of the big business interests in this city, should so slur the name of Magistrate Smith. I say, quite frankly, that Magistrate Smith is a man of very great honesty, of great reliability, and a man who believes in the truth and who searches after the truth and who has been endeavouring, during the

time in which he has been a Royal Commissioner, to investigate the affairs of the Railway Department in a thoroughly exhaustive manner.

Mr. Court: He does not believe in getting evidence from both sides. In his report he said that he had not called evidence from the other people and that applies to individuals as well as to industry.

Mr. HAWKE: I can understand the hon. member for Nedlands now developing regret for the unsavoury statement that he made.

Mr. Court: I do not regret it; it was a duty that had to be done.

Mr. HAWKE: The hon. member for Nedlands said, in effect, that the Royal Commissioner had been got at and had been prevailed upon to make a report of convenience; and nothing more scurrilous than that has been said in this Chamber in the 25 years during which I have been here. There is absolutely no truth in it.

Sir Ross McLarty: Then your memory is failing.

Mr. HAWKE: The trouble with the hon. member for Nedlands is that he takes up the attitude that big business is always right.

Mr. Court: Nothing of the sort!

Mr. HAWKE: The suppliers of sleepers who all put in the same price to the Railway Department were all big business men. They all put in the same price for large quantities of sleepers—

Mr. Court: Including State Building Supplies.

Mr. HAWKE: —which proves, beyond doubt, that there was collusion and plenty of it.

Mr. Court: What has the manager of State Building Supplies to say about it?

Mr. HAWKE: He was not one of them.

Mr. Court: That is strange, when one reads Commissioner Smith's report.

Mr. HAWKE: He did not put in the same price as those who conspired in this matter.

Mr. Court: You are talking about the one lot of tenders.

Mr. HAWKE: I am talking about the tenders investigated by the Royal Commissioner, whose report in connection with the matter the hon. member for Nedlands disgracefully described as a report of convenience.

Mr. Court: Will you tell this Chamber that State Building Supplies' tender was greater than that of the other suppliers?

Mr. HAWKE: Yes, and I am going to tell this Chamber that the tender put in by State Building Supplies was above the collusive tender put in by the big firms in question. I will also tell the Chamber why.

Mr. Court: They said it only covered their cost of production.

Mr. HAWKE: If the hon. member for Nedlands knew one-half or one-quarter as much about this matter as he thinks he does, he would not make the foolish statement that he has just made.

Mr. Court: It is not foolish, but is supported by your friends.

Mr. HAWKE: Here we have the hon. member again pulling anyone in to support his statement which is not correct. As a matter of fact, the higher price put in by State Building Supplies was put in at the figure in question because State Building Supplies would have had to purchase from other timber companies most of the sleepers which they tendered to supply.

Mr. Court: I thought that was the complaint of Commissioner Smith—that they all bought in the sleepers.

Mr. HAWKE: I am interested to see the hon. member for Nedlands change his ground. As a matter of fact, he moves so fast in changing from one ground to another that Herb Elliott would have no chance with him in a mile race in this Chamber. As a matter of fact, I would not be surprised if Mr. Leavitt fails to get Herb Elliott—as he is certain to fail—if he does not make overtures to the hon. member for Nedlands.

Mr. Court: Can one lose amateur status as a member of Parliament?

Mr. HAWKE: We had some very airy-fairy talk from the hon. member for Nedlands on Commonwealth-State financial relationships. When he began to tell us that he had a scheme or plan or proposal, I was very interested and so, too, was the hon. member for Leederville. We listened and waited, and waited and listened, and we are still waiting—

Mr. Wild: At least it was something constructive.

Mr. Court: Tell us your solution. You haven't given one yet.

Mr. HAWKE: I will tell the Committee what is wrong with Commonwealth-State financial relationships. The fundamental thing wrong in that regard is that all parties in the Commonwealth political sphere believe in financial unification, and none more than the present Menzies Government. That is what is wrong with Commonwealth-State financial relationships.

Mr. Court: Why haven't the States got back their taxing rights?

Mr. HAWKE: Whether the present situation can ever be satisfactorily overcome is beyond me to say, with any degree of certainty. The hon. member for Nedlands childishly asks why the Commonwealth Government has offered to hand back income taxing powers to the State Governments. Of course it has—

Mr. Court: And how the Premiers ran away!

Mr. HAWKE: The only Premier who might, by some stretch of imagination be described as having run away from the offer, was the Liberal Party Premier of Victoria; because, as members of this Committee know, the Liberal Party Premier of Victoria won a case in the High Court—

Mr. Court: It was a hollow victory, because he could not get any practical result from it.

Mr. HAWKE: Why not?

Mr. Court: For reasons which you should know.

Mr. HAWKE: Why not?

Mr. Court: The practical effect is that he could not get any result unless he could get all the Premiers to work together and the Federal Government to relinquish the power.

Mr. HAWKE: I thought there was one question—only one—upon which the hon. member for Nedlands had some practical knowledge. Now I am driven to the unfortunate conclusion that there is not one.

Mr. Johnson: Hear, hear!

Mr. HAWKE: The reason why the Premier of Victoria, and the Premiers of the other States, have not accepted the empty offer of the Commonwealth Government to hand back the income taxing powers to the States, is that under the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act, first grab at the income tax resources of the people of Australia lies with the Commonwealth Parliament and the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Court: But the States have never yet put up a proposition as to what they should relinquish.

Mr. HAWKE: Here we have this financial cum-political cum-economic cum-accountancy oracle again.

Mr. Court: Keep going!

Mr. HAWKE: I have never seen him at a meeting of the Loan Council or at a Premiers' Conference.

Mr. Wild: You will shortly.

Mr. Heal: You never will.

Mr. HAWKE: And yet, with all the assurance and confidence in the world, he tells us now that the Premiers of the States of Australia have never put up any proposition to the Commonwealth Government in regard to Commonwealth-State financial arrangements, on this question of the States actively resuming control of income-taxing powers.

Mr. Court: They have kept it mighty secret! Don't you think the Opposition has a right to know about these things?

Mr. HAWKE: Although it is to some extent breaching a confidence, I would say that it would have done the hon. member for Nedlands the world of good to have

heard Sir Thomas Playford in action on more than on occasion when this issue was raised at Canberra.

Mr. Court: I have heard him in action in public.

Mr. Johnson: You do not think much of Sir Thomas Playford, I notice.

Mr. Court: We think a lot of our men.

Mr. HAWKE: We had some rather entertaining guess work from the hon. member for Nedlands in connection with the erection of schools, hospitals and similar buildings under the Public Works day labour scheme as compared with the cost of erecting them under private contract. But it was all guesswork. There is nothing which can be replied to specifically.

Mr. Court: You prove that it is wrong.

Mr. HAWKE: All I want to say on the point is that in the last financial year the Government paid over £7,000,000 to private building contractors in Western Australia for work which they did for the Government.

Mr. Court: Are you going to demonstrate that I was wrong in my assertions, or are you going to leave it at that?

Mr. HAWKE: How can one demonstrate that some person is wrong when he makes a guess about something?

Mr. Court: But we are the Opposition. You have all the figures of the departments at your disposal and you should, in fairness to the Committee, tell hon. members where I am wrong.

Mr. Tonkin: I will do that later on.

Mr. HAWKE: I did not even say that the hon. member was wrong; I said that he had engaged in some very entertaining guesswork.

Mr. Court: Then let us know where the guesswork is wrong.

Mr. HAWKE: The Minister for Works is straining at the leash not only to prove that the hon. member was wrong, but also to say something else.

Mr. Court: We are all ears.

Mr. HAWKE: At a later stage in his speech the hon. member for Nedlands had something more to say about the railways. He sort of tried to prove that the improved financial position of the railways in the current year, on the basis of estimates presented by me to Parliament, as compared with the actual position last year, is not correct, and that the position will not be any different. But he told only a quarter of the story—the quarter that suited him. He did not give us the figures showing the greatly increased interest bill, the substantially increased item of costs in regard to depreciation—

Mr. Court: But that is all part and parcel of running the system.

Mr. HAWKE: —the substantially increased charges in connection with pensions, and similar costs of that description.

Had he cared to give even half the total picture, not to mention the whole of it, he would have shown that in effect the total improvement was very much beyond the figure which he plucked out of the air and threw into the ring several hours ago.

Mr. Court: I used the figures which you used in your speech.

Mr. HAWKE: He also told us that the only thing the Government appeared to have done in connection with the railway system generally, was to have appointed a full-time Royal Commissioner. He knows that is not true. Why does he say a thing of that kind?

Mr. Court: What else does the man do?

Mr. HAWKE: Is it just playing on words?—and I must admit he is an expert at that.

Mr. Court: What else is the man doing now? Anything else?

Mr. HAWKE: At present—and this is something which I feel will have the full support of the Government part of the House, the Country Party part of the House, and even the Independent Liberal Party part of the House—he is proceeding to inquire, by visiting the districts concerned and meeting the people concerned, into the suspension of rail traffic on several lines, which suspension the hon. member for Nedlands supported several months ago. So, at least 75 per cent. of us in this House will agree that the Royal Commissioner is well occupied at present, and will undoubtedly be occupied for some weeks to come in following through that particular line of inquiry. The great mistake the Royal Commissioner made in regard to the position he would continue to occupy in the estimation of the hon. member for Nedlands, was to criticise some big business interests.

Mr. Court: That is not so.

Mr. HAWKE: Prior to that the Royal Commissioner had a place of some considerable esteem in the mind of the hon. member for Nedlands. However, since the Royal Commissioner criticised some big business interests he has been wiped off by the hon. member—written down as a dead loss and as a menace.

Mr. Court: You know that that is not true.

Mr. HAWKE: In addition, as I said earlier, he was even accused of allowing himself to be got at by the Government for the purpose of presenting to the Government, and through the Government to Parliament and the public, a report of convenience.

Mr. Court: What about the letters I wrote to you previously regarding another report of the same commissioner?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is interjecting too much. He has had about three hours. The Premier may proceed.

Mr. HAWKE: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that you check your time, because I think you have underrated the period taken by the hon. member for Nedlands. He also had something to say about water rates. Any hon. member in this Chamber with commonsense, and with a knowledge of procedure in regard to water rating, local government rating and so on, knows that periodically there is a revaluation of land.

Sir Ross McLarty: You had better make another one now.

Mr. HAWKE: Not at Pinjarra; so the hon. member can relax.

Sir Ross McLarty: You want to take into consideration the cost of primary products and let us do the right thing.

Mr. HAWKE: By a sort of clever play on words, the hon. member tried to make it appear as though the Minister for Works misled Parliament and the country some few weeks ago when he stated that there would be no increase in water rates in the metropolitan area. The hon. member for Nedlands finds that in the district of Dalkeith, perhaps, where the basic wage earners find it difficult to meet charges of this sort, there has been a revaluation of land; and, as a result, the amount of water rates which are calculated upon the value of the land are greater than they would have been had no revaluation taken place. As far as I know, the Water Supply Department did not revalue these lands. Presumably, the local governing authority revalued them. Would that be correct?

Mr. Court: I do not think so.

Mr. HAWKE: Well, it might have been the Taxation Department.

Mr. Court: The Minister for Works was trying to get a chain system of valuations so that he could get a general approach to the problem.

Mr. HAWKE: Be that as it may, the revaluations were due and probably considerably overdue.

Mr. Court: Did you see the answer to the question given by the Minister for Works when he mentioned the revaluations made previously? The ink was hardly dry.

Mr. HAWKE: I know a little about this subject.

Mr. Watts: They were pretty sudden in any case.

Mr. HAWKE: That may be so; but if one tried to buy some of this land at the valuation upon which these water rates are assessed, one would not be in the race to get it.

Mr. Watts: In some areas you would.

Mr. HAWKE: Only in odd instances.

Mr. Roberts: The water rates have increased considerably in some country areas.

Mr. Tonkin: Not considerably.

Mr. HAWKE: The point I wish to make—which is vitally important—and which all hon. members of Parliament should make when the opportunity presents itself, is that of all the essential commodities, water is by far the cheapest. Whenever water rates have been increased in my district, a few ratepayers have come to me complaining and protesting, but they are very few. They are usually the grizzlers and the hungry ones.

Mr. Court: I wish there were only a few coming to me at the moment.

Mr. HAWKE: Of course, the hon. member advertises for them to come to him. He gets up in Parliament and makes a song and dance about it, so obviously they would come to him. I hope that they come to him in increasing numbers. I hope that thousands more come to him. I hope his telephone never stops ringing; week-ends and all. If this happens, he has brought it all on himself. Members of this Parliament should be honest with themselves and their electors about this question of the price of water. Everybody would agree that a supply of pure water is perhaps the most essential need of human beings. It is the most essential need of all!

Who would say, no matter what party-political purpose he was trying to serve and no matter how desperate he might be, that the price of water is not reasonable in all conscience?

Mr. Court: They still have to pay for it in their overall commitments in land ownership.

Mr. HAWKE: Water is an absolutely essential commodity and of all the essential commodities that human beings need, water is by far the cheapest in price. Of course, the trouble with the hon. member for Nedlands is that he condemns every charge the Government makes. It does not matter what it is, he condemns it because the Government is providing the services or the goods, as the case may be. So, automatically, as the chief spokesman for the Liberal Party and with conservative thought and selfish thought in this community, he condemns it! If we did not know him better, we would think, on listening to him, that the cost of water was a crushing burden upon the people.

Mr. Wild: It is a pretty severe one.

Mr. HAWKE: That it was bearing them down into poverty, degradation, and insolvency.

Mr. I. W. Manning: It was the last straw that broke the donkey's back, you know.

Mr. HAWKE: I should not be surprised if the hon. member's back broke on that basis. Is it not amazing to compare the outlook of the hon. member for Nedlands in regard to the price of water and the prices of the other goods and services

which the Government makes available, with the prices that private enterprise charges to the people for all the goods and services that it makes available.

Mr. Bickerton: The sky is the limit there.

Mr. HAWKE: Is not the difference in his outlook remarkable? There is never a word from him about the suffering of the public in regard to the prices and charges which private enterprise imposes upon his electors and upon ours. Never a word! Whenever a private enterprise increases a price or a charge upon the public, he flies to the defence of private enterprise.

Mr. Andrew: Including the banks!

Mr. HAWKE: He absolutely justifies private enterprise; and yet, when the Government does something—not to the same extent—it is doing something which is cruel, burdensome, destructive and ruinous to his electors and to ours. Of course, the whole matter has only to be explained to expose the unspeakable hypocrisy of his attitude. He has no real concern for the welfare of the people from the political point of view. None at all! His only concern as the hon. member for Nedlands, for the people of Western Australia, is to try to take advantage of every opportunity to poison their minds politically.

Mr. Court: It looks as though you are softening us up for some first-class increases in water rates.

Mr. HAWKE: I am not trying to soften up the hon. member for Nedlands. Some hon. members on this side of the House complain that the hon. member for Nedlands talks too much.

Mr. Andrew: He does, too!

Mr. HAWKE: I complain that he does not talk enough. I think the more he talks, the better for us.

Sir Ross McLarty: You do not really think that, you know.

Mr. HAWKE: Indeed I do! What is more, I have half an idea that the hon. member for Murray, in his quiet moments, thinks the same.

Sir Ross McLarty: You are quite wrong.

Mr. HAWKE: I am not asking the hon. member to admit it.

Mr. Court: I must say that you have said some things tonight that are very helpful to us politically.

Mr. HAWKE: I know that the hon. member for Nedlands is always watching with a snake-like eye and, if snakes have ears, listening with a snake-like ear, for some word, perhaps a sentence, perhaps a suggestion, perhaps a hint; something from which he can draw an inference; something from which he can torture a special interpretation; something which he can put in his book of lies to be used when the election campaign comes

along. Look at what he tried to do this afternoon in regard to the rate of increase during the current financial year in Commonwealth Government expenditure, and State Government expenditure, as compared with last year. Smoothly, hypocritically, he told us—

Mr. Court: Fair go! Factually.

Mr. HAWKE: —that the rate of expenditure by the State Government was greater this financial year compared with last year, than was the rate of increase by the Commonwealth Government this year as compared with last year.

Mr. Court: My figures were factual.

Mr. HAWKE: An increase of 5 per cent. by the Commonwealth Government and 6 per cent. by the State Government. I promptly asked the hon. member if he could give us the figures in millions of pounds. He shuffled, and looked uncomfortable.

Mr. Court: I did not!

Mr. HAWKE: I repeated the invitation and asked the hon. member to give us the figure in millions and, cornered as he was with no possible means of escape, he had to come up with those figures.

Mr. Court: You tell a great story.

Mr. HAWKE: What were those figures? Did they prove that the Government of this State is extravagantly spending much more this financial year as compared with last financial year; by comparison with what the Commonwealth Government is doing this financial year as compared with last financial year? When he gave us the figures in millions of pounds, the hon. member for Nedlands showed that, during this financial year, the Commonwealth Government will spend nearly £70,000,000 more than the State Government will spend in the same time, compared with the amounts each Government spent last year.

Mr. Court: You have to take relative proportions.

Mr. HAWKE: Oh, yes, of course, of course! The hon. member for Nedlands set out to put the State Government in a bad light to the public.

Mr. Roberts: You are already in a bad light.

Mr. HAWKE: Why did he do this?

Sir Ross McLarty: You did the same thing when you were on this side of the House.

Mr. HAWKE: He did so for only one purpose, which was to try to fool and mislead the people, and to poison their minds.

Sir Ross McLarty: You did the same thing when you were on this side of the House.

Mr. HAWKE: The hon. member for Murray, earlier today, told me he was not very well.

Sir Ross McLarty: I cannot stand this.

Mr. Bovell: After listening to the Treasurer he must be worse.

Mr. HAWKE: I am certain the hon. member for Vasse does not feel comfortable after listening to me.

Mr. Bovell: I am quite comfortable.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You are flattering yourself.

Mr. HAWKE: I thought I heard the hon. member for Cottesloe say something.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: I said you are flattering yourself.

Mr. HAWKE: I have no need to flatter myself; no need whatever. But I will say that the hon. member for Cottesloe will need to do a lot of flattering during the next few months, because already he is feeling the hot breath of Eddie Edwards on his neck.

Sir Ross McLarty: Is that a threat? You have a keen sense of humour.

Mr. HAWKE: I am sure it is not necessary to appeal to the hon. members of the Committee to defeat this—I am not sure what it is, but they should defeat it!

MR. WILD (Dale—on amendment) [5.55]: We have listened to the Treasurer making what is no more nor less than a Domain speech. It is one of those speeches we hear every now and then when the Treasurer finds himself at bay. Unfortunately my Leader is not too well this evening, and I am going to deputize for him with a few words as to why there is every reason for reducing these Estimates by £1.

My colleague, the hon. member for Nedlands, endeavoured to point out to the Government various ways in which money could be saved. I want to ask the Government why it is that it continues to pander to Latter & Co. when we can get coal from Collie at £402,000 cheaper annually by using open-cut methods? This pandering by the Government results in industry in this State being called upon to pay the extra amount involved.

Last evening we listened with great interest to the Treasurer replying to allegations made by the Leader of the Opposition concerning the Chase Syndicate. I want to say here and now that if ever the public of this State were hoodwinked they were hoodwinked by the Government in collaboration with Chase. I will say publicly, from the floor of this House, that people like Woolcott Forbes, de Bernales and others were children as compared with Chase. When the Government was accused by my Leader, and asked about all the men who resigned one after the other, we did not get one peep from Government members opposite. We were not given any information nor were we told why Ansley, Groom, Long, Gunn, Dr. Mould,

and the others had left. Even the American directors made no comment; but there must be some answer.

I would like hon. members to recall what the late Mr. Ackland, the then hon. member for Moore, said when he represented that constituency in the House. He said that even though he had three farms from the Lands Department during his lifetime, never before had he heard of such terms being given as were provided for the Chase Syndicate.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that the subject he is now discussing is already before the House in the form of a motion.

Mr. WILD: Very well, Mr. Chairman, I will now turn my attention to unfair trading. There is no doubt that this legislation has brought the State into the position in which it is today. I am sure that the Deputy Premier was not at all happy when he arrived in England on his Cook's tour and found that his Premier had got involved in an argument with Sir Harold Reddish. As far as we can remember, nothing worse has happened to this State than the unfair trading legislation.

Mr. W. Hegney: It was passed with the help of the Liberal members.

Mr. WILD: The hon. member is just as culpable as the rest of his colleagues. All they have done is to frighten capital away from this State; and yet, on the eve of an election we have the Deputy Premier and two or three colleagues rushing around in vain trying to bring new industries to the State from overseas.

Mr. Tonkin: Did you say "in vain"?

Mr. WILD: Yes. The Deputy Premier's trip was nothing but a Cook's tour.

Mr. Tonkin: You are in for a dreadful shock.

Mr. WILD: I have been overseas at my own expense; and after having looked at the itinerary of this Cook's tour carried out by the Deputy Premier, I feel his hopes are vain ones. We all hope that something will come of his visit, but if anything does eventuate, it will only be by sheer good luck. When we look at the American itinerary we find that after having spent four days in New York, the members of the party skipped through America and Canada with 24 hours in each place. Nobody can tell me that they had an opportunity to present Western Australia's case during that short space of time.

The other day I was interested to read a statement made by Mr. Ledger when he was over there. It was apparently made to one of the large engineering organisations which he endeavoured to secure for Western Australia. He set out what we would be prepared to do for them if they established themselves in this State. I

well remember having taken representatives of good enterprises in this State along with me to the Department of Industrial Development, asking for only one tithe of what the trade mission that went overseas has promised the various industries there. The answer I received was "Nothing doing; there is no money." Yet the mission went overseas and did some kite-flying in England and the U.S.A. It offered land, interest-free loans, and everything that opened and shut.

Had the Government been sincere in its policy of encouraging the purchase of goods produced in Western Australia, the first thing it would have done would have been to repeal the unfair trading legislation. If it did that, it would find capital coming into this State from the U.S.A. and Great Britain. But as long as that legislation is enforced, will any investor dare to come to this State in view of the treatment that was meted out to the Cockburn Cement Co.? That company established itself here and brought in many thousands of pounds to set up a business, but before long it was charged with being a monopoly. Let us see what happened; the case went before the courts, and the company was completely absolved.

The Treasurer and his colleagues have done more harm to this State than anyone in the past. Until such time as the unfair trading legislation is taken off the statute book the possibility of attracting industry to this State is, I regret to say, very remote. I venture the opinion that business houses overseas, which have the necessary capital and are prepared to make investments in this State, are looking to the opportunity of having a Liberal and free Government in this State.

Mr. Kelly: You are hoping.

Mr. WILD: The Minister should not forget his friends in the D.L.P. When they have wormed into him he will know what is happening. It is possible with a change of Government that there will be a chance of getting the capital for development which is required by this State and there will not be the need to send missions overseas, offering everything but the kitchen sink, to attract industries.

Mr. Hawke: The hon. member for Dale may not be here in the next Parliament.

Mr. WILD: Parliaments and hon. members come and go, I know. My colleague, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, has put up very strong reasons why the vote we are considering should be reduced by £1. I repeat for the fourth time this afternoon that no Government has done more to harm the State than has the Government of the Treasurer and his colleagues opposite, by bringing into force the unfair trading legislation which they consider to be such a marvellous piece of legislation.

Progress reported.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

(No. 2).

Returned from the Council with an amendment.

House adjourned at 6.4 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 21st October, 1958.

CONTENTS.

	Page
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE :	
Local Government Bill, 1957, tabling of rewrite of Clause 42	1563
Water supplies, construction of Wubin dam	1564
Railways, staff movements in the Geraldton area	1564
Sawn karri, tabling of South Australian and Victorian price lists	1564
LEAVE OF ABSENCE	1564
BILLS :	
Local Government, Standing Orders suspension	1564
Electoral Act Amendment (No. 3),— Application of Standing Order No. 242 Council's message to Assembly....	1573
Electoral Act Amendment (No. 2), 1r.	1573
Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 2), 1r.	1573
Western Australian Aged Sailors and Soldiers' Relief Fund Act Amendment 3r., passed	1574
Tuberculosis (Commonwealth and State Arrangement), 3r., passed	1574
Weights and Measures Act Amendment, 3r., passed	1574
Cattle Trespass, Fencing, and Impounding Act Amendment, 3r.	1574
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r., defeated	1574
Long Service Leave— 2r.	1579
Com.	1581

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

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL, 1957.

Tabling of Rewrite of Clause 42.

1. The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE asked the Minister for Railways:

Will the Minister lay on the Table of the House the rewrite of Clause 42 of the Local Government Bill as submitted by